

МЕЖРЕГИОНАЛЬНАЯ
АКАДЕМИЯ УПРАВЛЕНИЯ ПЕРСОНАЛОМ



МАУП

**МЕТОДИЧЕСКИЕ МАТЕРИАЛЫ
ПО ОБЕСПЕЧЕНИЮ САМОСТОЯТЕЛЬНОЙ
РАБОТЫ СТУДЕНТОВ**

по дисциплине

**“СРАВНИТЕЛЬНАЯ ГРАММАТИКА
АНГЛИЙСКОГО И РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКОВ”
(для иностранных студентов) (для бакалавров)**

Киев

ДП «Издательский дом «Персонал»
2014

Подготовлена доцентом кафедры теории и практики перевода
А. С. Малюгой

Утверждено на заседании кафедры теории и практики перевода
(протокол № 2 от 17.09.10)

Одобрено Учёным советом Межрегиональной Академии управления персоналом

Малюга А.С. Методические материалы по обеспечению самостоятельной работы студентов по дисциплине “Сравнительная грамматика английского и русского языков” (для иностранных студентов) (для бакалавров). – К.: ДП «Изд. дом «Персонал», 2014. – 24 с.

Методические материалы содержат пояснительную записку, формы текущего и итогового контроля, вопросы для самоконтроля, а также список литературы.

- © Межрегиональная Академия управления персоналом (МАУП), 2014
- © ДП «Издательский дом «Персонал», 2014

ПОЯСНИТЕЛЬНАЯ ЗАПИСКА

Цель обучения:

Владение иностранным языком определяется навыками корректной речи, что, в первую очередь, требует высокого уровня знаний грамматики и сформированности грамматических навыков во всех видах речевой деятельности. Цель курса сравнительной грамматики английского и русского языков — заложить основы системного понимания и усвоения основных грамматических категорий английского языка путем их сравнения с грамматическими категориями русского языка.

Основные задачи дисциплины:

Овладение материалом курса предусматривает усовершенствование понимания студентами языковых универсалий, базовых понятий дисциплины, выявление типологических признаков сравниваемых грамматических явлений, распознавание изо- и аломорфных признаков в грамматических системах двух языков и дальнейшее развитие грамматических навыков владения как английским, так и русским языками, а также решение определённых задач:

- заложить студентам теоретическую основу грамматики английского и русского языков через сравнение категориального аппарата сопоставимых языков;
- достичь понимания студентами характера межязыковых грамматических связей и отношений;
- раскрыть основные грамматические трансформации в процессе перевода при отсутствии грамматических эквивалентов в сопоставимых языках;
- добиться от студентов свободного оперирования грамматическими структурами как в письменной, так и в устной речи;
- научить студентов различать грамматические явления при чтении или аудировании и объяснять употребление той или иной грамматической формы.

Самостоятельная работа студентов:

Комплексное обучение грамматике английского языка предусматривает развитие у студентов навыков самостоятельной работы, что включает:

- обработку тем, которые выносятся на самостоятельное изучение;
- выполнение домашних заданий (лексико-грамматические упражнения, письменные переводы, грамматические упражнения)

на воспроизведение и трансформацию, составление диалогов и монологов с использованием активного грамматического материала);

- подготовка к письменным работам.

Формы текущего и итогового контроля

Система контроля состоит из текущих, рубежных и итоговых этапов.

Текущим контролем является устный фронтальный опрос на практических занятиях для оценивания уровня усвоения студентами теоретического материала и качества выполненных практических заданий. Рубежный контроль осуществляется в форме тестов, которые охватывают изученные темы.

Итоговым контролем является сдача экзамена, которому предшествует итоговая тестовая работа.

Последняя выполняется на заключительном этапе изучения курса и предусматривает оценивание уровня знаний грамматики английского языка в сопоставлении с грамматикой русского языка и качества выполнения практических грамматических заданий.

Экзамен по сравнительной грамматике английского и русского языков проводится в форме устного ответа и включает теоретическое и практическое задания. Задания экзаменационной карточки содержат: теоретический вопрос; переводческий анализ текстового отрывка на английском языке через комментирование и сопоставление грамматических явлений; перевод с русского языка на английский с учетом грамматических явлений, предусмотренных программным материалом курса.

МАТЕРИАЛЫ И ЗАДАНИЯ ДЛЯ САМОСТОЯТЕЛЬНОЙ РАБОТЫ

Раздел 1

SUBJECT OF CONTRASTIVE TYPOLOGY

Typology as a branch of linguistics comes from “type” or “typical”, hence, it aims at establishing similar general linguistic categories serving as a basis for the classification of languages of different types, irrespective of their genealogical relationship.

Contrastive typology (порівняльна типологія), as the notion itself reveals it, represents a linguistic subject of typology based on the method of comparison or contrasting. Like typology proper, which has hitherto been practised, contrastive typology also aims at establishing the most general structural types of languages on the basis of their dominant or common phonetical/phonetic, morphological, lexical and syntactic features. Apart from this contrastive typology may equally treat dominant or common features only, as well as divergent features/phenomena only, which are found both in languages of the same structural type (synthetic, analytical, agglutinative, etc.) as well as in languages of different structural types (synthetic and analytical, agglutinative and incorporative, etc.).

