МІНІСТЕРСТВО ОСВІТИ І НАУКИ УКРАЇНИ
НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ТЕХНІЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ
«ДНІПРОВСЬКА ПОЛІТЕХНІКА»

ЕЛЕКТРОТЕХНІЧНИЙ ФАКУЛЬТЕТ
Кафедра перекладу

Л.В. Бердник

**ПОРІВНЯЛЬНА ГРАМАТИКА
АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВ**

Конспект лекцій
для здобувачів ступеня бакалавра
освітньо-професійної програми «Германські мови та літератури
(переклад включно), перша – англійська»
зі спеціальності 035 Філологія

Дніпро
НТУ «ДП»
2024

Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов [Електронний ресурс] : конспект лекцій для здобувачів ступеня бакалавра освітньо-професійної програми «Германські мови (переклад включно), перша – англійська» зі спеціальності 035 Філологія / уклад. Л.В. Бердник ; М-во освіти і науки України, Нац. техн. ун-т «Дніпровська політехніка». – Дніпро : НТУ «ДП», 2024. – 83 с.

Укладач
Л.В. Бердник, канд. філол. наук, доц.

Затверджено науково-методичною комісією зі спеціальності 035 Філологія (протокол № 4 від 26.11.2024) за поданням кафедри перекладу (протокол № 4 від 26.11.2024).

Уміщено теоретичний матеріал з основних питань, що розглядаються на лекційних заняттях курсу.

Конспект стане у пригоді для самостійної роботи здобувачів під час підготовки до лекційних занять з дисципліни «Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов».

Конспект укладено за навчальним посібником Корунець І. В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов. – Вінниця: «Нова Книга», 2003. – 464 с.

Відповідальний за випуск завідувач кафедри перекладу Т.М. Висоцька, канд. філол. наук, доц.

ЗМІСТ

ВСТУП

Дисципліна «Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов» має зв'язок з дисциплінами, що становлять стандарт фундаментальної філологічної освіти, а також із загально-гуманітарними дисциплінами.

Мета вивчення дисципліни «Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мова» – узагальнення, розширення і поглиблення знань студентів про граматичні системи мов у порівняльному аспекті; удосконалення розуміння студентами мовних універсалій як базових понять дисципліни; формування компетентностей щодо ефективного оперування спеціальною термінологією в межах курсу «Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов» для розв'язання професійних завдань.

Така мета передбачає розв'язання наступних завдань:

- створити цілісне уявлення про типологічні властивості сучасної англійської та української мови на морфологічному та синтаксичному рівнях;

- закріпити знання про самостійні та службові частини мови, морфологічні категорії самостійних частин мови; види синтаксичного зв'язку у словосполученнях; структурні особливості словосполучень та речень; головні та другорядні члени речення;

- ознайомити студентів з основними поняттями, одиницями, категоріями та робочими термінами дисципліни;

- сформувати навички визначати та класифікувати основні спільні й відмінні риси та явища граматичного строю у мовах, що порівнюються.

Очікувані результати навчання:

- знати принципи, технології і прийоми створення усних і письмових текстів різних жанрів і стилів державною та іноземними мовами; визначати та аналізувати взаємодію мовних одиниць англійської мови та характеризувати мовні явища і процеси, що їх зумовлюють;

- здійснювати лінгвістичний, літературознавчий та спеціальний філологічний аналіз текстів різних стилів і жанрів.

Lecture 1. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS

This Lecture:
1) introduces the notion of comparative linguistics;
2) describes aims of comparative linguistic studies;
3) describes methods of comparative linguistic research;
4) introduces terminology of comparative linguistic studies;
5) provides survey of comparative investigations in linguistics.

Comparativistics as a branch of linguistics aims at establishing similar general linguistic categories serving as a basis for the classification of languages of different types. Comparativistics represents a linguistic subject of general typology based on the method of comparison of two or more languages. This branch of language studies reveals their common and different phonetical, morphological, lexical and syntactic features. Each of them may be compared either synchronically or diachronically.

The basic aims of typological investigations are the following:
➢ to identify and classify the languages under investigation according to the main common (isomorphic) and divergent (allomorphic) features;
➢ to draw from these features the isomorphic and allomorphic traits (peculiarities) in the languages compared;
➢ to establish the typical language structures and the types of languages on the basis of the obtained (acquired) isomorphic features;
➢ to perform a truly scientific classification of all languages of the world on the basis of the obtained practical data.

These are the goals of **comparative linguistics** which are pretty close to those of language typology, though there exists specific practical aims of comparative research. The results of comparative investigation may be applied in:
- translation practice;
- compiling dictionaries;
- teaching foreign languages.

Comparative linguistics is based on the typological method of research which is grounded upon the procedure of comparison. The specific method of comparative investigations **is called contrastive**. Sometimes scholars may also apply the historical method based on reconstruction and diachronic analysis of language data. Though, more often they deal with the functional methodology aimed at analyzing the usage of language data in speech.

Depending on the aspect of research linguists may apply different methodology:
- descriptive;
- experimental;
- statistic;
- transformational;
- substitutional;
- intermediate and ultimate constituents analysis;

- inductive (comparing language data on the ground of certain criteria);
- deductive (working out criteria for comparison).

The terms most widely applied while carrying out comparative linguistic research are the following:

- language universals are linguistic phenomena used to characterize all languages existing on the globe on all levels taking into consideration their systems and structures. According to the statistic principle they are classified into unrestricted **universals** (**absolute**) and restricted universals (**relative/near** universals - неповні/часткові універсали) i.e. features or phenomena common in many or some languages under typological investigation.).

Languages may possess **unique** features as well, e.g. the final position of prepositions in present day English special questions *What do you depend on?*

- **typologically dominant features** (типологічні домінанти) 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 <u>nice</u> flower-nice flowers, Peter <u>came</u> - Mary came), etc. The change of placement of the part of the sentence may completely change its sense. Cf. <u>The hunter</u> killed the hare - *The hare* killed *the hunter.* In Ukrainian 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: *Мисливець* застрілив *зайця* or: *Зайця* застрілив *мисливець.* In Ukrainian everything is just on the contrary: case, gender and number categories are expressed by means of inflexions: братові книжки, братових книжок; він співав - вона співала, дитя співало; червона квітка - червоні квітки; перший крок - перші кроки, перша зміна. There is abundance of synthetic and analytical or synthetic and analytical government (кликати Марію/Петра; кликати до вечері/до столу; зроблено Петром/будь-ким (будь для кого), etc. Consequently, the dominant (and typical) features of a language predetermine its structural type as analytical, synthetic, agglutinative, etc.

- **typologically recessive** features/phenomena (типологічно рецесивні, втрачаючі колишню активну роль) 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 Ukrainian.

- **isomorphic** features (ізоморфні риси/явища) are common features/phenomena in languages under contrastive analysis. Isomorphic in English and Ukrainian is, for example, the existence of consonants and vowels, assimilation, and the categories of number, person, tense, as well as parts of speech, the existence of sentences, etc.

- **allomorphic** features/phenomena (аломорфні риси/явища) are observed in one language and missing in the other. For example: palatalization of practically all consonants or the dual number in Ukrainian, the gerund or the diphthongs and analytical verb forms in English, which are missing (allomorphic) in Ukrainian.

An exhaustive list of isomorphic and allomorphic features/phenomena of a foreign language and of the native tongue can constitute a reliable basis for charactereological 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 Ukrainian and to use the obtained results for methodological purposes in their future teaching and as well as in their translating practices.

As for the language units analyzed there exist phonetic, morphological, lexical and syntactic universals.

The universal phonetic phenomenon is that all languages have vowels and consonants.

As for the morphology:
a) in most languages, words are structured into morphemes;
b) morphemes function as full and auxiliary elements

As for lexis:
a) in all languages vocabulary presents a system of semantic fields;
b) in all languages there exists polysemy, synonymy, homonymy and antonym.

As for syntax – all languages possess distribution of the subject, the predicate and the secondary elements (SVO) in the sentence.

Type denotes a generalized form of features characteristic of a number of languages: e.g. in syntactic typology they differentiate between several types according to the basic word order of a language. Thus, there are SOV, SVO, OVS, OSV, VOS and VSO types. E.g. English and Ukrainian belong to the SVO type, while Turkish represents the SOV type;

the etalon language is a hypothetical language created by linguists for the sake of contrasting languages;

a world language is spread throughout the whole world and understood by many people. Greek, Latin used to perform this function. Nowadays English and French are used for international communication in different spheres. English, French, Russian, Chinese, Arabic and Spanish are officially recognized as the languages of the United Nations Organization because they:
- represent big nations;
- possess great cultural heritage
- play an important role in world politics.

At the end of the 19th century **artificial language**s were considered to perform international functions, though these attempts failed because:
- they were not natural;
- had no spoken norm;
- lacked emotional colouring;

language norm (competence) is the unity of correct, conventionally recognized as correct forms in the language system; speech norm is the unity of language forms

7

recognized in the process of communication without leading to misunderstanding.

History of **comparative linguistics** may be divided into 3 main periods:

• the end of the 18th century up to the middle of the 19th century, which is called the beginning of comparative research;

• the end of the 19th century – the period of neogrammarian studies, when linguists started comparing living languages;

• the beginning of the 20th century up to the present – the period of structural and functional approaches to language.

As early as the 17th and 18th centuries many European linguists pointed to the existence of some common features in different languages (I. Komensky, W. Leibnitz).

This idea came into being in the minds of the first Europeans who visited India in the 16th and 17th centuries. They were often struck by a great similarity in the lingual form and meaning of a number of common words like *mother brother, sister*, etc. The first attempt to create grammar on «common in all languages principles» was made by the Frenchmen Arnaud and Lancelot (in Port Royal, 1660). But only the beginning of the 19th century with its historic and comparative method brought a dynamic development to European linguistics.

Lecture 2. GRAMMAR IN THE SYSTEM OF COMPARATIVE STUDY OF LANGUAGES

This lecture:
1) introduces grammar as linguistic science;
2) describes languages of the world; the notion of a language family; the basic language families;
3) analyses the genealogical classification of languages;
4) gives the typological (morphological) classification of languages.

Grammar is the part of linguistics that studies the grammatical structure of language, i.e. the laws of formation and functioning of words and sentences. This term is also used to denote the grammatical structure of language, i.e. the system of morphological and syntactical forms and categories of language.

Grammar as science has ancient traditions. Its roots lie in the works of ancient Indian linguists, and had been formed in the investigations of ancient Greeks. By its very nature the origin of grammar from the very beginning studied the formal means of expression (формальні засоби вираження) of linguistic content in connected speech. Not by chance phonetics and writing had been the parts of grammar for a long time, in such a way sounds and letters serve to be the form of expression of linguistic content.

In linguistics **general grammar** (загальна граматика) and **specific grammars** (окремі граматики) of each language are distinguished. General grammar studies the universal grammatical features which are typical for all languages. Specific grammar investigates the grammatical structure of a concrete language, for example, the grammar of English, German, Japanese, Ukrainian, Russian and others. Both grammars are connected and correlated (співвідносяться) as gender/generic and aspect/specific and present different levels of understanding of a language as linguistic phenomenon.

It is difficult to define how much is the precise number of languages in the world.

It is conditioned by the fact that sometimes it is not clear whether the language is independent or its territorial or regional variant, i.e. a dialect. Besides, there exist the «dead languages» which are not always included in the general panorama of the world languages. Modern linguistics distinguishes about 5000 languages. English is the second language in the world (after Chinese) as for the number of speakers. It is common knowledge that about half a million people now speak English as first language. It is the national language of Great Britain, the USA, Australia, New Zealand and part of Canada. English is native to many who live in India, Israel [ˈɪzreɪl], Malta [ˈmɒltə] and Ceylon [sɪˈlɒn]. As for Ukrainian people use it daily in different countries either as the first or the native language.

The interest to the knowledge of languages and their historical development was not the same through centuries. The history and theoretical descriptions of languages have their traits at different periods of time.

The problem of language classification, language distribution in accordance with their definite taxonomic rubrics (таксономічні рубрики, тобто закон розміщення за порядком від грецької «taxis – розміщення за порядком», «nomos» – закон) has been one of the main points of linguistic investigation since the beginning of the 19th century.

The most productive and recognized **classifications** are **genealogical and typological** (morphological). In the middle of the century the interest to the comparative and historical study of languages greatly increased. In the process of comparative investigations the identity of ancient Indian words and grammatical structure with the basic European languages was established and it made an extraordinary impression on European scientists.

With the help of the comparative-historical method the genetically similar words and forms of the related languages can be compared and their original type can be restored. It is considered that if the relationship of languages is established then regular sound and grammatical correlations (the identical flexions in particular) in the contrasted languages give the most reliable results. Valid results also take place when the roots of words which belong to the ancient layers of lexis are similar. It should be born in mind that the historical relationship of languages is not always explained by the fact of their common geographical area of existence.

According to the principle of relationship languages may be divided into several big groups which are usually called **families**. The language family is formed by the joint combination of related languages, i.e. there are common features in the structure of these languages. Languages that belong to different families do not demonstrate any features of historical relationship. There are no words and forms of common origin in such languages besides borrowings which can interfere from one and the same source into related and non-related languages. Inside the family the languages are connected with different degree of relationship. Some languages of a family are characterized by a great number of distinctions; the others have quite a few. The number of languages inside the family is termed **the branch or the group**. Languages of one and the same branch are always closer to each other than languages of two different branches.

For example, Slavonic languages as the branch of the Indo-European family have much more in common than Ukrainian and English because the latter belongs to the Germanic branch of languages. Inside the branch the level of identity between languages is not the same that is why some groups are divided into subgroups of related languages. According to the comparative grammatical study of the English and Ukrainian languages the main point of interest in these terms are the Indo-European and Germanic language families. The Indo-European family is the largest group between all the language families according to the number of people speaking them. Indo-European languages manifest their relationship rather distinctly. This family is divided into twelve branches, the big part of which consists of separate languages and some dead languages. To the Indo-European family belong Indian, Iranian, Germanic, Slavonic, Romanic, Baltic, Celtic groups of languages, and also some dead groups of languages. The Greek, Armenian and Albanian languages stand separately in this family.

The Germanic group is usually divided into two subgroups – northern Germanic (Scandinavian) or West Germanic. English together with German, Dutch, Frisian and Yiddish are the languages of this branch.

For the last two centuries one more **classification called morphological** has been developing in linguistics. The main principle of this classification is the affirmation that all the languages of the world in spite of their relationship or nonrelationship may be parted into different types according to some common features of their structures, and above all it is the morphological structure of a word.

At the end of the 18th century a German linguist Frederic Shlegel was the first who got interested in the possibility of defining the type of a language. The scientist made an attempt to compare Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and the Turkic languages and divided them into two types – **inflected and non-inflected** (affixal), later termed as **agglutinative**. Such division distinctly presented the structure of the languages under investigation. But still one problem remained disputable, namely, the problem of distinguishing in the morphological classification of such languages, as Chinese, for example, which has neither flexions nor regular affixes. August Shlegel made changes in his brother's theory and defined one more type of languages – those that have no grammatical structure, later termed amorphous languages. The linguist made it possible to single out two means of the grammatical structure of inflected languages – analytical and synthetical. Wilhelm fon Humboldt due to the profound knowledge of a great majority of languages perfected the Shlegels' classification and singled out the fourth type of languages – incorporative. The scientist stated that there are no «pure» representatives of this or that certain type of languages. Subsequently, typological classifications have been verified, perfected, made in accordance with the new bases. But still the typological classification of languages remains generally accepted, it presents the four morphological types: **inflected, agglutinative, amorphous and incorporative**.

In languages of inflected type (флективна мова) flexion is the steady and essential feature of the morphological structure of a word. Inflected languages are characterized by the wide use of flexions which express different grammatical meanings.

At the same time flexion is often multifunctional, i.e. expresses simultaneously several grammatical meanings. For example, in the Ukrainian word *рука* the ending – a expresses three grammatical meanings simultaneously: feminine gender, singular, Nominative case. Affixes in inflected languages may occupy different positions in relation to the root, being a suffix, a prefix, or an infix (инфикс – *«аффікс, що вставляється до кореня слова при словотворенні або словозміні»; «вставляти букву, звук у слово у якості інфікса»*).

Inflected languages are characterized by phonetically non-conditioned changes of a root (бігати –біжу, літати – лечу, pronounce - pronunciation) and the presence of a great number of types of declension and conjugation. The word in inflected languages is an independent unit which has indicators of its relation to the other words in a word-combination or a sentence.

To inflected languages belong, first of all, Indo-European languages. Their essential character is the division into languages of analytical and synthetical structure. The analytical structure presupposes the wide use of functional words, phonetical means and word-order for the expression of grammatical meanings. English is the language with analytical structure. The synthetical structure is characterized by the greater role of the word forms which are created with the help of flexions and also word-forming suffixes and prefixes in the expression of grammatical meanings. Ukrainian belongs to the languages of synthetical structure.

The next morphological type of languages is agglutinative. Agglutination (склеювання, прилипання) is the process of successive joining to the root-stem specific affixes each of which expresses only one grammatical meaning. In the agglutinative type of languages the borders of morphemes are strictly differentiated between each other. The morphemes themselves remain meaningful in any combinations. Agglutinative affixes are unchangeable in the process of transformation of a grammatical form of the word.

Amorphous (без форми, без структури) languages constitute the third morphological type of languages. Such languages are characterized by the absence of alterations (зміна, варіант) in words. The grammatical meanings in amorphous languages are expressed with the help of functional words, word-order, musical accent and intonation. To the languages of this type Chinese, Vietnamese and some others belong.

The last morphological type of languages is incorporative (змішаний). The main structural peculiarity of such languages consists in the fact that the sentence is built as a complex word, i.e. the words are merged and constitute integrity (цілісність) which is a word and a sentence at the same time. Incorporation is characteristic of American Indian languages, the languages of North-Eastern Asia.

The undertaken analysis makes it possible to state that any language or a group of languages may have some specific peculiarities of the other morphological types. For example, Ukrainian is not devoid of agglutination. It can be seen in the forms of the past tense of verbs, imperative mood of verbs in plural, in the formation of verbs of the Passive Voice with the help of the suffix – ся (сь). Many languages take intermediate position in morphological classification combining features of different types.

Lecture 3. **TYPOLOGY OF ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN MORPHOLOGICAL SYSTEMS**

This Lecture:
1) shows the morphemic structure of English and Ukrainian words;
2) gives a definition of grammatical meaning and grammatical category;
3) describes grammatical forms of English and Ukrainian words;
4) analyses parts of speech in English and Ukrainian.

Grammar as a branch of Linguistics treats the laws of language units' usage in speech. It considers and examines language from its smallest meaningful parts up to its most complex organization. Grammar classifies words into categories and states the peculiarities of each category. We think of vocabulary as the word-stock, and grammar as the set of devices for handling this word stock. It is due to these devices that language is able to give material linguistic form to human thought. The semantic value of grammatical devices is developed in the process of communication. So **grammar is treated** as a branch of linguistics, which studies the structure of language, i.e. a system of morphological categories and forms, syntactic categories and constructions.

That is why grammar consists of two branches – **morphology** and **syntax**.

Morphology studies grammatical properties of a word, word form changes and their grammatical meanings.

One of the typological constants on the morphological level is the **morpheme**, which is endowed in both languages with a certain minimal meaning.

Not all words can be analyzed into morphemes so easily (e.g. irregular verbs and nouns: *feet, children, spent;* adjectives and pronouns: *ця, його).* Morphemes in both languages can be modified (e.g. *cats, pens,* boxes, *надписати – надіслати, письмо – пишу).* Such morphemes are called **allomorphs.**

Morphemes may possess one of the three meanings:
1) lexical (speech) – conveying generalized reflection of reality e.g. *чит-*has the meaning of perceiving something, which is presented in letters);
2) derivational – the meaning, which is added to the speech meaning e.g. *-ач* in *глядач, пошукач* indicates the doer of an action; *-льн* in *вітальня, приймальна* points out a place. This meaning deals both with vocabulary and grammar;
3) relational – purely grammatical meaning, which indicates the relations between words in a sentence e.g. *The boy reads a book. Його зацікавили цією книгою.* (The morphemes *s, и, ею, ою* have only relational meaning). Ukrainian has a larger number of relational morphemes if compared with English.

As for their role in a word **morphemes are divided** into:
1) **segmental** – which can be singled out by means of word segmentation:
– *root morphemes* –the common part of related words, the most important component of any word (certain words may possess 2 or more root morphemes);
– *affixal morphemes* – functional morphemes, added to the root (suffixes –*мамуся, wonderful* and prefixes – *виїхати, unpleasant);*

– *inflectional morphemes* – are placed at the end of a word expressing the syntactic relations between words in the sentence (*writes, нов**ий**);

– interfixes occupy a place between two roots within a word (*Anglo-Saxon, statesman, handicraft, броненосець*);

2) **Non-segmental** morphemes include:

– zero inflections (*water, дім*);

– supersegmental, which appear due to the change of a stress ('*extract – ex*'*tract;* '*руки –рукú*).

From the functional point of view **affixes are classified** into **word forming** (derivational) and **form building**. Among derivational morphemes we single out: *-acy, -ance, -ion, -dom, -or, -ess, -hood, -ics, -ism, -ity, -ment, -ness, -ship, -able, -al, -fold, -ful, -ic, -ile, -ish, -less, -ous, -some, -ward, -ate, -en, -esce, -ify, ize, -ly, -wards, -ways; -ник, -івник, -ч, -ік\їк, -руць\єць, -ар\яр, -ир, -ист, -іст, -тель, -аль*. They serve for forming new words and for making new forms of already existing words.

Suppletivity is sometimes used for building new forms of a word in both languages (*to be - was, were; good - better, the best; поганий - гірший, найгірший, я - мене, ми - наш*).

Grammatical meaning is treated as a generalized meaning, possessed by sets of words, their forms, which are regularly registered in different syntactic constructions. Thus, such words like *finger, affair, table, pen, winter, сад, папір, яблуко, праця, актор* and the like are characterized with the meaning of thingness.

So grammatical meaning differs from lexical meaning on the ground of:

1) existence of the formal oppositions within the grammatical system of a language (*girl :: girls, girl :: girl's, girls :: girls'*). Such forms are built by means of form-building affixes;

2) the abstract character of generalization;

3) relations with reality *(baby* belongs to the neutral gender in English, *картина* is the Noun of the feminine gender in Ukrainian);

4) grammatical meaning serves as a ground for grammatical categories.

A **grammatical category** is generally represented by at least two **grammatical forms**. A simple case of oppositions in pairs of grammatical forms are found, for instance, between the singular and the plural in nouns, or Active and Passive Voice in verbs.

Grammatical form of a word presents the unity of grammatical meaning and forms of its expression. In *He waters the flowers every day* and *Still waters run deep* we have 2 different forms, which coincide, though the 1st indicates the verb in the 3rd person singular of the Present Indefinite Tense and the 2nd – the noun in the plural form. If we compare *на вітрилах пісні* and *дати нове життя пісні* we view different forms of the noun *пісня* - of the Genitive and the Dative Cases.

There exist, however, different forms possessing the same meaning *(писатиму, буду писати* of the Future Tense). The above forms are considered as **synthetical** and **analytical**.

Synthetical forms reveal the grammatical meaning within the word boundaries, i.e. lexical and grammatical meanings are combined within one grammatical form

(inflections; suppletivity; sound interchange – *tooth – teeth, to leave – left, left, важкий – важче*).

Analytical forms consist of at least two words but actually constitute one sense-unit. In this case the lexical meaning is revealed through the meaningful component and the grammatical meaning by the functional element (*буду малювати, сказав би, have come,would do*).

Such forms are numerous in Modern English. They express: future, perfect and continuous tense and aspect; the Passive Voice; certain mood forms and degrees of comparison of adverbs and adjectives. The grammatical category of definiteness / indefiniteness is realized only analytically. All these present-day English forms sprung from free syntactic word combinations. They are associated with the conditions of the English language development.

The occurrence of grammatical forms in different syntactical environments gives sufficient evidence to treat them as systematic. Thus, they make the ground for grammatical categories, like case, number, gender, person, tense, aspect, voice, mood.

Degrees of comparison in both languages may be expressed both synthetically and analytically: *calm - calmer / more calm - the calmest / the most calm; kind - kinder / more kind - the kindest / the most kind; важливий - більш важливий / важливіший, найбільш важливий / найважливіший.*

The finite verb in the languages compared has common morphological categories, which are realized partly with the help of syntactic means (inflexions) and partly through different analytical means.

Thus, the categories of person and number are realized in both languages synthetically, the category of tense – synthetically and analytically, the category of aspect – synthetically and analytically in English and only synthetically in Ukrainian, the category of voice – only analytically in English but synthetically and analytically in Ukrainian and the category of mood is realized in both languages synthetically and analytically.

Grammarians long ago recognized the fact that there must be different kinds of words, according to the positions they can fill and the functions they can perform in various structures. The term **parts of speech** was given to these various types of words. **Parts of speech are defined as** lexico-grammatical word-classes, which differ in their grammatical meaning and forms, word-making devices and functions in the sentence.

Grammatical categories identifying the parts of speech are known to be expressed in paradigms. Though some structural ambiguity always results in English whenever the form classes of the words are not clearly marked (*The ship sails today :: Ship the sails today).*
Due to its historical development, English unlike Ukrainian has a much larger number of morphologically unmarked words, i.e. regular roots morphemes.

Consequently, the number of inflexions expressing the morphological categories is much smaller in English than in Ukrainian. Moreover, a lot of notionals in English lack even the affixes identifying their lexico-morphological native. Free rootmorpheme words, though fewer are represented in all lexico-morphological classes – nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, etc. *(art, pen, she, read, do, ten, here; ніс, я, є, три, тут; осад, брат, дім).*

The number of inflexions in Ukrainian by far exceeds their number in English since every notional part of speech has a variety of endings.

They express number, case, gender, tense, aspect, person, voice, mood, degrees of comparison. In the structural nature of the compared languages the paradigm of the same notionals naturally differs, the Ukrainian paradigms being richer than the English ones.

However, in old English the noun paradigm included nine different inflexional forms, the weak verbs paradigm ten forms and the paradigm of adjectives 13 forms. The variety of case inflexions of Ukrainian and Russian nouns is also predetermined by the existence of four declensions.

Linguists are unanimous as for the existence of isomorphic set of parts of speech in English and Ukrainian.

The linguistic evidence gives us every reason to subdivide the whole of **the English vocabulary** into **13 parts of speech**. **Seven of them** include **notional** or meaningful words, which make up the largest part of the word-stock and **six are function words**, comparatively few in actual number of items, but used very frequently.

Notional parts of speech are: nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, statives. Prepositions, conjunctions, particles, articles, modal words and interjections are parts of speech largely devoid of lexical meaning and used to indicate various functional relations between the notional words in an utterance. In semantic terms functional words are known to be weak and very general. **In Ukrainian 12 parts of speech** are to be singled out (7 notional and 5 functional). The latter play a less important role in Ukrainian. The article is the only part of speech missing in Ukrainian.

Parts of speech are grouped according to the following criteria:

1) semantic – they are united according to the same general grammatical meaning (thingness – for nouns, action – for verbs, quality – for adjectives, the quality of the quality – for adverbs, number – for numerals, state – for statives);

2) morphological – a set of certain grammatical categories. It is important for Ukrainian, but far less important for English;

3) syntactic – the functions in the sentence; specific modifiers they possess; typical valency.

This criterion is more important for English, than Ukrainian, because of the productivity of conversion;

4) word-building – a set of word-building patterns necessary for deriving a part of speech.

The above criteria are important for notionals. Functionals are deprived of semantics, they only indicate relations between other words; they possess no grammatical categories; functionals are never treated as parts of a sentence. The identification of the parts of speech in the compared languages is not always easy, though the main subdivision of words into notional and functionals seems to be indisputable.

Nevertheless, the existence of the kind of morphologically indistinct notionals in modern English does not deprive the languages of the regular system of notional parts of speech in general and those of Noun, Verb, Adjective, and Adverb in particular.

Common in the languages compared is also the "migration" of one part of speech to another: *a just man* (adjective), *he has just come* (adverb), *just a moment* (particle), *хто там?* (adverb), *де там?* (particle), *а там ще люди* (conjunction).

Lecture 4. NOTIONAL PARTS OF SPEECH IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

This Lecture:
1) describes typological features of the noun as a part of speech;
2) introduces typology of the pronoun;
3) describes the numeral as a part of speech in English and Ukrainian;
4) shows typological characteristics of the adjective;
5) analyses typology of the adverb;
6) discusses statives and their typological characteristics;
7) explains typological characteristics of the English and Ukrainian verb.

The lexico-grammatical meaning of the noun in English & Ukrainian is «substance \ thingness». It is realized by means of **common** and **proper nouns**. The first group includes concrete nouns *(hat, heart, дім, капелюх),* abstract *(joy, news, інформація, знання),* collective *(family, cattle, екіпаж, міліція),* names of materials *(air, sugar, борошно, вугілля),* class nouns *(bird, furniture, квітка, ссавець).* The second group includes names of people *(American, Michael, німець, Семен),* family names *(Smith, Сидорчук),* geographical names *(London, Київ),* names of companies, newspapers, journals (Hoover, The Times, «Урядовий кур'єр»).

The division of nouns into animate \ inanimate is revealed lexically in both languages, though in Ukrainian it has grammatical representation connected with gender, type of declension (тип відмінювання), forms of certain cases (Vocative, Accusative – кличний, знахідний відмінки), word-building suffixes.

The lexico-grammatical category of definiteness \ indefiniteness in the system of English nouns finds its linguistic expression in the article. Apart of the article demonstrative and possessive pronouns, certain syntactic means (*the Tory government, Палац Україна)* are used to specify either the meaning of the noun or its grammatical links.

Compare:

A girl wants to see you. vs *Вас хоче побачити дівчина.*
The girl wants to see you. vs *Дівчина хоче вас побачити.*
I've bought a book. vs *Я купив одну книгу.*
A child can understand this rule. vs *Кожна дитина може зрозуміти це правило.*
Ви можете взяти будь-яку книгу. vs *You may take a book.*
Here is the book you want to buy. vs *Ось та книга, яку ви хочете купити.*

The classes of **pronouns** are isomorphic in the languages compared. They are:
1) **personal** (*I, she, you, я, ти, вони*) possess the categories of gender, case, number);
2) **possessive** (*mine, ту, мій*) have gender, number, case);
3) **reflexive** (*yourself - yourselves*) have number;
4) **demonstrative** (*this -* has number, *such, цей -* have gender, number);

5) **interrogative** (*who, what, який, чий* - may have gender, number and case);
6) **relative** (coincide in form with interrogative);
7) **reciprocal** (*each other, один одного* - have gender forms);
8) **negative** (*nobody, nothing, ніхто, ніскільки; нічий* - has number, gender, case);
9) **indefinite** (*each, something, дехто, хтось, який-небудь*).

The **numeral** in both languages has a common implicit lexico-grammatical meaning of quantity; part of an object or order of some objects. Thus, they are subdivided into: 1) cardinal (*three, один, двадцять три*);2) ordinal (*the second, восьмий*); 3) fractional (*one-forth, дві треті*).

In Ukrainian all numerals are declinable, possessing the categories of number, case and gender distinctions: *десяти, другого, двом цілим і чотирьом десятим* тощо. Only cardinal numerals *один, два* have 3 gender forms. Ukrainian numerals also denote the indefinite number (*декілька, кільканадцять)* and a group of objects (*тринадцятеро, п'ятеро, трійко).* In English the numerals are invariable (незмінні).

The adjective as part of speech is characterized in English and Ukrainian by common lexico-grammatical nature and functions. The adjective expresses the attributes of substances *(an interesting book, важливі заходи)* and can serve as a predicative *(the child was small, дитина була маленькою).* Adjectives may be **qualitative** (gradable) and **relative** (expressing relations to qualities) which characterize objects and phenomena through their relation to other
objects and phenomena *(economic progress, міський житель).* Gradable adjectives (якісні прикметники) in both languages possess the category of degrees of comparison.

English relative adjectives fall into 2 subgroups: possessive *(Byronic, Shakespearian);* genuinely relative (дійсно відносні) *(Italian, eastern).* In Ukrainian this group is numerous and non-divided *(Шевченківський, київський, батьківський, журавлиний, березовий, сестрин, Надіїн, Михайлів, козацький, виборчий, доїльний).* Ukrainian also has contracted root adjectives like *винен, ладен, зелен;* diminutive and augmentative forms of adjectives (зменшувальні та підсилюючі форми) *(гарненький, малесенький; здоровенний, величезний).* The number of Ukrainian emotionally colored adjectives by far exceeds such forms in English (*білесенький – extremely white*).

The Ukrainian adjective possesses grammatical categories of gender, number, case and degrees of comparison, whereas the latter is the only category registered in English.