Practical Aims and Tasks of Contrastive Typology

The results obtained in any branch of typological investigation can be usefully employed both in theoretical linguistics and in teaching practices. Thus, the all-embracing final results of universal and general typologies could help to successfully perform a scientifically substantiated general classification of languages. The results of structural and sublevel/aspect typologies could usefully help in creating scientifically well-grounded theoretical as well as practical phonetics/phonologies, grammars, lexicologies, stylistics and dictionaries of various languages. The study of caractereological and partial (aspects) typology would acquaint the student with the fundamentals of this modern branch of linguistics in general and with some of its principal methods of analysis in particular. A contrastive typological treatment of the main phonetical/phonological, lexical and grammatical features/phenomena, available or unavailable in the corresponding systems of the foreign language/languages and in the native tongue, will provide the students not only with the linguistic results necessary for their successful methodological work

at school, but also with the understanding of a systemic organisation of all languages. Contrastive typology as a branch of linguistics employs some terms and notions of its own. The principal and the most often occurrent of them are as follows:

1. **Absolute universals** i.e. features or phenomena of a language level pertaining to any language of the world (cf. vowels and consonants, word stress and utterance stress, intonation sentences, parts of the sentence, parts of speech, etc.).

2. **Near universals** i.e. features or phenomena common in many or some languages under typological investigation.

3. **Metalanguage**, as has been mentioned already, is the language in which the actual presentation/analysis of different features/phenomena of the contrasted languages is carried out.

4. **Typologically dominant features** are features or phenomena dominating at a language level or in the structure of one/some of the contrasted languages. Dominant in present-day English are known to be analytical means: rigid word order in word-groups and sentences, the prominent role of prepositions and placement as means of connection and expression of case relations and syntactic functions (cf. books for my friend, books to my friends, books by my friends; a nice flower-nice flowers, Peter came – Mary came), etc. The change of placement of the part of the sentence may completely change its sense. Cf. The hunter killed the hare – The hare killed the hunter. In Russian the change of placement of the main parts of the sentence usually does not change the meaning of the sentence, as in this same sentence: Охотник застрелил зайца or: Зайца застрелил охотник. In Russian everything is just on the contrary: case, gender and number categories are expressed by means of inflexions: он пел – она пела, дитя пело; красный цветок – красные цветы; первый шаг – первые шаги, первая смена. There is abundance of synthetic and analytical or synthetic and analytical government (звать Марию/Петра; звать на ужин/к столу; сделано Петром/кем-нибудь (для кого-нибудь), etc. Consequently, the dominant (and typical) features of a language predetermine its structural type as analytical, synthetic, agglutinative, etc.

5. **Typologically recessive features/phenomena** are those losing their former dominant role as, for instance, case forms in English or the dual number forms of some nouns in present-day Russian.

6. **Isomorphic features/phenomena** as was mentioned already, are common features/phenomena in languages under Contrastive analysis. Isomorphic in English and Russian is, for example, the existence of con-

sonants and vowels, assimilation, and the categories of number, person, tense, as well as parts of speech, the existence of sentences, etc.

7. **Allomorphic features/phenomena** are observed in one language and missing in the other. For example: palatalisation of practically all consonants or the dual number in Russian, the gerund or the diphthongs and analytical verb forms in English, which are missing (allomorphic) in Russian.

An exhaustive list of isomorphic and allomorphic features/phenomena of a foreign language and of the native tongue can constitute a reliable basis for characterological typology. Its main aim, as in our case, should be to teach students to identify, select and group the isomorphic and allomorphic features/phenomena in English and in Russian and to use the obtained results for methodological purposes in their future teaching and as well as in their translating practices.

8. **The etalon language** is a hypothetical language created by typologists for the sake of contrasting any languages. This “language” is supposed to contain exhaustive quantitative and qualitative data or characteristics concerning all existing language units and phenomena. For example, the quantity and quality of sounds (vowels, consonants) and syllables, morphemes, parts of speech and their morphological categories, the correlation of the means of grammatical connection, etc. Methods of Investigation in Contrastive Typology Contrastive typological investigations are carried out with the help of several methods. The main one is the comparative method, which is also employed in historical and comparative linguistics. Nevertheless, the final aims of Contrastive typological linguistics and of historical and comparative linguistics differ greatly. The latter aims at establishing the parent language and the former at establishing the isomorphic (alongside of allomorphic) features, the dominant features and on their basis the establishment of structural types of languages under Contrastive investigation.

Comparing of isomorphic features and phenomena can very often be performed both with the help of the deductive and the inductive methods. The deductive method is based on logical computation/calculation which suggests all admissible variants of realisation of a certain feature/phenomenon in speech of one or of some contrasted languages. For example, the existence of the attributive AN and NA structure word-group patterns in English and Russian is indisputable. Cf.: the green pasture – the pasture green (Byron), зеленое пастбище – пастбище зеленое.

Common are also the dAN and the dDAN patterns in English and Russian (eg: that nice book, that very interesting book – та хорошая книжка, та очень хорошая книжка).

Rarer, though quite possible, are also ANd or DANd patterns word-groups, eg: dear lady mine, very dear lady mine; дорогая сестра моя, сестра очень дорогая моя.

Russian word-groups of both these patterns regularly occur in speech. Cf. хорошая книжка эта, очень хорошая книжка эта. The deductive computation helps find some other transforms of the ANd pattern with the post-positional pronoun determiner as in the word-group “nice young sisters of his” or “a brave deed of hers” which are impossible in Russian, where a prepositional pronoun or noun displays a strong objective relation.