The adverb in English and Ukrainian is an indeclinable notional part of speech expressing the quality or the state of an action, the circumstances in which the action proceeds or a degree of some other quality. Qualitative adverbs (*distinctly, slowly, швидко, гарно)* in both languages possess degrees of comparison. It is the only grammatical category, which this part of speech has in both languages. The rules of building such forms are the same as for the adjectives. The rest of the adverbs denote certain circumstances (time – *now, yesterday, щойно, рано;* place or direction – *here, somewhere, backwards, надворі, десь;* cause and purpose – *why, на зло;* frequency and repetition – *usually, twice, завжди, часто;* degree – *extremely, fairly, цілком,*

майже; manner of action – *likewise, suddenly, upside-down, by chance, нехотячи, випадково;* consequence and cause (наслідку і причини) – *therefore, hence, accordingly, for this reason, тому що, через те що, у зв'язку з*).

Statives in English and Ukrainian are invariable notional words denoting the physical state of persons, things or phenomena, the psychological state of persons, state in motion. English statives possess a characteristic prefix *a–* (*afar, afire, alike, afloat, awake*). Ukrainian statives are built by means of the suffix *–о* (*прикро*), *–є* (*добре*), *–а* (*шкода*). They may be graded (*He is more dead than alive. He was more ashamed than she. їй стало холодніше*).

Verbs in English & Ukrainian convey verbality, i.e. different types of activity (*make, sing, write, сіяти*), various processes (*grow, appear, рости*), the inner state of a person (*worry, feel, хворіти, каятися*), possession (*have, possess, мати*). Due to these lexico-grammatical properties the verb generally functions in the sentence as the predicate. As regards their role in expressing predicativity, verbs may be either of 1) complete predication; 2) incomplete predication.

The 1st group is presented with notional verbs, which are in their turn divided into subjective (*to sleep, іти* – always intransitive*)*; objective (*to envy, давати* – only transitive); terminative (*to find, зачиняти* – express an action with some result); durative (to *hope, любити* – express an action without any aim); mixed (*to know, to remember, сидіти* – both terminative and durative); reflexive (*to wash oneself, to shave oneself, листуватись, одягатися, кусатися, журитися, битися*). The last group is really widespread in Ukrainian.

English notional verbs split into regular and irregular, based upon correlation between the stem of the infinitive and its past forms. 13 classes of Ukrainian verbs are singled out on the correlation between the infinitival stem of the verb, on the one hand, and its present stem on, the other (*будувати – будуєш, будують; бувати – буваєш, бувають; казати – кажеш, кажуть; горіти – гориш, горять* тощо).

Allomorphic is the combinability of English notional verbs with postpositional particles thus forming Phrasal Verbs (*to look for, to look around, to look through,* etc).

Verbs of incomplete predication are presented in English with auxiliary verbs (do, *shall, would, мати*). Close to auxiliaries by their function are English and Ukrainian modal and linking verbs (e.g., *can, to be to, ought to, dare, могти, вміти, мусити; to be, to feel, to become, to remain, бути, ставати*). They can't function independently in the sentence. Auxiliaries are used only together with a notional verb; linking verbs function as a copula of the compound predicates; modal verbs show that a certain action is represented as necessary, possible, desirable, and doubtful from the speaker's point of view. With the infinitive forms they perform the function of the compound modal verbal predicate. Modal verbs are followed by the Infinitive without the particle *to* (exceptions *to be to, to have to, ought to);* their interrogative and negative forms are built without the auxiliary *do;* they have more than one meaning; they lack ending s in the 3rd person singular of the Present Indefinite Tense; have no future forms, build no verbals, some of them possess no past forms.

Verbals (the infinitive, the gerund, the participle, інфінітив, дієприкметник, дієприслівник) constitute a specific group of verbs, because they lack number, person, mood; possess the qualities of the verb and the noun (інфінітив, the infinitive, the

gerund) or the adjective, the adverb (the participle, дієприкметник, дієприслівник); build specific constructions in English (the Accusative-with-the infinitive\participle; the Nominative-with-infinitive\participle, the For-phrase, the Absolute constructions, the gerundial complex); perform syntactic functions not typical of a verb. They possess only time relevance (*to do – to have done, writing – having written, пожовклий, відмовивши, співаючи*), aspect *(to do – to be doing, being written – having been written, зблідлий, стоячи, принісши)* and voice (*writing – being written, having written – having been written, вживаний, вжитий*). The only invariable verbal is participle II *(written).* The participle has much in common with дієприслівник and дієприкметник. The gerund is a unique form typical only of present day English.

Allomorphism is observed in the categorical meanings of the infinitive and інфінітив, because the latter has no aspect and voice forms. The gerund, the participle as well as дієприкметник and дієприслівник are formed by means of word-building affixes.

The above mentioned constructions with verbals are built in the following way:
the For-phrase – by means of: the preposition *for,* a noun in the Common case, or a pronoun in the Objective case and an Infinitive in its either indefinite, passive or continuous form *(It will be best for you to go back home; I am anxious for her to succeed; There is no one for the children to play with)*;
the Accusative-with-infinitive/participle – by means of the pronoun in the Objective case or the noun in the Common case and the infinitive/participle *(I saw him run; Have somebody fetch the chalk; He saw an old lady entering the cottage; I left her playing in the garden)*;
the Nominative-with-the-infinitive / participle – by means of the noun in the Common case or the pronoun in the Nominative case and the infinitive/participle (*He is said to have arrived; The two ladies appeared to be discussing clothes; She was kept waiting for some time; She got herself respected)*;
in **the Nominative absolute participial construction** the participle has the subject of its own expressed by a noun or a pronoun. All forms of the participle are used. Most usually this construction is indicated by a comma (*The work finished, we went home; Weather permitting, we shall start tomorrow; He came into the room, his book shut*).

If the gerund has a subject of its own different from that of a sentence, the gerund and its subject form a construction called the **gerundial complex**. The nominal element of the complex may be expressed either by a noun in the Common case, a noun in the Possessive case, a pronoun in the Objective case, or a possessive pronoun (*His saying this made all the difference; He insisted on their paying him at once*). All these sentences with complexes correspond to complex sentences in Ukrainian. Дієприкметниковий and дієприслівниковий звороти in Ukrainian also correspond to complex sentences in English.

Lecture 5. GRAMMATICAL CATEGORIES IN ENGLISH AND UKRAINIAN

This Lecture:

1) introduces grammatical categories as the main constants for parts-of-speech comparison;
2) describes nominal categories;
3) explains verbal categories.

It is the grammatical category, which is the main unit for typological contrast. Prof. Vlad. Dmitr. Arakin distinguishes three criteria to determine constants for typological analysis of grammatical systems: 1) functional identity of the units contrasted; 2) correspondence of general and concrete & vice versa, i.e. every case has its own meaning and at the same time it possesses a generalized meaning expressing correspondence between objects of reality;
3) rather wide range of the words within one class: e.g. Ukrainian animate nouns: genitive case coincides in form with accusative case: родовий відмінок (кого? чого?) *юриста, водія, студента;* орудний відмінок (кого? що?) *юриста, водія, студента*; inanimate nouns: common case coincides in form with accusative case називний та орудний відмінки *папір, шоколад*.

Grammatical categories are considered to be universal for grammar of any language. Grammatical categories include a set of paradigms, expressing a generalized meaning. (Парадигма (від грец. parádeigma – приклад, зразок), система форм одного слова, яка відтворює видозміни слів за ознаками властивих їм граматичних категорій, наприклад, за родом, числом, відмінкам для іменників, особи, часу, виду для дієслів тощо.

Grammatical categories fall into nominal and verbal. Nominal categories are number, case, gender, degrees of comparison. The categories of aspect, voice, tense, mood, person, number are verbal categories.

Nominal categories.

The category of number. They distinguish the plural and the singular number in the languages compared, though only nouns and some pronouns have this category in English. In Ukrainian this category is characteristic of nouns, adjectives, ordinal numerals, all pronouns except reflexive.

The main way of plural forming is inner flexion. Sometimes there is an alternation in the stem: *wife – wives, друг – друзі.*

Completely allomorphic is also the formation of plural number by root vowel interchange in English: *tooth – teeth, foot – feet.*

Some English nouns have zero plural: *deer, salmon.* There are borrowed noun inflexions: *medium – media, criterion – criteria.*

The opposition singular: plural is applied only to countable nouns: *student – students; стіл – столи.*

The existence of singularia tantum and pluralia tantum is also an isomorphic phenomenon in both languages. Pluralia tantum nouns are more widespread in Ukrainian than in English. There are groups of nouns which are referred to Singularia tantum *(milk, sugar, foliage, цукор, завзяття, листя, здоров'я)* and Pluralia tantum

(trousers, tongs, jeans, консерви, іменини, солодощі, вершки).

These groups do not always coincide in English and Ukrainian. Many nouns may have a plural meaning in English and singular meaning in Ukrainian or vice versa:

Singularia tantum   Pluralia tantum

chess   шахи

money   гроші

зелень   greens

The category of case comprises all nouns (except foreign words), pronouns, adjectives, numerals in Ukrainian. While in English only animate nouns have the category of case. The number of cases also proves allomorphism: 2 in English (common, genitive), 7 in Ukrainian (називний, родовий, давальний, знахідний, орудний, місцевий, кличний).

Case meaning is manifested in case forms. Max Deutschbein singled out four cases in English. Otto Jespersen, Victoria Yartseva speak about 2 cases (nouns, pronouns – with *body, one)* and *who,* which has three cases *(whose, whom).*

Ukrainian nouns have seven marked singular and plural oppositions in nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, locative and vocative cases in singular: *ручка, ручки, ручці, ручку, ручкою, на ручці, ручко* and in plural: *ліси, лісів, лісам, ліси, лісам, у лісах, ліси.*

In English ‘*s* can be joined not only to one morpheme, but also to the whole word-combination or sentence: *This is a girl 1 met yesterday's mother.*

The category of gender. Lexico-grammatical category of gender is characteristic practically of all languages. In Ukrainian, Russian, German and other languages there are three grammatical genders: masculine, feminine and neuter. In Italian, Spanish, French and Danish there exist 2 genders (masculine, feminine). In Estonian, Finnish, Japanese and Turkish no gender distinctions are made.

The morphological category of gender is identified through the inflexions of the adjunct: *tiger – tigeress; студент – студентка.*

No gender determines forms of other words: adjectives, verbs, and possessive pronouns.

The morphological category of gender is identified through the inflexions of the adjunct: *tiger – tigress; студент – студентка.*

English lacks grammatical category of gender, though there exists a conceptual category of gender. Most often biological sex is not differentiated: *teacher, friend, parent, lawyer.* If you want to emphasize the biological sex you should use lexical means, sometimes the differences are shown with the help of lexical means: *bull – cow, boy friend – girl friend, he-wolf – she-wolf, Tom-cat – Sally-cat* or by means of word forming suffixes: *-ess* (for feminine) *lioness, tigress; -er* (for masculine) *widow – widower.*

All Ukrainian nouns, except pluralia tantum, belong to one of three genders.

The category of comparison determines the difference in the degree to which a certain quality is realized. The category is typical of adjectives and adverbs. The forms of comparison are divided into analytical, synthetical and suppletive. Ukrainian doesn't show any restrictions as to analytical or synthetical formation of degrees of comparison: *привабливий – найпривабливіший/самий привабливий.* But English

adjectives and adverbs form their degrees of comparison synthetically if only they are mono- or disyllabic. Hence, analytical forms of degrees of comparison are widespread in English.

Verbal categories. The category of aspect is lexico-grammatical in Ukrainian and comprises two aspects: perfect – non-perfect. English verb has two aspects as well, but they differ from Ukrainian. The English aspects are common and continuous. English common aspect can correspond to either perfect or non-perfect aspect in Ukrainian. But not all English verbs have continuous aspect (verbs of mental activity, expressing feelings and physical perception): *to understand, to remember, to know, to hear, to see, to love, to hate etc.* Sometimes English link-verbs can be used in the continuous aspect, when combined with an adjective: *He is being tired (sad).* It's not typical of the Ukrainian language.

The category of voice. They differentiate three voices in Ukrainian: active, passive and reflexive. There are only two voices in English – active and passive. They are morphologically expressed *(to be + Past Participle)* in Passive. Moreover, only transitive verbs can be used in the Passive Voice in English, intransitive verbs don't have Passive forms: *I have typed the report. The report has just been typed. They go to the theatre every week.* But passive constructions are more frequent in English than in Ukrainian.

Some linguists group English verbs ending in «self» separately and call them reflexive, but they don't coincide in meaning with Ukrainian reflexive verbs *(to embrace – обніматися).*

The category of tense. There exist 3 tense forms in the languages compared. Tense is determined from a certain starting point. But there's a relative tense in English – Future-in-the-Past.

The present tense in all languages can be used extra temporally, i.e. it can refer an action not only to the present, but also to the past and future. In English Present Perfect means the time which is past in fact. We use present instead of future in subordinate clauses of time and condition. In Ukrainian we use Present instead of Past *(Він сказав, що йде в кіно).* The Past Tense in English has only past meaning, in Ukrainian it expresses present as well: *Ну, я пішов.* There is Past Perfect (before past) in English, which is absent in Ukrainian.

Future tense has a restricted usage in English. It is not used to express present or past, though such cases are observed in Ukrainian. Future tense has only analytical forms in English *(shall/will + VI),* while in Ukrainian – both analytical and synthetical. The before-future is characteristic only of English (*I will have finished my work by five o'clock).*

The category of mood is the distinction between the reality and unreality expressed by the corresponding forms of the verb. It reflects the relation of an action to reality as real, possible or necessary. In both languages this category is realized through:
1) modal words: *obviously, perhaps, apparently, звичайно, безумовно;*
2) modal verbs: *can, may must, могти;*
3) mood forms: indicative, conditional and imperative.

The paradigm of conditional mood is richer in English (Subjunctive I,

Subjunctive II, Conditional, Suppositional) than in Ukrainian. Ukrainian has only analytical forms with *би, б.*

The Imperative mood serves to express requests, orders, commands, etc. The Imperative mood is presented both synthetically and analytically in the languages compared: *Let me say! Do say it again! Говори! (Не)хай говорять.*

The category of person is realized both in English and Ukrainian (three persons). The paradigm of person in English is realized in the Present. There is no category of person in the Past. It is represented partially in the Future tense *(shall/will).*

Lecture 6. FUNCTIONAL WORDS IN THE COMPARED LANGUAGES

This Lecture:
1) describes typological characteristics of modal words and phrases/ modals;
2) introduces typological characteristics of prepositions;
3) explains typology of conjunctions;
4) shows typological characteristics of particles;
5) analyses typological characteristics of intejections/emotives.

The number of functionals in the contrasted languages is practically the same, the only exception being the article in English. Their nomenclature is as follows: 1) *modal words (and modal phrases); 2) the preposition; 3) the conjunction;* 4) *the particle; 5) the interjection.*

Modal words and phrases are characterized in both languages by their meaning of "modality". They are used to express the speaker's judgement concerning the action/event or object in the utterance/ sentence. These words/phrases in English and Ukrainian are as follows: *certainly, indeed, maybe, perhaps, possibly, probably, of course, no doubt - певне, напевне, звичайно, може, можливо, безумовно, безсумнівно* and others.

Modals are traditionally classified as follows:
a) **modal words/phrases expressing various shades of certainty:** *certainly, of course, surely, no doubt, assuredly, indeed, undoubtedly, really (певне, напевне, звичайно, безсумнівно, безперечно, безумовно, зрозуміло, правда);*
b) **modal words expressing various degrees of probability:** *maybe, perhaps, possibly, probably (може, можливо, мабуть, ймовірно, видно, здається) ;*
c) **modal words expressing** various **shades of desirability** *(for- tunately, unfortunately),* which have a restricted number of semantic equivalents in Ukrainian *(на щастя, на жаль, шкода);*
d) **Modal words expressing doubt, uncertainty** and coinciding in form with the modal words denoting **probability** *(maybe, perhaps, probably-може, можливо, мабуть).*

Modals, like statives, originate from different parts of speech or phrases which acquire some modal meaning in the sentence. These parts of speech are: a) **adverbs** *(really, probably, fortunately справді, очевидно, дійсно);* b) **nouns** with or without prepositions (mainly in Ukrainian): *in one's view, in one's opinion, to one's judgment - сором, страх, на мою думку, на мій погляд;* c) **verbal phrases and sentences** *(it seems, you see— здається, бачите, як бачите, кажуть);* d) statives (in Ukrainian):

чутно, видно, etc.

The common feature of modals in the compared languages is their position in

the sentence. Most of them may occupy any position according to the emphasis they are given by the author/speaker. Cf. *Perhaps* he will come. He will, *perhaps,* come. He will come, *perhaps. (Можливо,* він прийде; він, *можливо,* прийде; він прийде, *можливо).*

Prepositions in English and Ukrainian are characterized by both iso- morphic and allomorphic features. Isomorphism is clearly observed in the morphological structure of prepositions which can be in the compared languages as follows:

<u>in English</u>
Simple: at, in, on, of, with, to, by
Compound: inside, into, within, without, throughout, upon, etc.
Derivative: along, below, beside, inside, outside, etc.
Composite (Phrase prepositions): by means of, because of, in accordance with, owing to, in front of, in spite of, with regard to, on account of, etc.

<u>in Ukrainian</u>
Прості: в, з, о, під, на, за, при, без
Складні: із-за, з-під, з-понад, попід, поперед, посеред, поміж, щодо, задля
Похідні: внаслідок, завдяки, коло, круг, поверх, поперек, довкіл, etc.
Складені: в справі, на відміну від, у зв'язку з, поруч з, згідно з, незалежно від, у відповідь на, збоку від, близько від, в межах, у плані.

Mainly common are the parts of speech from which many preposi tions are formed (except the diyepryslivnyk). They are: a) ***nouns: beside, in front*** of, ***in accordance*** with ***внаслідок, у зв'язку з, слідом за, коло, кругом;*** b) *verbals* (participles, diyepryslivnyks): ***owing*** to, **concerning, including включаючи, завдяки, зважаючи;** c) *adverbs* (the largest number): **along, before, down, among близько, довкола, ззаду, обабіч, серед,** etc.

The lexico-grammatical meaning of prepositions as semi-notional words is isomorphic in both languages as well. Prepositions may be *temporal* (**before** noon до обіду, **after that після того,** *during* the war під час війни, *since* Monday від понеділка, *until* **he** came - **доки** він не прийде, etc.); *local (**along** the road **вздовж** дороги, *across* the street **через** шлях, *among* the books **серед** книжок, *in front* **o/me переді** мною), *behind/over* the house **за/над** хатою; *causal (**because of** that **через те що,** *in view of* all this **з погляду на** це, **or** *pervasive* (he poured water *all over* me з голови до ніг); **concessive (despite** his expectations **всупереч** його очікуванням).

According to their meaning prepositions in the contrasted languages may express various syntactic relations, the main of which are as follows:

a) **agentive relations:** *the play written by Shakespeare бути /під чиєюсь високою рукою/під орудою;*

b) **objective relations:** *to be angry/ satisfied with somebody*
   сердитись на когось, помиритися з кимсь;

c) **attributive relations:** *birds of a feather, the man in question*
   товариши по школі, друзі з Канади;

d) **various adverbial relations:** *temporal: to depart on Monday, to arrive in spring від'їжджати в понеділок, приїхати в березні/через півроку;* **local:** *in the cottage, behind the fence, in front of the house у хаті, за тином, під лісом;* **of direction:** *into the room, go out of the room, he went to the door у кімнату/з кімнати, зайдіть до хати;* **of manner or comparison:** *to look in astonishment, the air came in a warm wave глянути з подивом; радощів у серці через край;* **of attendant circumstances:** Winter set in early and unexpectedly *with a heavy fall of snow.* Зима прийшла зі *снігопадами;* **of cause:** My dog pants, *with the heat* собака задихається *від спеки.* Троє діток *на віспу* вмерли; **of concession:** they continued their way *despite the rain,* he *would do it in spite* o/the obstacles. Чорнявому зрадливому *на лютеє горе.* Він приїде *незважаючи на* хворобу; **of possession:** books of his brother, the windows of the cottage. Стояв генерал... *при всіх орденах.*

Conjunctions in the compared languages are functional words realizing the connection of homogeneous parts in co-ordinate word-groups and sentences or linking subordinate clauses in composite sentences. As to their structure, conjunctions in English and Ukrainian are generally characterized by isomorphism. The various types are as follows:1) **Simple** *(and, but, or, if, that, till; і /й, а, бо, ні, та.* 2) **Derivative/compound:** all + though - *although,* un + less - *unless,* be + cause - *because,* un + till - *until,* where + as - *whereas,* а + бо - *або,* за + те — *зате,* про + те - *проте,* як + що - *якщо,* як + би — *якби,* etc. 3) **Composite** (складені): *as if, as soon as, in order that; так що; через те, що; для того, щоб; з того час, як; відтоді, як,* etc.

The use of conjunctions may be non-repeated *(and, but, since а,але, що)* and repeated (in Ukrainian) or correlative (in English), eg: *both... and, either..or, neither... nor, no sooner... than (і - і, ні - ні, то*

— то, чи — чи, не то — не то, не стільки — скільки).

As to their syntactic functions, conjunctions in the contrasted lan- guages fall into two common-isomorphic groups: a) co-ordinating con- junctions and b) subordinating conjunctions. Co-ordinating conjunctions in the compared languages fall into the following subclasses:

a) **copulative** (єднальні): *and, nor, neither... nor, as well as, both... and, not only... but also; і/й, та, також, і... і, ні... ні, як... так і, не тільки... але й/і.* Copulative conjunctions in the contrasted languages have a bilateral combinability. They connect separate components, com- ponental parts of word-groups or clauses in compound sentences which are of equal rank, eg: In the afternoon *he and Jolly* took ***picks and spades*** *and went* to the field, "It was a cold fall *and* the wind came from the mountains". По обіді ***він і Джоллі*** взяли **кайла і лопати** й пішли на поле. Була холодна осінь, і вітер віяв з гір. / пить будем, *і* гулять будем. (Ukr. folk-song);

b) **disjunctive** (розділові) conjunctions denote in both languages separation. They are: *or, either... or або, ато, чи, або... або, чи... чи, то... то, чи то...чи то, eg: "Imust* weep, *or else* this heavy heart will burst". "I have nothing of the artist in me, **either** in faculty or character". Я мушу плакати, ***ато*** від горя серце розірветься. "Все пішло *то* на податі, ***то*** на борги, ***то*** на оренди";

c) **adversative** (протиставні): *but, still, yet але, проте, зате, однак, все ж* and others. Eg: Andrew turned towards her dis tressed, *yet still* determined to carry out his intention. Ендрю повернувся до неї занепокоєний, *але* готовий здійснити свій намір;

d) **resultative** (пояснювальні): so, *hence так, що, тож/отож, тобто, а саме, як от,* eg: The grass was drenching wet, **so** he de scended to the road. У траві стояла вода, ***тож*** він вийшов на шлях. І він катапультується, **тобто** вистрелює себе з літака разом з сидінням;

e) **the causal conjunction** (for) is pertaining only to English, eg: The windows were open, for it was hot. The corresponding semantic equivalent of this conjunction in Ukrainian are, **бо, тому що, оскільки** - all of subordinating nature which testifies its allomorphism in the system of co-ordinate conjunctions in the contrasted languages. Consequently, it is sometimes far from easy for Ukrainian students to differentiate Ukrainian causal clauses in a complex sentence.

It is not so with the **subordinating conjunctions** introducing subordinate clauses. These conjunctions also include in both languages the group of the so-called connectives standing separate from regular subordinating conjunctions. Regular conjunctions of this group are: *that, whether, if, що, чи, якщо/якби* which are used to introduce in both languages subject, object, predicative and attributive clauses. Eg. *Whether/if* he is going to come or not is still unknown. The question is *whether* he is going to come or not. He asked г/she was going to come. I know *that* he is going to come. This is the flower *that* was bought there, etc. Similarly in Ukrainian: *Чи він прийде ще - не відомо. Питання полягає в тому, що/ чи він ще прийде. Я вірю/знаю, що він прийде.* Common functions in both contrasted languages are also performed by connective or conjunctive/relative (as they are often referred to) pronouns: *who, what, which, how many, хто, що, який, котрий, чий, скільки;* and by connective/ conjunctive adverbs: *where, when, how, why, де, коли, куди, як, чому.*

Subordinate conjunctions introducing adverbial clauses are of isomor- phic nature, i. e. common in both contrasted languages, too. They express different sense relations and fall into the following groups:

a) **conjunctions of time:** *since, until, till, as long as, after, before, while, as soon as, коли, відколи, поки, аж поки, доки, аж доки, як, після того як, в міру того як, як тільки, тільки що, щойно, ледве;*

b) **conjunctions/connectives of place and direction:** *where, wherever, whence, де, де б, куди, звідки;*

c) **conjunctions of cause or reason:** *as, because, since, seeing,*
   бо, через те що, тому що, затим що, оскільки;

d) **conjunctions of condition:** *if, unless, provided, supposing*
   якби, якщо, якщо б, коли б, аби, скоро;

e) **conjunctions of purpose:** *lest, that, in order that, so that, щоб, для того щоб, з тим щоб;*

f) **conjunctions of result:** *so that, that, так що, отож, тож;*

g) **conjunctions of concession:** *though, although, as, even if, even though, however, wherever, whatever, whichever, хоч, хай, нехай, дарма що, незважаючи (на).*

Conjunctions of comparison: as, as...as, *not so... as, than, as if, as though, як,*

що, мов, мовби, немов, немовби, наче, неначе, начебто, ніби, нібито.

Particles in English and Ukrainian are unchangeable words specifying some component in a phrase or the whole phrase (a sentence/clause). Unlike conjunctions or prepositions, particles do not express any syntactic relations. Their function is in both languages to emphasize, restrict or make negative the meaning of the units they specify by giving some additional shade (emotional, evaluative, etc.) to their meaning/sense. Therefore some particles may perform a form-building function (cf. To be or *not* to be. Shakespeare) бути чи *не* бути. Besides, particles in both contrasted languages express an attitudinal relation to action, state or the whole message/or to reality, as well as to expressing the attitude of the speaker to the content of some message. Hence, the categorial meaning of a particle in both contrasted languages comes to influencing the content/sense expressed in the utterance.

As to their morphological structure, particles in the contrasted languages may be: **simple** (*all, else, even, just, too, yet, not, а, i/й, так, ну, не,ж, еге* and others); **derivative** (*alone, merely, scarcely, simply, нум, нумо, було,просто, все, воно, собі, та, те,це,оце, а, чи);*) **compound** (*almost, also невже, якраз).*

Isomorphic is the homonymy of many particles in English and Ukrainian with the following parts of speech:

a) with adverbs: *exactly, precisely, never, simply, still, просто, лиш, там, ще, вже;* b) **with adjectives** (in English): *even, right, just;*

c) **with pronouns:** *all, either, все, воно, собі, те, то; d)* with conjunctions (very few in English): but they are in Ukrainian *(а, i, та, чи);* e) **with articles** (in English only): *the* more, *the* better; *the* longer, *the* better.

Quite common, although not always equally represented, are the semantic groups of particles in both contrasted languages. Namely:

a) **particles of emphatic precision** (емфатичного уточнення): *ab- solutely, exactly, precisely, right, точно, справді, просто, прямо* and others;

b) **demonstrative particles / вказівні:** *here, there, ось, от, це, оце, онде, ген, воно;*

c) **affirmative particles/стверджувальні:** *well, now, yes, так,гаразд, еге, еге ж, ато ж;*

d) **intensifying particles / підсилювальні** are rather numerous in English an Ukrainian: *all, but, just, even, simply, yet, still, etc. i, й, та, таки, аж, навіть, вже, ж, бо, же, etc;*

e) **negative or form-building** (заперечні й формотворні) particles: *not, never, по, не, ні, ані;*

f) **interrogative particles/запитальні** частки: *well, really, по, why, why not, га, ну, невже, хіба, та ну, що за;*

g) **connecting or linking particles / приєднувальні** частки: also, too (тож, також.теж, до того ж ще й).

A distinguishing feature of present-day Ukrainian is a more extensive use of particles in speech (especially of emphasizing and modal particles). The latter constitute a large group including such particles as *б, би, мов, мовби, бодай, хай, нехай, може, нум, нумо,* etc. Cf: А *бодай* вам весело було. Пройти *б* на старе бойовище. *Хай* тільки-но зачеплять зморшки на чолі *все* глибшають у мене.

Ukrainian has also a wide use of interrogative particles. Cf. *Невже* не можна ради дати серцю?.. Те дерево, що я садив, *чи* діждеться весни? *Хіба* є хто на світі крилатіший за людину? *Це* ти Шовкун?

Unlike notionals, **interjections** in English and Ukrainian do not correlate with notions, they do not express any relations or point to any connection with words in an utterance. Interjections are unchangeable words or phrases expressing emotional and volitional reaction of the speaker on some event. Hence, there are to be distinguished communicative, emotive, and signalizing interjections, which express respectively joy or pleasure, sadness, warning or repugnance. Interjections in English and Ukrainian utterances mostly occupy a front position, rarely a midposition or a closing position. Cf.: А ми! *хе! хе! а* ми жонаті. І одного часу, як гукне, так, ***ой-ой-ой!***

Interjections may be primary (первинні) and derivative (похідні). According to their structure, interjections may be simple, compound and composite, or phrasal.

1. **Simple interjections** fall into some subgroups, namely: a) inter- jections consisting of one or two sounds: *ah, a-ah, oh, oo, ooh, oof, coo, gee.* Or in Ukrainian: *a! el o! e-e! au! ax! ox! xa! xe! yx! am! em!* etc. b) Interjections may consist of consonant sounds only: *brr, mm, sh (sh-sh) гм! хм! цсс! шш! брр!;* c) interjections often consist of more than two different sounds which form one syllable: *gosh, tut, umph, whoop гай! гей! гов! гоп! пхе! пхи!* etc; d) interjections can consist of two syllables: *alas, ahem, boffo, hello/hullo, okey ага! агей! агу! агусь! ану! люлі! нумо! овва! ого! мугу!);* e) reduplicating (повторні) interjections are pertained to both languages as well: *ah-ah, ay-ay, ee-ee, goe-goe, how-how, ho-ho, hubba-hubba, chock-chock, ta-ta, tut-tut.* Similarly in Ukrainian: *а-а, ану-ану, гай-гай, еге-ге, о-го-го, ну-ну, ха-ха.*

2. **Compound interjections** are more characteristic of English than of Ukrainian, eg: *heigh-ho, holla-ho, fiddlesticks, whoo-whoop, wo- ho, yo-ho,* etc. Cf: *Господи-Боже! Добридень! Спасибі! Боже мій!*

Derivative interjections constitute a common group in the contrasted languages too. They are mostly of common origin and sometimes even of identical lexical meaning. There are distinguished six types of emotional interjections in the contrasted languages: a) **of substantival** origin: *beans! bully! fiddle! hell! Lord! nuts! raspberry! rabbit! rats! taps! Господи! матінко! нене! Боже! леле! жах! страх! ґвалт! слава! хвала! біда! горе!;* b) of **verbal** origin: *come! look! see! cut! bother! shoot! диви! гляди! бач! рятуйте! пробачте! даруйте! прощайте! побачимо! цур!* (from цуратися); c) of **adjectival** origin (mostly in English): *fine! grand! right! dear! swell! divine! gracious!; d)* of **adverbial** origin: *here! there! now! well! why? so! добре! зараз! тут! там! так! геть! прекрасно!;^)* of **pronominal** origin: "ay me! oh me!" (Shakespeare) *отаке! стільки ж! отакої!* "Куди ж писати?" **"Отакої!** Не знає куди!.."; f) **of phrasal** origin (contracted), which are rather numerous in English: *howdy* (from how do you do), *alright* (from all right), *my!* (from my God/my Lord), *dammit* (from damn it), *attaboy* (from that's a boy), etc.

3. **Derived** are also numerous idiomatic interjections of various com- ponental nature and expressing different emotions, eg: my eye! Holy Moses! the cat's pyjamas! gee whiskers! well I never! їй же бо! хай йому цур! кат їх бери! Боже ж мій! біда та

й годі! де там! ой лелечко! де ж так! etc.

4. **Emotive interjections** express various feelings, one interjection being often used in English and Ukrainian to express different meanings. These classes of meanings are as follows:

   a) positive feelings (joy, satisfaction, sympathy) – *great, ooh, ooh;*
   чудово, гу-у, г-уу;

   b) incentive orders (спонукальні накази) – *hey, here, quiet; гей, сюди, замовкніть;*

   c) negative feelings (grief, sorrow, horror, alarm, disgust, etc.) –
   oops, pshav, nuts; ух-ти, тьху, дурниці;

   d) greetings and partings which may sometimes be rather emotional as well –
   Oh, hello! Howdy! Об привіт! Здоров!

Lecture 7. **TYPOLOGY OF THE SYNTACTIC SYSTEMS**

This Lecture:
1) describes syntactic processes, their types and ways of realization;
2) explains syntactic relations and ways of their realization;
3) shows typology of the word-group/phrase;
4) analyses tpes of word-groups in English and Ukrainian;
5) introduces typology of the sentence.; structural types of sentences in English and Ukrainian;
6) focuses attention on one-member sentences in English and Ukrainian;
7) deals with one-word sentences/quasi-sentences in English and Ukrainian;
8) discusses communicative types of sentences in English and Ukrainian;
9) establishes typology of the main parts of the sentence;
10) outlines typology of the composite sentence: compound sentences with free/neutral interrelations between their clauses; compound sentences with adversative interrelations between their clauses; complex sentences.