Consequently, the deductive method of analysis can be rather helpful in Contrastive typological investigations, and not only when contrasting syntactic level units or phenomena.

Much more often employed in Contrastive typology is the inductive method which needs no verification whatsoever, since the investigated feature/phenomenon was proved already by the preceding generations of researcher linguists. Due to this the reliability of the results or data provided by the inductive method is indisputable. An example of thus obtained results may be the qualitative characteristics of vowels in some European languages (Table 1).

| Quality | English | Ukrainian | Russian | French | German | Spanish |
|---------------|---------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|---------|
| front | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| central | + | – | + | – | + | + |
| back | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| long | + | + | + | + | | |
| diphthongised | + | – | – | + | + | |
| labialized | + | + | + | + | + | + |
| nasalized | + | + | + | + | | |

These results had been obtained by the preceding researchers long ago and are simply taken from the corresponding phonetics bona fide by everybody interested in the nature of vowel sounds in the mentioned languages. Open covered syllable and the other is a consonantal CC syllable. At the morphological level the ICs method helps establish the componental morphemes in words of the contrasted languages. Thus, the noun writings consists of three ICs: writ/ing/s i.e. a root morpheme (writ), a suffix (-ing) and the ending (-s). A similar ICs analysis can be observed in

Russian. Thus, the noun *земляне* splits into the following ICs: *зем/-л-/ян-/-е*; the first morpheme */зем/* is the root morpheme, the second and the third */-л-, -ян-/* are suffixal morphemes and the fourth *(-е)* is the inflexion.

At the syllable level this noun splits into as many syllables as there are vowels: *зем-ля-не*, though the syllabification of this noun may depend upon the speaker's stress: *зем-ля-не* or *зе-мля-не*, both variants being linguistically justified in Ukrainian. The ICs method is often employed to single out constituent parts of the syntactic level units both at sentence level and at word-group level. Thus, the sentence *He learns many new words every week* can be subdivided into the following constituent word-groups: 1) He learns (predicative word-group); 2) many new words (attributive word-group); 3) every week (adverbial word-group). At word-group level a further splitting is observed: He learns; many / new// words; every/ week. The Russian equivalent of this sentence has the same types of word-groups with the identical division into ICs: Он/ изучает; 2) много/ новых// слов; 3) каждую / неделю.

The transformational method is more often employed than the ICs method. Also it is more helpful when identifying the nature of some language unit in a contrasted language. Its reliability is clearly proved through translation, which is always the best transformation of any language unit. In short, any transformation is a form of expressing some definite meaning. The simplest transformation is transcoding (перекодирование другими буквами). Cf. in English: Leeds, Liverpool (in Latin letters) and Лидс, Ливерпуль in Cyrillic or any other letters. The transformational method is employed: a) to identify the nature of a language unit in the source language or in the target language. Thus, the type of the Russian sentence *Знаю, прийду*, may be understood and treated differently:

- 1) as a definite personal sentence with two homogeneous predicates;
- 2) as a definite personal main sentence (why shall I come?) because (I know it) or
- 3) as two co-ordinate definite personal clauses with the causal implicit meaning. When translated into English (i.e. transformed), this sentence acquires the following structural form: /know it and I shall come. Therefore, the original Russian variant *Знаю, прийду*, may be identified as a definite personal sentence with two homogeneous i.e. co-ordinate clauses corresponding to (Я) *знаю* and (и я) *прийду*.

b) Transformation may reveal the difference in the form of expression in the contrasted languages. Cf. *Вас приглашают принять участие*

в научной конференции (an indefinite personal sentence, active voice), which has for its equivalent in English You are invited to take part in the scientific conference (i.e. a definite personal sentence with a passive voice verbal predicate). Transformation may often be required by the peculiarity of the syntactic structure of the source language (or the target language) unit. Cf. The lesson over, all students went to the reading-hall. После того, как занятие закончилось (Поскольку занятие закончилось...) or into a prepositional noun, expressing time: После окончания занятий студенты пошли... The nominative absolute participial construction *The lesson over* (i.e. being or having been over) has to be substituted i.e. transformed into an adverbial clause of time or cause (После того, как занятие закончилось / Поскольку занятие закончилось все студенты пошли в библиотеку).

Transformation may also be lexical, as in the following sentences: He is not unlike his father Він схожий на свого батька; or Dick was running in the yard in his shirt sleeves Дик бегал во двор без пиджака (в одной верхней рубашке).

Apart from these some other methods of analysis are helpful for the establishment of structural or semantic isomorphisms and allomorphisms in the contrasted languages. Among these is also the Contrastive linguistic method, which is usually employed to investigate a restricted number of genealogically related or non-related languages. The object of Contrastive linguistics in general is the meaning, form and functioning of certain language units, their features or phenomena. Unlike Contrastive typology, Contrastive linguistics does not treat language features or phenomena with the aim of establishing isomorphic or allomorphic features and universals. Divergent features and phenomena in the languages under Contrastive linguistic investigation are considered to be irregularities or exceptions to some general rules. The aim of Contrastive linguistics has never been to establish systemic relations on a global scale, or to establish universal features. Despite all this, the Contrastive linguistic method, when employed both synchronically and diachronically, provides the establishment of valuable theoretical and practical results providing the reliable data on various aspects of languages under investigation. Contrastive linguistics contributes greatly both to the aspect and characterological typologies of the investigated languages. Some purely typological methods of Contrastive investigation have recently been suggested as well. Among the best known is the indexes method by the American linguist Joseph Greenberg. The method helps identify the quantitative co-

occurrence or frequency of some feature or phenomenon in the contrasted languages. J. Greenberg selected some passages, among them one English and one Russian, each containing one hundred notional words and subjected them to various typologically relevant analyses. The parameters of his computations were as follows:

1. The degree of synthesis in the words. Thus, when the morphemes are lettered as M and the number of words in the passage as W, the M/W- ratio will express the synthetic structure index, which is in English between 1.62 to 1.68.
2. The second parameter constitute the ways in which various morphemes are joined in English notional words. Since one of the mainways in English is agglutination (lettered as A), it gives in relation to this kind of juncture (lettered J) an A/J ratio reflecting the degree of cohesion between the morphemes in these notional words. It goes without saying that the higher the index, the greater the role of agglutination and the lower their fusion (i.e. synthetism) in any language.
3. The productivity degree of the form-building morphemes constitutes the third parameter. When the number of root morphemes is lettered as R, the number of words in the text as W, the R/W ratio will express the index of derivation. This index proves that the higher the number of root morphemes making the notionals, the lower is the degree of form-building in the system of words in the contrasted language.
4. The quantity of derivational morphemes (D) in direct relation to the number of words (W) in the text gives the D/W ratio indicating the word- forming capacity of a language.
5. The fifth parameter characterises the correlation of affixal morphemes in their relation to the number of words. So, the P/W ratio constitutes the index of prefixation and indicates the correlation between the number of prefixes and the number of words in the text.
6. Similarly, the S/W ratio with the letter S standing for suffixal morphemes will be the index of suffixation in the words of the text.
7. Finally when accidence, i. e. genuine form-building is lettered as Pi, then the Pi/N- ratio will designate the index characterising the form-building capacity of words in the language.
8. Consequently, when the synthetic agreement is lettered as Co (concord), the Co/N ratio will represent the index of concord i.e. grammatical agreement in the selected by the researcher passage/text.

It should be added in conclusion that J. Greenberg's indexes have been analysed and proved to be true by different linguists in some European countries. Some linguistics as V. Kroopa in Slovakia have even further elaborated and improved the method by substituting the lettered indexes for the digital gradation from zero (0.3, 0.5 etc.) up to 1 (one).

Вопросы для самоконтроля

1. The subject of contrastive typology and its theoretical and practical aims.
2. The principal terms and notions of contrastive typology (isomorphic / allomorphic features and phenomena, absolute/near universals, typological constants, idiomatic, dominant and recessive features, etc.).
3. Kinds of typological investigations/various typologies (special typology, level typologies, areal typology, etc.).
4. The typological method vs. the historical and comparative method, the contrastive linguistic method of investigation.
5. The principal linguistic methods employed in contrastive typology (the comparative, the inductive/deductive methods, the ICs, the transformational and substitutional methods, Greenberg's indexes method).
6. Give a short prehistory of European contrastive typology of the 17th – 18th centuries. The Ukrainian lexemes in Sanskrit.
7. The contribution to contrastive typological investigations of the brothers F. and A. Schlegel and of W. Humboldt, H. Steinthal and others in the 19th century linguistics.
8. Prague school linguists (V. Mathesius, N. Trubetskoj, V. Skalika, R. Jakobson, and others) and their contribution to typological investigations.
9. Other 20th century linguists (E. Sapir, J. Greenberg, O. Isachenko, N. Ya. Marr, M. Kalynovych, Y. Zhluktenko) and their contribution to typological and Contrastive linguistics.
10. The dominant typical features of a language vs. the structural type of this language.

Раздел 2

TYPOLOGY OF THE MORPHOLOGICAL

Systems of the contrasted languages

The morphological systems of the English and Russian languages are characterised by a considerable number of isomorphic as well as of several allomorphic features. The isomorphic features are due to the common Indo-European origin of the two languages, while allomorphisms have been acquired by English and Russian in the course of their historical development and functioning as independent national languages.

The main *typological constants* that make the object of contrasting at the morphological level of English and Russian, and not only of these but also of many other languages, are three. These are 1) the morpheme; 2) the parts of speech; 3) their morphological categories.

The principal typological constant of the morphological level is, of course, the morpheme which is endowed in both contrasted languages with some minimal meaning. As to its structure, the morpheme may be a) **simple** (one-phoneme): a-, -s, -t (*alike, says, burnt*) in English and -a, -y, c-, etc. in Russian (*весна, дома, беру, скушать, спрятать*) or b) **compound** (-ment, -hood, -ward, -ство, -ский, -цкий) as in *management, brotherhood, seaward, общество, сельский, ткацкий*. The complexity of its nature, structure and meaning makes the morpheme one of the main objects of contrastive study at the morphological level. Moreover, the morpheme in English and Russian has some peculiar features, which are characteristic of each of these contrasted languages.