A successful typological contrasting of syntactic systems of the English and Ukrainian 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 folowing: 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 charactarize 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 Realization

Syntactic processes are various in the contrasted languages and they find their realization only in word-groups and sentences. The realization of these processes in English and Ukrainian 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 Ukrainian 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 realized 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.

As to their structure, word-groups can be unextended, i.e. consisting of two notional words *(read well, nice flowers, good enough)* and extended which consist of more than two notional words, e.g. *to go to work every day, not to know what to do, strike the iron while it is hot,* etc. Such and the like word-groups function as extended parts of the sentence as, for example, the extended subject in the following sentence:

- *her dark short hair* was neat   ... *її чорні коротенькі коси* були
and glossy. (Maugham)   гладенькі й лиснючі.

Similarly extended in both contrasted languages may also be the simple and compound predicates, objects with attributive adjuncts and also adverbial modifies. For example, a simple phrasal predicate performed by an extended word-group:

She *gave* him a *slightly rueful smile.*   Вона *ледь помітно окинула* його
(Ibid.)   *невеселим поглядом.*

Extended in both contrasted languages may equally be the compound nominal predicate as in the following English sentences and their Ukrainian structural equivalents:

Their mother is *one of the village*   їхньою матір'ю є *одна з цих*
girls. (Ibid.)   *сільських дівчат.*

Practically isomorphic by their structure are also extended objects with the adjunct attributes in both contrasted languages. Thus, the simple (unextended) word-group *her face* may be extended and function as an extended object in the following

sentence:

There was almost a frown *on her*   По *щирому, відкритому, гарному*
frank open pretty English face. (Ibid.)   *обличчі* англійки сковзнула тінь
несхвалення.

    Extension may be achieved in English with the help of asyndetic *clustering of nouns* or other parts of speech forming syntactic (and semantic) strings of words or a regular tandem. For example: *school* library -*• *school library* books -»• *new school library* books -* *school library* books readers. Or such syndetic word-groups as *production* and *sale prices, production* and *also sale prices changes,* etc. Such and the like clusters of nouns or nominal sense groups, as was shown above, perform in English and Ukrainian utterances the functions of different extended parts of the sentence. Cf. the subject: *The latest New York and Washington terrorist air attacks* were aimed at intimidating America. (USA Today) The object: Cuba pays great attention to *this year's cane sugar production,* etc.

    Extension of adverbial components is realized likewise, i.e. asyndeti-cally. And not only in English, but in Ukrainian as well. Eg:

"It (house) *is just round the bend,*   "Будинок *там зразу за поворотом, по*
to the left, a few hundred yards".   *ліву руку, кілька сот ярдів звідси".*
(S.Hill)

    Ukrainian has no asyndetic substantival word - groups of this kind, though analytical joining of components may be observed in some cases of extension as well. Cf.: *можна спати -* можна довше спати -*• молена взавтра довше поспати -* можна взавтра вранці довше поспати.* Consequently, the Ukrainian language is not completely devoid of extension via asyndetic clustering, though Ukrainian asyndetic clusters do not go into any comparison with the possible analytical ways and means of extension in the syntactic units of present-day English. Even though many of them, as will be shown further, are of isomorphic nature in both these languages.

    Apart from the above-named ways of realization 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 Ukrainian. Eg: a woman doctor, the city of Kyiv/London, Shevchenko the poet, Shevchenko the painter, we all, they all, etc. Similarly in Ukrainian: жінка-лікар, місто Київ, Шевченко-поет, Шевченко-маляр, ми всі, вони всі.

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

He would, *of course,* say nothing.   Він, *звичайно/зазвичай,* нічого не
(B. Glanwill)   відповів.
That evening after supper - *her*   Того вечора по вечері *(а її батько*
father had a taste for Middle East   *добре розумівся на смакових якостях*
food - Mary slipped out into the   *близькосхідних страв)* вона вибігла
garden in great agitation. (D. Garnett) страшенно збуджена в сад.

    As can be seen, extension of the sentence was achieved by the author by way of an insertion of the whole sentence.

In some texts (and rather often) paranthetic words and inserted words or phrases may be used side by side:

The percentage of college education, *John W. Gardner says,* has led many people to *assume falsely* that there is no other type of learning after school. (G. Schiffhorst, D. Pharr)

Звуження освіти багатьох людей до рівня коледжу, *на думку Дж.В. Гарднера,* привело багатьох до *невиправданої* думки, що після середньої школи взагалі не існує іншого типу освіти.

Here the parenthetic sentence *John W. Gardner says* and the inserted adverb *falsely* were introduced by the author additionally in order to extend the sense of the sentence.

B. *Detachment* is one more common way of external syntactic exten sion that is presumably of isomorphic nature in most languages. De tached (відокремленими) in English and Ukrainian may by any second ary part of the sentence and detachment is achieved through extension by means of subordination. These may also include subordinating con junctions or regular expansion, which is realized by way of co-ordination that may be achieved usually with the help of co-ordinate conjunctions.
For example, detached attributes:

They're (Negroes) just like *children just as easy-going,* and always singing and laughing ... (D. Parker)

Таж вони просто *як діти—такі ј/с - добродушні* і завжди то співають, то сміються собі...

A detached apposition (also functioning as an extended part of the sentence):

And you know, he had *this old coloured nurse, this regular old nigger mammy* and he just simply loves her. (Ibid.)*

І знаєте, у нього навіть нянькою була стара негритянка, *справжнісінька негритоска мемі,* і він просто любить її.

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

C. *Specification.* This kind of syntactic process presents a way of syn tactic extension in English and Ukrainian which is achieved via a syntac tic 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. As for example:

"I'm not *very tall, just everage."* (A. Wilson)

Я не дуже *висока, якраз середня.*

"She's got *heaps of drink* there - *whisky, cherry brandy, crume de menthe."* (Ibid)

"У неї там багато різних напоїв: *віскі, черрі-бренді, молочний лікер",*

Hence, in the first sentence the meaning of the predicative **not very tall** is specified, made more precise by the second part of the predicative *half just everage.* Practically an identical process is observed in the second sentence where the objective

complement *heaps of drink* is specified by the names of these drinks: *whisky, cherry brandy, crume de menthe.* Similarly specified are the equivalent componental parts in their Ukrainian translated sentences. Cf. *не дуже висока, якраз середня; різні напої: віскі, черрі-бренді, молочний лікер.*

Specification is more often employed for the identification of adverbial parts of the sentence as in the following example:

In the *evening, about eight o 'clock,*	*Увечері, десь біля восьмої години,* він
he went dejectedly to call on Denny	пішов у невеселому настрої до Денні. (Cronin)

Alongside of extenstion, though formed on cardinally differerent 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 co-ordinate 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 Ukrainian various parts of speech functioning as expanded parts of the sentence. Expansion is usually achieved by way of *addition* (termed so by Почепцов 1971: 121). The formed in this way (through addition) strings of components usually function as homogeneous parts of the sentence. For example, homogeneous subjects:

The police, the fishmonger, boys going to school, dozens of people waved to him. (V.S. Pritchett)	*Полісмени, торгівець рибою, учні, що йшли до школи, десятки людей* маха-ли йому руками.
There were *rumours, rumours, rumours...* (Dreiser)	Щодалі більше ширились *чутки, чуткий чутки ...*

Expanded can also be in both contrasted languages the simple verbal predicate. For example:

Hercule Poirot *rose, crossed* to the -writing-table, *wrote* out a cheque *handed* it to the other man. (Ibid.)	Геркул Пуаро *встав, підійшов* до пи-семного стола, *виписав* чека і *вручив* його другому чоловікові.

Such and the like simple verbal predicates in the contrasted languages are usually refferred 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. For example:

- we passed *troops* marching under the rain, *guns, horses,* pulling wagons, *mules, motor trucks,* all moving from the front. (Hemingway)	... відступаючи, ми бачили *солдатів,* що йшли під дощем, *гармати, коні,* що тягли вози, *мули, вантажні машини,* які відходили з передової.

Expanded (homogeneous) adverbial modifiers or adverbial complements, as they are usually termed, are equally common in both contrasted languages. Cf:

Long, long, afterwards I found the arrow still unbroke. (Longfellow)	*Геть-геть десь* по тому, я знайшов ще цілою стрілу...

Apart from external syntactic processes there also exist some external ones in word-groups and sentences of the contrasted languages. The latter take place only in sentences and include omission and reduction that may be by their nature as follows:

1. *Elliptical* which are often occurring in oral and written speech in two-member sentences and not only in the contrasted languages. Omitted may be in a two-member sentence only one or both principal parts of the sentence. For example, the subject and the predicate in the second sentence are omitted:

"When did you get in?"   - Ти коли прибув сюди?
"Yesterday morning". (H.E. Bates)   - Вчора ввечері.

Here the subject ("you") and the predicate of the sentence ("did you get in") are omitted both in the English sentence and in its Ukrainian variant. Similar omissions may commonly be observed in spoken utterances in English and Ukrainian:

"I suppose you've *left schooll"* - Ти, здається, *покинув школу!*
"Last term". (Ibid.)   - Минулого семестру.

The adverbial modifier *Last term* in the last sentence accumulates the meaning of the whole previous utterance, or more precisely the whole its primary predication word-group "you've left school" that has a corresponding Ukrainian equivalent "Ти покинув школу?" Consequently, ellipsis as a syntactic process performs in both languages absolutely identical functions. Its transformational potential is mostly used in both languages for ecomizing the speech effort as well as for achieving the necessary expressiveness in oral and written speech.

Maintained as a result of omission may sometimes be only the object in the elliptical sentence:

"What do you *want* from me?" - Що ти *хочеш* від мене?
"Everything". (Ibid.)   - Все.

The subject *(you)* and the predicate *(want)* in this sentence are omitted in English and consequently they may be omitted in Ukrainian. Moreover, the subject in Ukrainian elliptical sentences may often be omitted as well, though not the predicate, which is impossible in English in such sentences as the following one: *Рахунки* за імпорт газу надійшли? -Давно *надійшли* (or simply: *надійшли).*

The omitted subject in this Ukrainian definite personal sentence is clearly reflected in the categorial (plular) ending of the predicate *надійшли (рахунки).* Since the English language has no definite personal sentences, no omission of its subject and maintaining of the predicate (as in Ukrainian) is ever possible. Nevertheless, English predicates may often be partly reproduced in elliptical sentences which is, on the other hand, only in some cases possible in Ukrainian:

"Do you *think* I'm a selfish brute?"   - Ти що, *вважаєш* мене грубою
егоїсткою?
"Of course not, Frank, you know   - Звичайно ні, Франку, ти ж знаєш, що
/ *don T.   не вважаю.*
"Can you *believe* me?"   - Ти *можеш* мені *повірити[1]?*
"Sure I *can."* (I. Сапу)   - Безперечно, *можу/Звичайно, можу..*

Therefore, the auxiliary and modal verbs in the last two-sentences ("/ *don't", "I can"}* represent the meaning of the predicates "Do+think" and "Can+believe". Modal verbs in Ukrainian mostly maintain this substituting functions as well (cf. Ви *можете*

взавтра мені зателефонувати? -*Можу/*'or *Не можу).* Sometimes it is stylistically quite relevant and there is common use of such English elliptical sentences as in answers to the following interrogative sentence: "Had you forgotten I *was* a policeman?" *"WasT"* "You *are* a policeman". (L.P. Hartley)

Among other internal syntactic process pertaining to the English or to Ukrainian oral and written speech the following are most often employed:

2. *Representation* (репрезентація) which is a particular process of syntactic substitution alien to the Ukrainian 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".

No less often used alongside of the linking verb in present-day English is the syntactic *substituting particle* **to.** Eg. "He thought of making another *phone call,* but he realized that he was afraid *to".* (Ibid.) The representing particle *to* in the final clause here is used as a kind of replacement for the prepositional object performed in the sentence by the word-group *making another phone call.* Similarly in the replying sentence to the following one: "I'm a fool to *tell you anything".* And the answer to this sentence is: "You'd be a bigger fool *not to".* (J. Carre)

Here the representing part *not to* in the replying sentence is used instead of the adverbial part of the first sentence *to tell you anything.* Representation may also be realized with the help of such words as *not, one, do/did* and even with the help of the syntactic formant *'-s/-s',* as in the following sentence: The other voice was raised now, it was a *woman s.* (Maugham) The - 5 in the sentence represents/ substitutes the noun *voice,* i.e. *a woman s voice.*

3.   *Contamination* (суміщення) is another internal process in which two syntaxemes murge into one   predicative unit as in the following sentence: The moon *rose red.* This means: The moon *rose* + she was *red.* Or in Ukrainian: Наталка *прибігла сердита, задихана.* (О. Гончар), i.e. Наталка прибігла + (Наталка) була сердита + (Наталка) була задихана. Or: Шлях *лежить великий.* (О. Довженко), i.e. шлях *лежить* + шлях *великий.*

Partly close to contamination is also the secondary predication construction with the English past participle that has practically an identical equivalent construction in Ukrainian. Cf. They found the door *unlocked* (that is: they found the door, it/which was unlocked). Вони застали двері, відімкненими: вони застали двері, вони/ які були *відімкненими.*

4.   *Compression* represents a syntactic process which is closely con nected 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 Ukrainian transformed variants of this secondary predicate/complex will be either a participial/diyepryslivnyk construction *тримаючи свічку в руці,* or a co-ordinate clause *а свічка була в руці,* or simply *зі свічкою в руці.*

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

Syntactic Relations and Ways of their Realization

Unlike some syntactic processes as, for example, representation that is observed in English and is completely alien to present-day Ukrainian 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 realized depending on their grammatical nature either at sentence level or at word-group (словосполучення) level.

There exist four types of syntactic relations that are also realized in different languages partly via different means. These are: **1) predicative relations; 2) objective relations; 3) attributive relations and 4) various adverbial relations.**
Not all these relations are equally represented in the contrasted languages. Thus, predicative relations may be in English and in most other West European Germanic and Romance languages of two subtypes: **a) primary predicative relations and b) secondary predicative** relations. The latter, it must be emphasized, are erroneously considered to be completely missing in present-day Ukrainian.

I. Primary predication is universal. It finds its realization between the subject and predicate in any two-member sentence of any paradigmatic form or structural type. Consequently, primary predication presents a grammatical/syntactic and logico-semantic relation on the *Subject-Predicate axis.* Eg:

"I never <u>said</u> 1 <u>was</u> a beauty",   - Я ніколи <u>не казав,</u> що <u>я є красенем.</u> -
<u>he laughed.</u> (Maugham) <u>сказав,</u>   *усміхнувшись,* <u>він.</u>

In this quotation three predicates of two types are realized: two simple verbal predicates *(I said, he_ laughed]* and one compound nominal predicate (I was a beauty). These types of predicate are presented in Ukrainian as well. Cf. <u>Я не казав, усміхнувся він, and Я є красенем.</u> [1] Consequently, predication of these sentences in both contrasted languages has an identical expression.

This expression can also be different, as can be observed in the following interrogative sentences below:
1.   "What *did* she *wantT* (Ibid.)   "Чого вона *хотілаГ* (Cf. Чого їй *треба було[1]?)*
2. "What *have* I *doneT* (VS. Pritchett)   "Що *я вчинив!І* Що *я зробивТ*
3. "She *was trying to help you".* (Ibid.)   "Вона *намагалася допомогти* тобі."

Hence, the primary predicative relation may have different forms of expression

in the contrasted languages. English predicates may have analytical forms of the verb

(did + <u>want,</u> have + <u>done,</u> was trying+ to help) with no analytical equivalents for the same simple predicates in Ukrainian. This may be seen from many other sentences as well, which testify to the difference between the means of expression of the primary predication in the contrasted languages. Cf.:

"I'm *off,* Dick, *it's good-bye* till "   *Я від 'і'жджаю,* Діку, а це *означаємо*
Chistmas". (D. Lessing)   побачення аж до Різдва".

       In this sentence both predicates in the English variant are compound nominal, whereas in Ukrainian their equvalents are two simple verbal predicates instead: <u>Я від'їжджаю</u> and <u>Це означає.</u>

       On the other hand, there also exist some differences in expressing predicative relations in Ukrainian that are unknown in English. These include first of all the placement of the predicate in Ukrainian, since the inflexional morphemes always identify person, number and tense form of the verb/predicate irrespective of its position in the sentence. Cf. Він *мусив* це *знати. -- Знати мусив* він це. -- *Мусив* він це *знати. -Знати* він це *мусив.* -- Це *знати* він *мусив.* -- Він *знати* це *мусив.* Despite the change of placement in the sentence, the Ukrainian predicate preservers its syntactic function unchanged. As a result, the **grammaticality** of the sentence is not ruined. It goes without saying that the corresponding English sentence *(He must have known* it) can not be transformed this way, except for its interrogative form *(Must he have known it?)* where part of the predicate *(must)* may change its place in the sentence.