Isomorphisms and allomorphisms in the morphemic structure of english and russian words

The morpheme is a minimal meaningful unit and it can be in the contrasted languages either **free** or **bound**. **Free** or **root** morphemes are lexically and functionally not dependent on other morphemes. They may be regular words (cf. *boy, day, he, four, день, конь, вещь, он, три*) or they may constitute the lexical core of a word. Eg.: *boyhood, daily, fourth, дневной, ночной, трижды*, etc. In other words, root morphemes in English, Russian and other languages are not dependent on other morphemes in a word. **Bound** morphemes, on the other hand, can not function independently: they are bound to the root or to the stem consisting of the root morpheme and of one or more affixal morphemes. Cf.: *days, spoken, fourteen, overcome, government, удивительно, умом, дни, нашим*), etc.

Bound morphemes like -s, -en, -teen, over-, -ment, -o, -ом, -и, ~им in either of the two languages can not exist independently, i.e. they are not free but always dependent on roots or stems of their words.

Root morphemes. Due to its historical development, English has also a much larger number of morphologically unmarked words, i.e. regular root morphemes, than Russian. Consequently, the number of inflexions expressing the morphological categories is much smaller in English than in Russian. Moreover, a lot of notionals in English lack even the affixes which can identify their lexico-morphological nature. **Free root-morphemed** words, though fewer in Russian, are still represented in all lexico-morphological classes as nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. of both contrasted languages. Cf. arm, pen, boy, work, do, red, he, she, it, five, this, ten, here, far, etc. Similarly in Russian: нос, лоб, чуб, ты, кто, три, тут, где, он, etc. Free root morphemes in English and Russian can also be functionals: but, till, on, not, through, just (a moment), мол, прочь, да, может, ох, гав, не, нет, от, на, под, etc. Root morphemes in English can often form part of the stem, which is especially characteristic of present-day Russian, for example: workers, friendliness, concerning, beautiful; безграничность, переодеться, переработавши, тепло, тепленько, etc.

Affixal morphemes in the contrasted languages split into a) Derivational morphemes which are in English and Russian mainly suffixes and sometimes also prefixes. The number of suffixes in the contrasted languages considerably exceeds the number of prefixes. So is, naturally, the significance of the former as word-forming means, the latter (prefixes) performing only in a few cases a word-building function in Russian. The number of suffixes in English does not exceed 100, there being 60 noun-forming, 26 adjective-forming, 5 verb-forming and 3 adverb-forming suffixes [13, 159–160]. Among the **noun**-indicating/forming suffixes in English are -acy, -ance, -ion, -dom, -er, -ess, -hood, -ics, -ism, -ity, -ment, -ness, -ship, -ty and others. Cf. democracy, alliance, delegation, freedom, writer, falsehood, politics, feudalism, government, management, fitness, likeness, penmanship, friendship, loyalty, etc. The **adjective**-indicating suffixes are: -able, -al, -ial, -fold, -ful, -ic, -ile, -ish, -less, -ous, -some, -ward, -y and some others. Cf. capable, formal, presidential, manifold, grateful, laconic, futile, selfish, meaningless, dangerous, tiresome, eastward, happy, silly, etc. The **verb**-indicating suffixes are -ate, -en, -esce, -ify, -ise. Cf. negotiate, facilitate, blacken, shorten, acquiesce, beautify, purify, demobilise, organise. The adverb-indicating suffixes are -ly, -wards, -ward, -ways: quickly, slowly, southward/southwards, sideways, etc.

Inflexional morphemes in the contrasted languages express different morphological categories. The number of genuine English inflexions today is only 14 to 16. They are noun inflexions, for example: -s (-es), -en, -ren (boys, watches, oxen, children); inflexions of the comparative and the superlative degrees of qualitative adjectives: -er, -est (bigger, biggest); inflexions of degrees of qualitative adverbs: -er/-ier, -est/-iest (oftener, oftenest; slower; slowliest); the verbal inflexions: -s/-es, -d/-ed, -t, -n/-en; he puts/he watches; she learned the rule (burnt the candle); a broken pencil. The inflexions of absolute possessive pronouns: -s, -e: (hers, ours, yours, mine, thine). There are also some genuinely English plural inflexions of nouns with restricted use. These are the plural form inflexions of kine (poetic for cows), fane (archaic of foes), and shoen (archaic of shoes).

Agglutination at the morphological level represents a mechanical adding of one or more affixal morphemes in pre-position, post-position or in interposition to the root morpheme. Somewhat different, however, is the quantitative representation of the parts of speech that are formed in the contrasted languages by means of preposed agglutinating morphemes.

Suppletivity is observed in words, word-forms and morphemes of all Indo-European languages as a means of grammatical expression. At the lexical level it helps express, both in English and Russian, sex distinctions, eg: boy – girl, bull – cow, man – woman, cock – hen, мальчик – девочка, мужчина – женщина, петух – курица, etc. Of suppletive nature are most of nouns forming the LSG denoting kinship. Cf. father – mother, brother – sister, son – daughter, aunt – uncle; отец – мать, брат – сестра, сын – дочка, дядя – тетя, зять – невестка, дед – баба, etc.

Typology of the parts of speech in the contrasted languages

The identification of the parts of speech in the contrasted languages is not always an easy matter though the main subdivision of words into notionals and functionals seems to be indisputable. The ambiguity of form and meaning of many English notional words, however, brought some grammarians to the assumption that there exist no proper grounds and justification for singling out some notional parts of speech in present-day English. C. Fries [41, 94–100], for example, suggested a purely functional approach to the classification of English words. He singled out class 1 words (those performing the function of the subject), class 2 words (those performing the function of the predicate), class 3. words (adjectivals), i. e. attributives, and class 4 are were in Fries' classification adverbial function

words or word-groups. C. Fries tried to avoid even mentioning the usual term of “parts of speech”. The term is also avoided by this grammarian in his classification of “function words”, which are allotted to 15 different groups and include also some pronouns, adverbs and verbs.

A typologically more relevant classification has been suggested for English notional by C. T. Hockett who distinguishes in English “parts of speech” and “classes of words”. Among the notional three pure “classes of words” (or regular parts of speech) are distinguished: “class N words”, “class V words” and “class A words”. These “classes” are mainly singled out with regard to the morphological (or rather paradigmatic) properties of these notional which, having the structure of mere roots or stems, can “show more than one pattern of usage”, as C. T. Hockett puts it. In other words, they may follow either the noun or the verb and an adjective pattern.

Hence, the grammarian singled out apart from the N, A, V classes of words some double and triple word stem classes. These are, for example, the NA class, represented by many words, such as American, human, innocent, private, savage, sweet, which may function both as nouns and adjectives (cf. American scientists, an American). The NV class are words which can respectively have the meaning and perform the function of the noun and verb (cf. a book, to book smth.). The AV class represents words which can show the adjective and the verb pattern (cf. clean hands, to clean the room). The NAV class represents words which can follow the noun, the adjective and the verb pattern respectively (cf. the fat of meat, fat meat, to fat (up) fowls). Thus, “classes of words” clearly reflect the amorphous grammatical nature of many English nouns, verbs, adjectives and sometimes adverbs which in the course of their historical development have been reduced, as a rule, to regular roots or stems. As a result, their true lexico-grammatical nature, i. e. their proper lexical meaning, and consequently their formal and functional characteristics can not be discriminated when taken out of a word-group or sentence. The word “export”, for example, may be noun or verb (when indicated by stress or determined by the particle “to”). “Negro” may also be noun (a Negro) or adjective (Negro and white schools); “blue” may be noun (the blue of the sky), adjective (the blue sky), or verb (to blue smth.).

Вопросы для самоконтроля

1. The dominant morphological and syntactic features distinguishing the structural type of present-day English from the structural type of present-day Russian.

2. The morpheme as a typological constant in the contrasted languages. Quantitative and qualitative correlation of affixal morphemes in English vs. Russian.
3. Agglutination at the morphological level. Pre-positive and post-positive agglutination.
4. Types of inflexional morphemes in the contrasted languages.
5. Suppletivity as a means of grammatical expression of words, word-forms and morphemes in the contrasted languages.
6. The problem of “Word classes” vs. the parts of speech in English and Russian.
7. Isomorphism and allomorphy in the quantitative representation of the morphological categories and means of their expression in the nominals of the contrasted languages.
8. Typological characteristics of the noun (classes, morphological categories, functions of the noun in the contrasted languages).
9. Singularia and pluralia tantum nouns and expression of quantity (or number) in the contrasted languages.
10. Isomorphism and allomorphy in the means of expressing definiteness and indefiniteness in the contrasted languages.
11. Morphological/structural, categorial, functional and other isomorphic and allomorphic features of different classes of adjectives in the contrasted languages.
12. The pronoun. Classes of pronouns. Isomorphic and allomorphic features of English vs. Ukrainian pronouns.
13. The numeral. Classes of numerals and their isomorphic/allomorphic features in the contrasted languages.
14. The verb. Isomorphism and allomorphy in the classes of verbs. Morphological categories of person, number, tense, voice, aspect, mood and their realisation in the contrasted languages.
15. Isomorphism and allomorphy in the system of verbals of the contrasted languages.
14. Typological characteristics of different classes of adverbs and their structural peculiarities. The origin of some adverbs in English and Russian.
15. Typological characteristics of English vs. Russian statives and their combinability.
16. Typological characteristics of the functional parts of speech in the contrasted languages:

- a) semantic groups of modal words and modal expressions in English and Russian;
- b) isomorphism and allomorphy in the meaning, structure and functioning of prepositions in the contrasted languages;
- c) the conjunction. Paradigmatic classes of conjunctions and their morphological structure in English and Russian;
- d) isomorphic and allomorphic features of different classes of particles in the contrasted languages;
- e) typological characteristics of interjections/emotives in the contrasted languages.

Раздел 3

TYPOLOGY OF THE SYNTACTIC SYSTEMS

A successful typological contrasting of syntactic systems of the English and Russian languages becomes possible due to the existence in them of several isomorphic and allomorphic features and phenomena. The principal of these are predetermined, as will be shown in this section, by several factors, the main of which are the following:

- 1) by common in both languages classes of syntactic units which are word-groups, sentences and various types of supersyntactic units;
- 2) by generally common paradigmatic classes and types of these syntactic units;
- 3) by isomorphic and allomorphic types and means of syntactic connection in them;
- 4) by mostly isomorphic syntactic processes taking place in their word-groups and sentences;
- 5) by identical syntactic relations in word-groups and sentences of both contrasted languages;
- 6) by common functions performed by different parts of speech in word-groups and sentences.

The allomorphic features and phenomena at the syntactic level find their expression in the following:

- 1) in the existence of various qualitative and quantitative differences in some paradigmatic classes of word-groups and sentences;
- 2) in some types of word-groups;
- 3) in the unequal representation of different means of syntactic connection;

- 4) in the existence of different ways of expressing predication; 5) in the difference in the structural forms of some English parts of the sentence;
- 6) in the means of joining some subordinate clauses to the main/principal clause, etc.