       Besides, placement may often be used in Ukrainian as a reliable means of expressing and often also as a means distinguishing between the predicative and attributive relations in a word-group or sentence. Cf:

Attributive Relations   ***Predicative Relations***
гарна погода, *червоне небо;*   Погода *гарна,* небо *червоне,*
працююче колесо/ устаткування;   Колесо/ устаткування *працююче,*
розбита клумба, *засіяне* поле, etc.   *Клумба розбита,* поле *засіяне.*

       As can be ascertained, prepositive adjectives as well as present and past participles form the attributive relation, whereas those same adjectives and participles in postposition to those same nouns form in Ukrainian a predicative relation. Eg. *Тепле* літо -- Літо *тепле. Посаджені* дерева - Дерева ***посаджені.*** In other words, preposed adjectives and past participles express quality and postposed adjectives/participles express state of things and form simple nominal (and not compound nominal) predicates. This assertion is based on the absence of the linking verb which can be substantiated in Ukrainian via an extention of the sentence, eg.: Грядка засіяна *гарної добірним зерном/ торік пізньої осені,* etc.

       7. *Secondary* predicative relation is formed in English by verbals in connection with other nominal parts of speech. The secondary predication constructions are formed in English by the so-called infinitival, participial and gerundial *complexes,* which function as various parts of the sentence. The nomenclature of them is as follows 1) the objective and the subjective with the infinitive constructions which perform respectively the function of the complex object and that of the complex subject. For example:

He stood by the creek and heard *it ripple* over the stones. (Cusack)	Він стояв біля струмка і чув *як він (струмок) хлюпоче по* камінцях.
He stood watching the *red dawn break* in the east. (Caldwell)	Він стояв і спостерігав,*як народжуєть-ся (червоний) світанок* на сході.

It goes without saying that the complex object expressed in this Ukrainian translation through the object subordinate clauses can also be conveyed with the help of nouns. Cf. Він чув хлюпіт/жебоніння води по камінцях or in the second sentence: Він спостерігав за народженням світанку на сході. Neither of these Ukrainian variants conveys the nature of the secondary predication expressed by the English objective with the infinitive constructions.

Similarly with *the subjective with the* infinitive complexes, which may be formed by turning the objective with the infinitive constructions passive. Cf. it (creek) was heard to ripple over the stones i.e. чулося/ було чути, як *вода хлюпоче по камінцях.* Or in such sentences:

You seem not *to have caught* my idea. (Harley)ТТге *operation* is expected *to start* in 48 hours. (K. Post)	- *Ти,* здається, *не зовсім зрозумів,* що я хочу сказати/ мою думку, Очікується, що (антитерористична) *операція почнеться* за 48 годин.

The subjective with the infinitive construction in English sentences has the function of the complex subject that is allomorphic for Ukrainian. Lexically and structurally isomorphic, however, is the English multifunctional secondary predication construction/complex of the/or + *to* + *infinitive.* This English construction can perform the function of the complex subject, complex predicative, complex object, complex attribute and complex adverbial parts of the sentence. For example, the complex subject: *"For you to decide* it won't be easy." (Hartley); the complex predicative: "That *is for you to decide* is it not?" (C. Doyle); the complex object: She wanted to wait/or *the moon to rise.* (Galsworthy); the complex attribute: "There is nothing *for us to change* at present, you see." (A. Wilson), etc.

One more secondary predication group constitute participial construc-tions/complexes which are functionally similar to the infinitival constructions and are: a) the objective with the present or past participles performing the function of the complex object: She heard *the door closing.* (Galsworthy). I will have some *photographs taken.* (Caldwell). These secondary predication constructions perform the same functions in the English sentences as the objective with the infinitive complexes.

Note. It should be repeatedly emphasized that there is one more secondary predication cosntruction which is practically identical in English and Ukrainian. It also performs the same function in the sentence. This is the already mentioned objective with the past participle (or adjective) construction, which has not only an identical meaning in both contrasted languages, but also the same structural form. It is treated in present-day Ukrainian grammars as double predicate (подвійний присудок). For example:

I found the *windows closed.*	Я застав *вікна зачиненими.*
We remember *him quite young.*	Ми пам 'ятаємо *його зовсім молодим.*
They found *the soldier wouded.*	Вони знайшли *воїна пораненим.*

Consequently, the predicative nature of the objective with the past participle is isomorphic in the contrasted languages, which is not the case with the objective present participle construction, that is completely allo-morphic for Ukrainian. Cf. I hear *you reading* (pronoun *you+present* participle). Я знаю, як *ти читаєш* (connective adverb *як* + objective subordinate clause, i.e. a complex sentence), which is but a simple (extended) sentence in English.

One more English secondary predication construction constitutes the subjective/ nominative absolute participial complex that is practically al-lomorphic for Ukrainian. The functions of this secondary predication construction is mostly adverbial. For example: She walked steadily, *the showel in front,* held like a spear in both hands. (D. Lessing) or: Charlie stood with the rain on his shoulders, *his hands in his pockets.* (Ibid.) Both italicized adverbial constructions have the functions of the complex attendent circumstances *(How/ in what way did he hold her showel? How/ in what way did Charlie stand?).* The nominative absolute participial construction may also perform the functions of the adverbial modifiers of time or cause. For example: *This being done,* they set off with light hearts. (Irving). In this sentence two functions may be implicit simultaneously - that of the adverbial modifier of time *(When did they set off!)* and that of the adverbial modifier of cause: *Why did they set off!* The answers may also be respectively two: either 1) *after that being done* or 2) *because that was being done.*

III. *Objective relations.* These, like the predicative, attributive and adverbial relations are undoubtedly pertained to all languages without exception. They are directed by the action of the transitive verb on some object, which may be either a life or lifeless component. Hence, the notions of seeing/hearing somebody or something of being given smth. by somebody, etc. are pertained to each single language and to all languages of the world irrespective of their structural/typological differences. Hence, depending on the concrete language, these relations may have different/unlike forms of expression i.e. realization. Thus, the notion to *giving something* to *somebody* can be expressed as follows:

Language	***Realization of case relation***
In Ukrainian	дати книжку (accusative case) Петрові (dative case)
In English	Give a book *to* Peter/give Peter a book (no case forms)

Therefore only in Ukrainian and German the objective case relation of nouns and in the former the accusative case of them (cf. Взяти/дати книжку, листа, дитину) have a synthetic way of expression. English, German, French, Italian and Spanish (like some other languages) have no synthetic expression of case (objective, accussative and some others) of nouns and consequently of case relations either, which are expressed analytically (by means of prepositions). Cf.

"Come on", said Mr. Sloan *to Tom,* "Ходім", - сказав *Томові* пан Слоан, - "we're late". (Fitzgerald) ми запізнюємось.

Isomorphism is observed, however, in the syntactic connection of the English or Italian objects expressed by some personal pronouns which take the objective case form (cf. for me, her, him, us, them; a me, a te, a noi/a voi, etc.). The expression of the objective relation coincides then not only in English and Ukrainian (cf. in German: gib

ihm/ ihnen or in Italian *date mi,* etc.). This can be seen in following examples:

"Tell *him* we could wait, will you?"   "Скажіть *йому,* ми почекаємо. Добре?"
But the rest offtended *her.* (Ibid.)   Все інше ображало *її.*

    Objective relations can also be expressed via a preposition and the synthetic form of the governed nominal part of speech (usually personal pronoun in English). Eg:
"You hadn't any *pity forme,* had   "Ти не мав *до мене* ніякого жалю,
you?" Walter could only stare *at*   правда ж?" Волтер тільки вирячився
him. (L.P. Hartly) *на нього.*

    Objective relations, therefore, can be expressed in English and in several other languages with the help of analytical means including the syntactic placement of objective complements. For example, in English:
Mary sat *next to Diana.* "Just listen   Мері підсіла *до Діани.* - Ти тільки при-
to your husband", Diana exclaimed,   слухайся до *свого* **чоловіка*.** -- вигу-
(Ibid.)*кнула* Діана.

    As can be ascertained, objective relations in each English sentence are perceived due to the logico-grammatical nature of the parts of the sentence and due to their functional significance. In the sentence above the objective relations are realized partly through the position of the objects which (their position) is usually stable in English, i.e. always following the predicate, as well as with the help of prepositions: *next to* Diana, *to your* husband. In Ukrainian these objective relations are conveyed with the help of the prepositional government (preposition plus the *dative* case ending: *до* Діани) and via inflexions (свого чоловіка, the accusative case of the direct object *чоловіка).*

    The fixed placement of these objects in Ukrainian is not obligatory and can easily be changed without ruining the objective relation in the sentences. Cf. *До* Діани підсіла Мері, or: свого чоловіка тільки послухай. Such kind of transformation is usually impossible in English. Though not without exceptions either, as in some emphatic sentences like Talent Mr. Micowber has, *capital* Mr. Micowber has not. (Dickens) In Ukrainian too placement on rare occasions can be employed to distinguish the subject from the object or vice versa as in the following sentences:
Радість сповнює серце (object)   but: Серце (subj.) сповнює радість (object).
Дні змінюють ночі (object)   but: Ночі (subj.) змінюють дні (object).
Вітри супроводжують <u>дощі</u> (object) but: Дощі (subj.) супроводжують <u>вітри</u> (object).

    Such cases can naturally be considered coincidental, since objects in Ukrainian have mostly inflexional identification except for cases when nouns are indeclinable, as in sentences like Вони оформили <u>фойє,</u> ми взяли <u>таксі,</u> їй подобається <u>кімоно/сарі,</u> etc. Foreign indeclinable nouns of the kind do not loose their objective functions as a result of transposition. Cf. *Фойє* (object) оформили вони; *Сарі* (object) їй подобається/ не подобається; *Таксі* (object) ми взяли, etc.

    IV. Attributive relations. These are formed in all languages between adjuncts and head words (subordinating parts) of nominal word-groups. This can be seen, for example, in the following English sentence and its Ukrainian counterpart:

The *young man* was still fresh, with *j aunty fair hair* and *alert eyes.* (D. Lessing)	*Молодий шахтар* ще був свіжим новачком з *неслухняною світлою чуприною* і *жвавими очима.*

The attributive components in the English sentence *(young man, jaunty fair hair, alert eyes]* do not agree syntactically with their head nouns as their Ukrainian equivalents do (cf. молодий шахтар, неслухняною чуприною, свіжим новачком, жвавими очима). Each Ukrainian adjunct reflects the grammatical number, case and gender of its head noun through the corresponding endings. The English adjuncts, on the contrary, rarely combine with their head components by means of their inflexions, the main means being semantic and syntactic placement (often with prepositions). This becomes especially evident in cases with the indeclinable adjuncts which are, for example, infinitives, gerunds, adverbs and other parts of speech (or their paradigmatic forms). For example: books for reading, books *to read/to be read and to be translated,* Sep-*tember five/fifth,* the *then governments,* etc.

Such kind of adjuncts are rare through not completely excluded in Ukrainian. For example: бажання *виграти,* бажання *відпочити,* номер *два* (alongside of номер *другий/ другий* номер), etc. The overwhelming majority of Ukrainian adjuncts, however, agree with the head word in number, case and gender. Cf. *гарний* день, *гарна* погода, *гарне* вбрання, *гарні* квіти; *перший* день, *першого* дня, *першої* зміни, *першій* зміні, *перше* змагання, *першого* змагання, *перші* сходи, *перших* сходів, *першим* сходам, etc.

Therefore, attributive relations in Ukrainian are mostly expressed with the help of synthetic means, i.e. via inflections, which is observed only in some four cases in English (when the adjuncts are the demonstrative pronouns *this, that, such_a* and *many_a* in singular and *these, those, such* and *many* in plural). Eg: *this* dumb *beast, that hand, these bandages, those bitter lips, such a* day - *such days,* many a boy -- *many boys* (S. Chaplin). In Ukrainian, naturally, all adjectives, ordinal numerals, participles and adjectives-pronouns agree in number, case and gender with the head word. Cf.: *червоний місяць, червона квітка, червоне небо, червоні очі; працюючий мотор, працююча зміна, працююче колесо, працюючі люди; твій брат, твого брата, твоя сестра, твоєї сестри, твоє пальто, твого пальта, (в) твоєму пальті, твої проблеми, твоїх проблем, твоїм проблемам,* etc.

Nevertheless Ukrainian adjuncts may sometimes not agree in number, case and gender (as it is mostly in English). It happens when the adjunct is an indeclinable part of speech or a word-group. Eg.: бажання *поспати,* фільм *"Вони боролися за волю батьківщини",* акція *"Допоможемо дітям-інвалідам",* etc. Such and the like attributive word-groups are common in English. Cf. *They fought for their motherland* picture, *America fights back* action, *boy and girl* affair, *night shift* workers, etc.

Generally, however, attributive relations in English and Ukrainian are realized with the help of quantitatively the same but qualitatively rather different means and ways of connection (and expression).

V. **Adverbial relations** in the contrasted languages are created both in coordinate and in subordinate word-groups to express different adverbial meanings. The latter may find their realization in isomorphic by syntactic connection and componental

structure co-ordinate or subordinate word-groups. Subordinate word-groups can be in all European languages substantival, verbal, adverbial and others. Co-ordinate word-groups expressing adverbial relations may be a) substantival: in winter and/or in summer (time) *зимою та/чи літом;* by hook or by crook *усіма правдами і неправдами* (manner), b) adverbial, i.e. consisting of adverbial components: quickly and well *швидко й добре* (manner or attendant circumstances); neither seldom nor often *ні часто ні рідко* (time or frequency), etc.

Subordinate word-groups expressing adverbial relations and meanings may be
1) **Substantival:** rains in March; university winter examinations in Ukraine, the harvest of 2002, дощі *в березні, зимові іспити в університетах України, урожай 2002 року*', *винаходи 20 ст.,* etc.

2) **Verbal word-groups** expressing local or temporal meanings and those of attendant circumstances: to *work/to be working there* (local adv. relation), *come/coming soon,* raising *early,* arrive *next week/on Sunday* (temporal relations), *to -work hard, to speak slowly,* (adverbial relation of manner), etc. Similarly in Ukrainian: мешкати *в Україні,* працювати *тут/там,* приходити *невдовзі/скоро,* приїжджати *наступного тижня/в неділю,* вставати *рано,* працювати *добре,* говорити *повільно.*

3) **Adverbial word-groups** are formed on the basis of adverbs or adverbial phrases (as heads): very *well, seriously* enough, rather *well,* very *early, soon* enough, *late* on Sunday, *early* in 2001, somewhere *there,* almost *here,* etc. And in Ukrainian: досить *добре,* зовсім *серйозно,* дуже *рано,* ще *рано, пізно* в неділю, *наприкінці* 2002 року, десь *там,* майже *тут/ на окраїні.*

4) **Co-ordinate adverbial word-groups:** soon and well, slowly but certainly, early or late, neither here nor there, here and everywhere, etc. *скоро й повільно зате напевне, рано чи пізно, ні тут ні там, тут і скрізь,* etc.

The adverbial relations in all languages usually coincide with various adverbial meanings, the main of which are as follows:
1. Temporal relations which express adverbial meanings of time or frequncy: *the meeting in 1991 or: the 1991 meeting, the detension of last August or: the last August detension, зустріч 1991 року,* затримання *минулого серпня, зустріч у понеділок,* etc.
2. Local relations: the house *in Manhatten,* life *near the seaport,* meetings *at the hotel,* помешкання *в Мангеттені,* життя *біля/ поблизу морського порту,* зустрічі *в готелі.*

Syntactic Relations in English and Ukrainian
As could be already noticed, various syntactic relations in the contrasted languages can be realized both by isomorphic and by allomorphic means. The latter pertain to both languages, though analytical means are naturally predominant in English, whereas synthetic or combined analytical and synthetic means are predominant in Ukrainian. An exception constitutes, however, only one relation (that

of the primary predication) whose expression finds its realization between the main parts of the sentence, i.e. between the subject and the predicate. This type of connection is often qualified as *interdependence,* that is dependence of the subject on the predicate on the one hand, and dependence of the predicate upon the sybject on the other. This means that primary predication is realized, at least in English, only on the S-P axis, though in some other languages it may be realized even without one (S or P) of these components. As for instance, in Latin: *veni, vidi, vici* or in present-day Italian, Ukrainian or Russian: *Amo patria mial* Люблю свою Батьківщину. Люблю свою родину. The predicate verbs *amo* and *люблю* correlate with the implicit subject (io, я) expressing its number, person and case.