All these features characterise respectively the syntactic constants of the syntactic level, i. e. the syntactic processes, the syntactic relations, the syntactic connections in word-groups and sentences being themselves constants of this language level.

Syntactic Processes, their Types and Ways of Realisation

Syntactic processes are various in the contrasted languages and they find their realisation only in word-groups and sentences. The realisation of these processes in English and Russian syntaxemes may be achieved both by isomorphic and allomorphic ways and means, the main of which are as follows:

1. **Extension** which is achieved in both contrasted languages through adding subordinate components to an element that is the head/nucleus, i.e. subordinating in the syntaxeme. Extension in English and Russian syntaxemes may be achieved both by syndetic, i.e. explicit, synthetic or analytical means or (which is more often in English) asyndetically, i.e. only by way of placement of components.

These processes are naturally realised in smaller and larger syntactic units which are word-groups and sentences. The former consist of two or more notional words connected by isomorphic or allomorphic grammatical means and expressing some sense. Eg: this book — these books, to see somebody — to see him; books for reading, library books, worth reading, red from excitement, to read much/well, very well, etc.

Such and the like word-groups are known to be syntactically free contrary to stable (усталені) or phraseological word-groups as, for example: to throw light, to set free, to make steps, etc. All word-groups in sentences usually perform the syntactic function of a part of the sentence.

Apart from the above-named ways of realisation of syntactic processes achieved through extension, there are some others having isomorphic nature in the contrasted languages as well. They are: a) Apposition, which is equally often employed in English and Russian.

Eg: a woman doctor, the city of Kyiv/London, Shevchenko the poet, Shevchenko the painter, we all, they all, etc. Similarly in Russian: жена —

врач, город Киев, Шевченко — поэт, Шевченко — маляр, мы все, они все.

An external syntactic transformation may equally be achieved via parathetic and inserted words, word-groups or sentences that are incorporated into the structure of a syntactic unit by addition or insertion.

Detachment is one more common way of external syntactic extension that is presumably of isomorphic nature in most languages. Detached in English and Russian may by any secondary part of the sentence and detachment is achieved through extension by means of subordination. These may also include subordinating conjunctions or regular expansion, which is realised by way of co-ordination that may be achieved usually with the help of coordinate conjunctions. Extension can also be achieved by other syntactic means, among which quite productive and often employed in the contrasted languages may be, for example, the one referred to as

Specification. This kind of syntactic process presents a way of syntactic extension in English and Russian which is achieved via a syntactic element/part of the sentence usually modified by one or more other complementing elements of the same nature and syntactic function. Though not necessarily of another lexico-grammatical class of words. Specification is more often employed for the identification of adverbial parts of the sentence.

Alongside of extension, though formed on cardinaly different principles of enlargement (on the basis of co-ordinate connection of componental parts) and yet performing the same syntactic functions of different parts of the sentence in the contrasted languages is also expansion.

2. **Expansion** as a syntactic process is equally aimed at enlarging the content of word-groups and sentences in either of the contrasted languages. It is no less often resorted to than extension though by its nature it is a completely different syntactic process representing a coordinate joining of components which are syntactically equal in rank. Connected in this way and maintaining the syntactic status of componental parts of the syntactic units unchanged may be in English and Russian various parts of speech functioning as expanded parts of the sentence. Expansion is usually achieved by way of addition (termed so by Почепцов 1971). The formed in this way (through addition) strings of components usually function as homogeneous parts of the sentence. For example, homogeneous subjects. Expanded can also be in both contrasted languages the simple verbal predicate. Such and the like simple verbal predicates in the contrasted languages are usually referred to, as was said above, to homogeneous.

Expanded in this way may also be objects/objective complements. They may often be with prepositive or postpositive attributive adjuncts. Expanded (homogeneous) adverbial modifiers or adverbial complements, as they are usually termed, are equally common in both contrasted languages.

Representation which is a particular process of syntactic substitution alien to the Russian language. It represents a kind of reduction in which the component of a syntaxeme is used to present the content of the whole syntactic unit, which remains in the preceding syntaxeme but its meaning is implicitly represented by some element. For example: "I don't know if he's hungry, but I am." (I. Baldwin) Here the linking verb *am* in the closing co-ordinate clause (but I am) represents the whole subordinate clause "if he's hungry".

Contamination is another internal process in which two syntaxemes merge into one predicative unit as in the following sentence: The moon rose red. This means: The moon rose + she was red. Or in Russian: Наталья прибежала сердитая, запыханая. i.e. Наталья прибежала + (Наталья) была сердитая + (Наталья) была запыханная.

Compression represents a syntactic process which is closely connected with reduction and with the secondary predication complex as illustrated above, but it exists only in English. This syntactic process is most often observed in English with the nominative absolute participial constructions, which are usually transformed in speech. Cf. He stood beside me in silence, his candle in his hand. (C. Doyle) The nominative absolute participial construction in this sentence is a reduced transform from the construction *his candle being or having been in his hand*. The Russian transformed variants of this secondary predicate/complex will be either a participial construction *держа свечку в руке*, or a co-ordinate clause *а свечка была в руке*, or simply *со свечкой в руке*.