The other three relations, which also pertain to all languages, i.e. the objective, the attributive and the adverbial ones can be realized with the help of different means that are grammatically relevant. Namely by a) syntactic placement and prepositions (analytical means); b) by morphological, i.e. synthetic means (inflexions), as well as with the help of combined means, i.e. synthetic plus analytical means simultaneously. Thus, the predicate in English statements always follows, as a rule, the subject, whereas in Ukrainian the simple verbal predicate even in unemphatic speech may precede the subject without ruining the grammaticality of the sentence. Eg:

Mary was listening; but she still said nothing. (F. King)   Слухала Мері (or Мері слухала), проте вона нічого не відповідала/ мовчала.

In English interrogative or (emphatic) sentences a part of the predicate may be placed in front of the subject/subject group, which is not necessarily followed in their Ukrainian counterpart sentence. For example:

" *Were* you ever *compelled* to mutilate the animals?" (S. Chaplin)   - Тебе *примушували* будь-коли ка- лічити тварин?

"Would you *like us to send* somebody now?" (Hartley)   - *Хотіли* б ви, щоб ми когось зараз послали?

Therefore, English predicates, whether simple or compound, rarely occupy, unlike predicates in Ukrainian, the initial position in the interrogative sentence. Though not without exceptions either. Cf. "He *was* there too". *'Was* he really?" or in the imperative sentences like *Come* here, my dear. *Іди* сюди, дорогенький. Or: *Do get* your boy to bring *it* here. (F. King) *Скажи* своєму хлопцеві, щоб він хутенько його приніс сюди (японський екран).

English simple verbal and compound nominal predicates, however, are in syntactic agreement (expressed through morphological means) with the subject. Cf. *"I'm* off, Dad, *it's* good bye till Christmas". (Less-ing) "Who й that in your flat?" "Who *are* they?" (W. Trevor)

All four predicates in these sentences *(am, is, are}* agree with their subjects in singular (first person) and correspondingly with *It* and *who* which are in the third person singular or plural. The same is observed in the preceding sentence where the predicate *(Was* she really) agrees in number and person with its subject *he.*

It is only partly so with the expression of the objective relation which may be realized in English and Ukrainian both synthetically and analytically as well:

We passed *him through* the *narrow* others relieved us. (S. Chaplin)   - Ми передали *його* по *вузькому про-way;* *ходу;* інші допомагали *нам.*

The first object *(him)* is direct and it is expressed through its morphological (synthetic) form *him* (objective case); the second object is prepositional *(through the narrow way)* and the third *(us)* has also a morphological (synthetic) form that expresses its objective function. In the Ukrainian counterpart of this sentence the objective relation has a synthetic expression in the first direct object *його* (as in English) and in the indirect object *нам* (synthetic expression, like in English). As to the prepositional object, its connection in Ukrainian differs from that in English in that it is prepositional and morphologically marked (по проходу). In other words it is combined (analytical, i.e. prepositional) and synthetic (objective case form *по проходу]*. Hence, Ukrainian nouns express their dependence by means of their case forms (cf. дав книжку Петренкові товаришці, товаришам/товаришкам). Exceptions are made for the already mentioned indeclinable nouns as in Вона зайшла в *фойє/сіла в таксі,* Вона у новому *кімоно,* сперечатися про *галіфе,* цікавитися працями *Монтеск'є.* The synthetic expression of objective relation in Ukrainian, unlike English, have also substantivized adjectives, present and past participles, and also numerals. Cf. задоволений новим (побаченим і почутим), зеленим та жовтим; зустрітися зі знайомим, з трьома/з першим. Synthetically dependent objective complements/ objects in Ukrainian may equally be indefinite and other pronouns. For example: зостатись/ вернутись з нічим, цікавитись усім, звести одного з одним, цікавитись кимсь, ніким і нічим. Many English pronominal objects of this type are naturally unmarked, i.e. they have no case distinction. Cf. He heard *nothing.* (S. Chaplin) Він *нічого* не чув. In Ukrainian *нічого* is the objective case form of the indefinite pronoun *ніщо,* whose equivalent *nothing* is indeclinable in English. Similarly with the English wholly substantivized adjectives which, unlike their Ukrainian equivalents, do not express their objective (or nominative) case form synthetically. For example:
<u>Pink</u> became royal red. <u>Blue</u> rose   Рожеве ставало густо-червоним. Синє into <u>purple.</u> (Norris)   ставало пурпуровим.

Therefore, objective relations in English are expressed predominantly in the analytical way, i.e. by means of syntactic placement or with the help of syntactic placement and/plus the prepositional connection of objective complements (cf. satisfied with *them/us).*

The *attributive relation* and its realization in English does not differ much from the realization of the objective relations, there being both synthetic and analytical means employed. The former, as has been pointed out above, are reduced in present-day English to a few standard cases involving only the four pairs of demonstrative pronouns *this - these, that -- those, such a - such, many a - many.* These pronouns express their attributive function with the help of their form in singular and plural, i.e. they agree in number with their head nouns (cf. *This day - these days, that book -- those books, such an event -- such events, many a boy - many boys].* Other ways and means of expressing the attributive relation in English are analytical. Namely, the preposed or postpositional placement of attributive components (adjectives, participles, numerals, pronouns) which do not agree either in number, case or gender with their head components (nuclei). *Cf. jaunty fair hair, alert eyes, shining face, the only child, sweated bloody sweets,* the *drizzling darkness, the atmosphere of trade union meetings* (after D. Lessing). Neither of the above-given attributive adjectives, present or past

participles and adverbs agrees with the head noun. Nor does the postpositive prepositional word-group functioning as an attribute agree synthetically with the head noun in the last example above (e.g. the *atmosphere of trade union meetings).* Neither do gerundial and infinitival adjuncts agree with their head nouns or subordinating word-groups performing their function. Cf. books *to read,* articles *to be translated* or: books *for reading* (what books?).

One more way of expressing attributive relation is that by means of the so-called synthetic formant ('s) (Vorontsova: 10, 1950) as in the word-group *her widowed mother's child.* This synthetic element ('s) does nor express any categorical (morphological) meaning, it performs only a connective function. Consequently, the realization of the attributive relation in English as compared with Ukrainian, so far as the means of expression are concerned, can be qualified as mainly allomorphic.

Adverbial relations in each of the contrasted languages are mostly realized with the help of the same means as the objective and partly the attributive relations. These means of connection are analytical (placement or placement plus prepositions in English) and synthetic or combined (analytical plus synthetic) in Ukrainian. Cf. in English: (to) work hard (how? the adverbial relations of attendant circumstances); hard work (what work? the attributive relation). Therefore, syntactic placement is the only means in English (here). In Ukrainian word-groups like працювати *важко* and *важко* працювати the change of place of the adverb *важко* does not change in any way the syntactic relation in the word-group, which remains in both variants adverbial (as in the English word-groups *to work hard).*

Other paradigmatic classes of word-groups in English and Ukrainian may have both isomorphic and allomorphic realization of adverbial relations. Isomorphism is observed in adverbial word-groups as: *very* well *дуже* добре, early *enough досить* рано, *quite* seriously *зовсім* серйозно, rather *slowly досить* повільно, etc.

Syntactic placement or juxtaposition may be often enforced by way of prepositions preceding the adverbial word-group as in the following English sentence:

She *looked &\.* him *with mild surprise,* Вона *глянула* на нього *трохи* blushed. (Jessing) *здивовано,* червоніючи.

The attendant circumstance in the English sentence (How did she look at him? With mild surprise) has a combined expression: preposition *with* + adjective *(mild)* + noun *(surprise),* whereas in Ukrainian this same meaning can be expressed by means of an adverb *здивовано* or with the help of a prepositional noun *(із здивуванням),* i.e. with the help of prepositional government. Since in English there is no genuine government of nouns, as the noun is practically indeclinable, it can not express any attendant circumstance through its morphological (case) form as it is the case in Ukrainian. Neither can the causal meaning be expressed in this way in English (cf. to *live from hand to mouth* жити в злиднях, to be *absent because of illness* бути відсутнім *через хворобу).* Therefore, the accusative case form of the noun хвороба is used in Ukrainian), i.e. prep. + Naccusative, the analytical and synthetic way of expression. Syntactic placement (juxtaposition or adjoinment) is also the main means of realization of temporal and local relations in English, which was already partly illustrated above. It

is often observed in Ukrainian as well. Eg. to come/coming *today* приїжджати *сьогодні,* come/coming *in time* прийти/приїхати *вчасно,* early *today* сьогодні *вранці.* In Ukrainian, however, adverbial components may change their place because of the logical/emphatic stress: учора *звечора -- звечора* вчора, прийти *раніше - раніше* прийти. The means of connection, however, remains the same, i.e. analytical (placement, i.e. juxtposition). This way of grammatical connection in both languages can often go along with prepositional connection which is usually an explicit form of prepositional government in Ukrainian. For example:

-by the way, your mother **is in town.** "... між іншим, ваша матір (є) у **місті".** (J. Сагу)

There was no one else **on the beach** Усе більш нікого не було **на пляжі в**
so late in the afternoon. (S. Hill)   **таку пізню годину пополудні.**

The local meaning in the first English sentence is expressed only through the postpositive placement of the noun *town (in town),* whereas in Ukrainian this same adverbial relation (local meaning) is conveyed (and expressed) with the help of the preposition (у) and/plus the case form (locative) of the noun **town (у місті),** i.e. prepositional government.

Similarly realized are also local and temporal relations in the second sentence. In English: was **on the beach** (prepositional connection), in Ukrainian **не було на пляжі** (preposition plus the locative case ending, i. e. syntactic government of the noun **пляж/на пляжі).** The temporal meanings (and relations) in the English and Ukrainian sentences have some isomorphic and allomorphic expression as well. The main means in English here is placement (so plus **late)** and prepositional connection (late **in the afternoon),** whereas in Ukrainian there is observed the combined, i.e. the analytical and synthetic ways of connection in the temporal word-group (у **таку годину),** but there is a purely asyndetic (analytical connection, i.e. juxtaposition прилягання) in the second temporal word-group (у пізню **годину пополудні).** This is because the adverb **пополудні** is indeclinable and is adjoined to the synthetic head/ nucleus у **пізню годину** (пополудні).

Consequently, the same syntactic relations in English and Ukrainian word-groups are mostly realized with the help of different means. The latter also display, as will be shown further, their cardinally different quantitative correlation in English and Ukrainian subordinate word -groups.

Typology of the Word-Group/Phrase

The word-group in both contrasted languages consists of two or more grammatically connected notional parts of speech expressing some content. Word-groups in English and Ukrainian may be: 1) **syntactically free combinations of words** like *to learn much, to learn hard, to learn quickly, to learn well, to learn there/here,* etc.- or 2) **idiomatically bound** (constant) collocations, i. e. unchanged for the given sense word-combinations as *to have dinner/supper, to take measures, to throw light, Hobson s choice,* etc.

Free word-groups or word-combinations exist alongside of prepositional phrases which are often considered even to be of the same nature as the idiomatic word-groups [7]. Genuine syntactically free word-groups, unlike prepositional phrases, are used to

name actions *(quick reading),* objects *(a new hat),* state of objects *(the house ablaze),* number or quantity *(two thirds, the first three);* also they may give characteristics of an action *(singing well, going quickly, arriving first - - новий капелюх, йому/Миколі страшно, дві третіх, перші три, швидко йти, гарно читати).*

Common features are also observed in the structural forms of word-groups in the contrasted languages. They are:

1. Simple or elemental word-groups which consist of two immediatle components /ICs/ connected with the help of one grammatical means (synthetic or analytical): *this book—these books, to see her; to read well; nice flowers; cotton yarn, people of rank; ця книжка - - ці книжки, бачити її; гарно читати, дуже добре, зайти у фойє, вийти з метро.*

2. Equally common in English and Ukrainian are word-groups of com plicated structure and grammatical form, i. e. with two ways of gram matical connection of their ICs or expressing different grammatical rela tions, eg: *writing and reading letters* (co-ordinate and analytical forms of connection), *these books and magazines* (synthetic and co-ordinate connection), *to see Mike driving a car* (analytical and predicative) -*ці книжки та журнали, застати двері зачиненими, бачити когось у метро, носити кімоно останньої моди.*

There are also structurally more complicated free word-groups in both languages, eg: *those long sentences for you to analyze and translate—ті довгі речення тобі для аналізу й перекладу.* In this English word-group and its Ukrainian semantic equivalent one can identify different grammatical relations: a) attributive *(those long sentences}* and predicative *(sentences for you to analyze].* Besides, the ways of syntactic connection are different: subordination with synthetic agreement in the initial part *(those long sentences]* and co-ordination *(to read and analyze)* in the second part of the word-group. In the Ukrainian equivalent word-group there is no secondary predication available in the English variant. Hence, there is no mostly qualitative and quantitative correlation between the means of grammatical connection of different constituents in English vs. Ukrainian free word-groups. Since present-day English is mainly analytical by its structure, the predominent means of its grammatical connection in word-groups are naturally analytical. They are syndetic (prepositional) and asydentic (syntactic placement). These two forms of analytical connection are very often of equal semantic relevance, as a result of which they are often interchangeable, as in the following substantival word-groups:

Syndetic connection   **Asyndetic connection**
books/or home reading   home-reading books
production *of* sugar cane   sugar cane production
books *at* the institute library   the institute library books

Syndetic and asyndetic connection, as will be shown further, is observed in verbal, adjectival, numerical, pronominal, adverbial and statival word-groups, eg: *to read books, to see well, red from anger, he himself, we all, four of the workers, well enough, afraid to read, afraid of that, ashamed to speak,* etc.

Hence, the word-groups, traditionally objective by their syntactic relation like *to ask Pete/somebody, reading books, to receive four/five, to invite all, good for all,* etc.

have in English an analytical form of connection, whereas these same word-groups in Ukrainian have a synthetic or analytico-synthetic connection: *запитувати Петра/когось, читання книжок, одержати четвірку, добре для Петра/для мене, зайти першим, думати про старих і малих, просити до столу.*

Synthetic government in English can be observed only in verbal word-groups having the following structural patterns: 1) the Vinf + lobj or 2) Ving+ lobj with the pronoun in the objective case form, eg: *to see him (her, them, whom),* seeing *him (her, them,* etc.). The analytical and synthetic connection is observed in all other kinds of English word-groups with these same objective case pronouns, eg: *reference to him them, four of them, none of whom, much for me, depend on her, afraid of them/us.*

As to **synthetic agreement**/concord, its use is restricted in present-day English, as was mentioned, to six patterns of substantival word-groups, in which adjuncts are the demonstrative pronouns *this/that -these/those, such a/such* + Nsing.- Nplur.: *this/that book -- these/those books, such a case/such cases; many a girl -- many girls (of this age).*

Note. Cardinal numerals functioning as adjuncts in English substantival word-groups are only in lexical agreement (unlike Ukrainian) with their head nouns, eg: *one book, twenty one books; one boy - one girl, one deer/ sheep - - two deer/sheep.* It is not so in Ukrainian where cardinal numerals may have number, gender and case distinctions (synthetic agreement). Cf. *один* хлопець - *одна* дівчина, *десятьох* хлопцш -*десятьом* хлопшш/дівчат^ш, etc. The same syntactic connection have also other Ukrainian notional parts of speech (nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns and participles), which, when used as adjuncts, mostly agree with the head-word in number, case and gender (though not without exceptions), eg: *рання весна - - ранньої весни - - ранній весні -ранньою весною; ранні весни •— ранніх весен; один день одного дня; два дні - - дві ночі; працюючий апарат - - працююча зміна, працююче колесо.*

No less striking is also the presentation of synthetic or analytic and synthetic *government* in the contrasted languages, these ways of connection are predominant in Ukrainian. This is because in English only some personal pronouns have the objective case form (cf. to see *me, her, them, him, us],* whereas in Ukrainian almost all nominal parts of speech are declinable, i.e. can be governed. Eg: *бачити Петра/Марію, знати першого/другу, перев'язувати пораненого, задоволений чорним/обома, двома,* etc.