The mentioned above external and internal syntactic processes do not completely exhaust all possible ways of transformation taking place within English and Russian sentences. And yet they graphically testify to the existence of isomorphic and allomorphic features that characterise respectively the syntactic systems of each contrasted language.

Syntactic Relations and Ways of their Realisation

Unlike some syntactic processes as, for example, representation that is observed in English and is completely alien to present-day Russian and other languages, the syntactic relations in contradiction to them present a phenomenon characteristic of all the 5651 languages of the world. Syntactic relations, therefore, constitute a universal feature and are re-

alised depending on their grammatical nature either at sentence level or at word-group level.

There exist four types of syntactic relations that are also realised in different languages partly via different means. These are: 1) **predicative relations**; 2) **objective relations**; 3) **attributive relations** and 4) **various adverbial relations**.

Вопросы для самоконтроля

1. Features and phenomena serving as typological constants at the syntactic level in the contrasted languages.
2. Isomorphism and allomorphy in the correlation of the means of grammatical expressing the syntactic relations in English and Russian.
3. Quantitative and qualitative correlation of the means and ways of syntactic connection in present-day English vs. present-day Russian syntactic units.
4. Isomorphism and allomorphy in the types of syntactic processes and in the forms of their realisation in the syntactic units of the contrasted languages.
5. Isomorphism and allomorphy in the nature, structure, and syntactic ways of connection in the existing types of word-groups of the contrasted languages.
6. Common and divergent features of predicative word-groups in English and Russian.
7. Isomorphism and allomorphy in the structure and nature of morphological (paradigmatic) classes of word-groups in the contrasted languages .
8. Isomorphic and allomorphic features in the structure and ways of connection in substantival word-groups of the contrasted languages.
9. Isomorphic and allomorphic features in the ways of connection and in the structural forms of substantival, adjectival, pronominal and numerical word-groups in English vs. Russian.
10. Common and divergent features in the forms of connection and in the combinability of components in English and Russian verbal word-groups.

СПИСОК ЛІТЕРАТУРЫ

Основная

1. *Аракин В. Д.* Сравнительная типология английского и русского языков — М.: ФИЗМАТЛИТ 2005. — 232 с.
2. *Корунець Л. В.* Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов. — Вінниця: Нова книга, 2003 — 350 с.
3. *Кусько К. Я., Тимошник О. М.* Контрастивна лінгвістика: проблеми, завдання, прикладна орієнтація // Іноземна філологія. — 1995 — Вип 96. — С. 55–89.
4. *Радчук В. Д.* Сторінка мовознавця. <http://www.radchuk.novamova.com.ua/pereklad> 2007

Дополнительная

5. *Wikipedia.* Free encyclopedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org> 2007
6. *Генсьорський А.* Галицько-Волинський літопис. — К.: Академія наук УРСР, 1961 — 284 с.
7. *Кухаренко В. А.* Інтерпретація тексту. — Л.: Просвещение, 1979. — 327 с.
8. *Мороховский А. Н., Воробйова О. П., Лихошерст Н. И., Тимошенко З. В.* Стилістика англійського мови. — К.: Вища шк., 1991. — 244 с.
9. *Пелевина Н. Ф.* Стилістический анализ художественного текста. — Л.: Просвещение, 1988. — 272 с.
10. *Пономарів О.* Культура Слова. Мовностилістичні поради. — К.: Либідь, 1999. — 120 с.
11. *Galperin I. R.* Stylistics. — М.: Higher School Publishing House, 1981. — 334 с.
12. *Циткина Ф. А.* Терминология и перевод. — Львов: Радуга, 1988. — 385 с.
13. *Швейцер А. Д.* Теория перевода. Статус, проблемы, аспекты. — М.: Альфа, 1988, — 285 с.
14. *Мирум Т.* Профессия — переводчик. — К.: Юніверс, 1999. — 195 с.
15. *Bell R. T.* Translation and Translating. — London: Cambridge Press, 1991.— 480 p.
16. *Hatim B., Mason I.* Discourse and the Translator. — New York: Brooklyn Bridge, 1988. — 490 p.
17. *Newmark P. A.* Textbook of Translation. — New York: Harrison Press, 1988. — 390 p.
18. *Reed C.* A Teacher's Guide and Glossary to The United States Constitution. — Washington: US Informational Agency.
19. *Teaching English for Business ESP English Classes.* <http://esl.about.com/library/20> Sells P. The Language of Advertising. <http://www.stanford.edu> 2007

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

| | |
|--|----|
| Пояснительная записка | 3 |
| Материалы и задания для самостоятельной работы | 5 |
| Список литературы | 23 |

Ответственный за выпуск *Е. Г. Аникина*
Редактор *А. А. Тютюнник*
Компьютерная верстка *Н. В. Коваленко*

Зам. № ВКЦ-5233

Формат 60×84/₁₆. Бумага офсетная.
Печать ротационная трафаретная.

Усл. печ. лист. — 1,39. Обл.-вид. лист. — 0,99. Тираж 50 пр.

Межрегиональная Академия управления персоналом (МАУП)
03039 Киев-39, ул. Фрометовская, 2, МАУП

ДП «Издательский дом «Персонал»
03039 Киев-39, просп. Краснозвездный, 119, лит. XX

*Свидетельство о внесении в Государственный реестр
субъектов издательского дела ДК № 3262 от 26.08.2008 г.*