It goes without saying that amorphous components in any language can be connected with the help of analytical means only (both syndetically and asyndetically). Since in English the analytical way of connection prevails in all kinds of word-groups and in Ukrainian—the synthetic means of connection is predominant, their role and correlation can not be the same, as can be seen from the following table of comparison:

Type of syntactic connection	In English	In Ukrainian
1 . Synthetic (agreement and government)	much less common	absolutely dominant
2. Analytical connection (syndetic and asyndetic)	absolutely dominant	much less common

The Ukrainian language is far from devoid of analytical (syndetic and asyndetic) connection either. Cf. *брати таксі, носити кімоно, бути в галіфе/у фойє для глядачів.* Common in both languages are also the V + D pattern word-groups with syntactic juxtaposition (analytical connection) of components, eg:

In English	In Ukrainian
to come soon, to learn well, going quickly, going home, take slowly/ go there, make sure, etc.	скоро прийти, добре вчитися, йдучи швидко/йдучи додому, заходити туди/ зайшовши туди, вийти звідти.

Verbal and substantival word-groups with extended or expanded complements and adjuncts often have an analytical asyndetic connection in both languages as well, e.g:

In English	In Ukrainian
/not/ to distinguish A from Z, to feel lonely and desperate, to love Shevchenko the painter, the film "They chose freedom".	не знати ні бе, ні ме; почуватися одиноко і розгублено, любити кіно, фільм "Живі й мертві", телепередача "Екран для малят".

Pertaining to English only are substantival word-groups of the NN, NNN, etc. patterns having asyndetic connection of components. For example: *cotton yarn, cotton yarn production, cotton yarn production figures;* Kyiv *street traffic,* Kyiv *street traffic violations, the university library books readers,* etc. No such asyndetically connected noun word-groups are available in Ukrainian, of course.

Types of Word-Groups in English and Ukrainian

According to the existing interrelations between their immediate components all word-groups in the contrasted languages split into the following three types: 1) co-ordinate word-group 2) subordinate word-groups and 3) predicative word-groups.

I. Co-ordinate word-groups in English and Ukrainian are formed from components equal in rank which are connected either syndetically (with the help of conjunctions) or asyndetically (by plecement). For example: *books and magazines; to read, translate and retell; neither this nor that, книжки й журнали; читати, перекладати й переказувати, ні те й ні се.* Co-ordinate word-groups are non-binary by their nature; this means that they may include several IC's of equal rank, though not necessarily of the same lexico-grammatical nature. Cf. (They were) *alone and free and happy* in love. (Abrahams).

Such and the like word-groups in both contrasted languages perform the function of homogeneous parts of the sentence, eg: *There they were: stars, sun, sea, light, darkness, space, great waters. (Conrad)* -*Тут ними були: зірки, сонце, море, світло, темінь, простір, великі води. He was clean, handsome, well-dressed, and sympathetic. (Dreiser). Він був чистий, гарний, прекрасно одягнений і симпатичний. It was done thoroughly, well and quickly.- - Це було зроблено досконало, гарно й швидко.*

According to the structure of the ICs and their number, co-ordinate word-groups may be elemental and enlarged. Elemental word-groups consist of two components only, eg: *Pete or Mike, he and she, read and translate, all but me; Піт чи Майк, він і*

вона, читати й перекладати, всі крім мене.

Enlarged co-ordinate word-groups consist of structurally complicated components: to read the text, to analyze it stylistically and translate it - читати текст, аналізувати його стилістично і перекладати його.

As to the expression of sense, co-ordinate word-groups in the contrasted languages may be closed or unclosed, i. e. infinite. Closed word-groups denote some actions, objects and phenomena. They consist of two components only, eg: *riverlTand lakes, neither he nor she, all but me - -річки й озера; ні він, ні вона; всі крім мене.* Common in both languages are also the unclosed or infinite word-groups consisting of several constituent components the number of which may still be continued (as by enumerating). These constituents may be connected by means of conjunctions or asyndentically, eg: *books, note-books, bags, pens* and *pencils; ні гори, ні гірські потоки, ні звірі чи птахи, ні рослини* (не цікавили їх).

A common means of expressing homogeneousness as well as forming co-ordinate word-groups in both languages is also intonation. Cf: He speaks English, German, French, Spanish and Russian. "чебрецем, м'ятою, любистком запахло літо (К. Гордієнко).

II. Subordinate word-groups in all languages are binary by their nature. It means that they consist of a head component, which is the nucleus of the word-group, and of one or more adjuncts/complements. They may be either a single notional word or a group of words/word-group functionally equal to it and having the function of a notional word, eg: *my pen, his "oh", your "r", her father and mother, take part in the games, bad for you, the film "They fought for their Motherland", Peter's brother,* etc. Among the existing classifications of word-groups the morphological (paradigmatic) classification remains one of the most embracing. It is based on the lexico-grammatical nature of the head component or on its functional substitute. As a result, the following seven (according to the number of national parts of speech) common paradigmatic classes of substantival word-groups are to be singled out in English and Ukrainian:

1. Substantival Word-Groups, in which the mainly attributive adjuncts may be in pre-position or in postposition to the noun head. Their way of connection is analytical in English and synthetic in Ukrainian, though not without exceptions, as can be seen in the following table:

Surface / Vlodels / / Ways of //Connection	English	Ukrainian
	Analytical (syndetic and asyndetic) connection	Synthetic connection (agreement or government)
N>N	cotton yarn, wage strike	N<N гра оркестру, виставка
NN>N	street traffic rules, sugar crop disaster	N<NN/NP>N гра оркестру теле-студії, будова станції метро
NP>NP*	last week football matches	N<NNN період розпаду ядер
N>NP/NN	Glasgow autumn holiday	N<NP/NN поведінка ринків
N cj N>N(P)	boy and girl secrets	M(yM>Nхлопця й дівчини

A>N	small children, lovely flowers	A>N малі діти, гарний день, холодна весна
I>N**	his work, my day, this look	I>N моя праця, його брат, наше таксі
Q(P)>N(P)	the first meeting, five days	Q>N перша зустріч, другий день
V$_{,ng}$ >N(P)	the reading people, the coming spring	Vpartc.^N працюючий прилад, крокуючий екскаватор
N(P)<A	the pasture green, the news available	N<A дні чудові, літа молодії
N(P)<I	Pete himself, lady mine	N<I Україно наша, дочка моя
N(P)<Q	page ten, group two, world War	N<Q номер п'ять/рік перший
N(P)<D	the book there, the people ahead	N<D крок назад*, голоси "проти", голоси "за"
N(P)<V$_{inf}$	the wish to win, to want to go	N<V$_{inf}$ бажання виграти**, намір піти погуляти
N(P)<V$_{ing}$	the student answering, the girls skating	N<N(P) знак, попереджуючий водіїв
N(P)<V$_{cn}$	the people invited, the words said	N<V$_{en}$ квіти политі (дощем), земля обітована
N(P)<Stative KStative	the child asleep, the house ablaze not available	N<Stative> дитині страшно KStative*** йому/їй краще
N(P)$_{prcp}$<N/NP	rays of hope, a game for our boys	N$_{prcp}$<N(P)Вісті з полів, папери на підпис/ для розгляду
N(P)$_{prcp}$ <V$_{gcr}$	the idea of being asked, books for reading	------

There are noun word-groups with synthetic or analytico-synthetic connection in English as well (when the complement/adjunct is a pronoun in the objective case, eg: *books for them/ for her,* or when the adjunct is the demonstrative pronoun *this/that, these/those, such a/such (this day — these days, such a book -- such books).* Analytical (asyndetic) connection. N<Stative word-groups are of predicative nature in Ukarainian (cf. мені краще).

Consequently, the conbinability of the noun as head of the substantival word-group is practically isomorphic in the contrasted languages. The only exceptions form a) the NprepVger pattern *(books for reading),* b) the N<Stative pattern word-group which is of attributive nature *(the child ashamed the house ablaze,* etc.). c) the N<Iposs.abs. pattern word-group are not awailable in Ukrainian since in *край наш/Україно моя!* both pronouns *(наше* and *моя)* are possessive conjoint but not possessive absolute which are not available in our language. Besides, the N<Stative pattern word-groups in Ukrainian are of predicative type (дитині *страшно, жах бере)* and not attributive as in English (the boy *asleep),* d) The English language has no KStative pattern word-groups like *йому страшно, нам сором(но),* etc. which present an allomor-phic feature for the English language.

No full synthetic expression of agreement or government can be observed in Ukrainian appositive word-groups like *число три/числа три, поет Данте/поета Данте, поетові Данте,* фільм "Вони воювали за Батьківщину", (у) фільмі "Вони

воювали за Батьківщину", etc.

Note. Pertaining to English only are also substantival word-groups whith adjuncts expressed by the definite or indefinite articles, which acquire a lexical meaning in a syntaxeme, i.e. in the context. For example, in such sentences as the following:

What his sister has seen in the man was beyond him. (London)	Що його сестра знайшла в **цьому чоловікові,** він не міг збагнути.
He hadn't a penny. (Maugham)	Він не мав **жодного** пенні ламаного шеляга.

2. Verbal Word-Groups are also characterized in English and Ukrainian by some isomorphic and allomorphic features. Generally common in both languages are the structural types of verbal word-groups that may be: 1) with simple objective or adverbial complements; 2) with extended or expanded complements; 3) with simple or extended/expanded objective and adverbial complements. Of common pattern in both languages are verbal word-groups with pre-posed and postposed complements.
Simple unextended word-groups with the transitive verbal head include nominal and adverbial complements/adjuncts. Their pattern is common in English and Ukrainian. Cf. V<N or I, Q, A, Stative: *to like books, to receive four, to love her, to prefer blue (to red), to love it to be asleep; любити книжки, отримати четвірку, кохати її, любити синє, щиро любити, почуватися краще,* etc. The head verb may also be extended or axpanded: to ardently love somebody *(дужелюбити* когось), etc.

Common are also prepositional complements in verbal word-groups of this pattern: *to speak of somebody, to divide by two; говорити про когось, ділити на два (на двоє).* Ukrainian has no equivalents, however, for the V<Vi$_{ng}$ and V<V$_{gcr}$ English word-groups patterns as *to sit reading, to like reading/being read* (or *having read it/the book). It* has, however, the V<Vdi$_y$ePrs pattern word-groups instead which are unknown in English. These are as follows: *читати стоячи, іти співаючи* or VdiyeprV/VP *співаючи іти/іти далі* (IVQD) patterns which are alien to English *читаючи/прочитавши (поему/її), гарно прочитавши, прочитаєш двічі, співаючи іти додому/здому,* etc. The English equivalents of these and other verbal word-groups are participial VingD (going home, going quickly) or V<V$_g$er(go on reading, stop talking), etc.

It should be pointed out, however, that unlike English, most of Ukrainian complements and adverbial adjuncts have no fixed position in the word-group. Cf. *слухати музику - - музику слухати, гарно співати -   співати гарно, вийти з лісу - - з лісу вийти, сидячи читати -читати сидячи, почуватися краще - - краще почуватися* and consequently D<D or D>D as in *гарно дуже - дуже гарно.*
Neither is the position of pre-posed complements/adjuncts fixed in Ukrainian. Cf. V$_P$re$_P$N or prep N>V: *думати про майбутнє - - про майбутнє думати.*

Some English complements, when emphasized, may also change their position, eg:
to speak of whom? - - Of whom to speak? to be invited by Peter -by Peter to be invited?

Extended and expanded complements/adjuncts have mainly common structural patterns in the contrasted languages. Cf. VW<VP: *to like to play the piano; любити пограти на піаніно;* Vinf<Vinf co-cj Vinf<N: *to like to read and translate a passage;*

любити читати й перекладати текст. In other words, the verbal head may have a VP structure.

Allomorphism is observed in the nature of some complements (gerun-dial, infinitival, participial) whicfToften form predicative complexes in English verbal word-groups, eg: V_{inf} prepN<V: to wait for Ann to read; $V_{in\{}$prep N'sVgei-: *to rely on Bob's reading the article;* Vinf<DV<N<Vin_g< D: *to go down to see the boy waiting outside. Similarly in Ukrainian: зайти додому взяти книжку заховану десь.*

3. Adjectival Word-Groups. Due to the restricted combinability of different notionals with the adjectival head, this paradigmatic class of word-groups has a much smaller number (and varieties) of structural models. The most productive and usual in English and Ukrainian are the following simple and extended models with different dependent components.

Model	English	Ukrainian
D>A	simply beautiful, very good	просто гарний, дуже добрий
A<V_{inf}	eager to know, glad to hear	радий чути, охочий знати
A<VP	glad to hear the news	радий чути цю новину
A<N(NP)	worth the efforts	вартий зусиль/грошей
A<Q(NP)	worth two/two pounds	вартий двох/двох сотень
Aprep I(Q)	best of all, cleverer of the two, good for you much	краща за всіх, найкращий з двох, зручний дія вас
D_{than}<N(I)	younger than Ann/she, simply smaller than that, easy for Nick to read so very	багато молодший, ніж Петро/ніж він,
$A_{for}NV_{inf}$	unusual/untrue so very nice for	легкий для Миколи вивчити
D>PA	boys/them, not very good for	(аж) надто важкий/гарний
$DPA_{prep}N(I)$	girls/all	аж надто гарний для
not $D(P)A_{prcp}N(I)$		хлопців/для будь-кого

Allomorphic, i. e. pertaining to English only are adjectival word-groups with gerundial complements (A<$V_g$er), eg: *worth reading (being read):* A<$V_g$erN(P): *worth reading the book;* AprepN(I)$V_g$er: *proud of Pete/ him being decorated, proud of his having been invited.*

Apart from the non-existence of gerundial complements, Ukrainian adjectival word-groups are characterized by some other features of their own. Among these, for example, is the free location of most of adjectival and complements adjuncts which is absolutely impossible in English. Cf. *дуже добра - - добра дуже;радий чути - - чути радий; значно молодший за мене - - за мене значно молодший, добрий до всіх - до всіх добрий.*

Nevertheless, it is impossible to change the order or position of any immediate constituent as in the word-groups like *багато молодший, ніж вона* but not* *ніж: вона, багато молодший,* though the pattern can not be considered completely

ungrammatical for a prediminently synthetic language, like Ukrainian either. Ukrainian head adjectives, however, express the morphological categories of number, case and gender which is impossible in English. Cf. *гарний зовні, гарна зовні, гарні зовні; гарної/гарній зовні, гарною зовні; добрий/добрим до всіх; рідна/рідної для нас,* etc.

4. Pronominal Word-Groups in the contrasted languages have some general features in common. Thus, most often the heads are indefinite, negative and mostly demonstrative pronouns, and much rarer personal and reflexive pronouns. The usually common adjuncts in both languages are pronouns, prepositional nouns, adjectives or adjectival word-groups, infinitives, verbal word-groups and subordinate clauses. The most common place of these adjuncts is postposition, though in Ukrainian they may be used in preposition as well. Besides, Ukrainian pronouns are all declinable. Cf. *ми всі - - нас усіх - - нам усім - - нами всіма; хто з учнів - - кого з учнів - - кому з учнів/з них.*

Pronominal word-groups, however, are formed in both languages according to some common structural models/patterns. For example:

English
he himself, we all, they all something new/very nice much to do, nothing to say those against, those opposite those being against poor me, poor him/her many of the workers some of them, none of us some
none of those who were there nothing for John/ him to say

Ukrainian
він сам/сам він, ми всі/всі ми щось нове, щось дуже гарне нічого казати, щось робити КІD хто «проти», хто «за», ті хто проти
бідний я, бідна вона дехто з учнів/з цих учнів ніхто з них, жоден з нас дехто з тих, хто був там, ніхто з тих, які ..

A characteristic/allmorphic feature of Ukrainian pronominal word-groups is their considerably free position within the pattern which is never possible in English. Cf. *щось нове - - нове щось, нічого казати -казати нічого, дехто з учнів - - з учнів дехто.*

5. Numerical word-groups form a separate group in the English and Ukrainian languages as well. They can not and should not be neglected or avoided, since they have in English and Ukrainian some isomorphic and allomorphic features of their own. Despite all this some grammarians often avoid even mentioning the **numerical word-groups** [39; 15; 3], whose existence in English and Ukrainian can not be overlooked. This morphological class of word-groups has the following combinibility with other parts of speech:

Model	English	Ukrainian
		багато часу, мало/кілька
Q_{card}prepN(P)	two of such birds	їх троє з групи/з того

$Q_{card}prep$	three of them,	класу двоє з них, три з яких/ наших
$Q_{ord}prepl$	second to none	перший з них/нас
$Q_{ord}preplA(P)$	one of the best/smallest	один із кращих, троє з останніх
$Q_{ord}Vinf$	the first to come/to answer	перший співати/танцювати
$Q_{card}NV_{ing}$	two of the girls singing	двоє з дівчат бажаючих (знати)
$Q_{card}NV_{en}(D)$	one of the students mentioned	одного із хлопців згаданих(вище)
$Q_{ord}V_{,ni}N$	the first to fight malaria	перші/двоє вчити грамоти
$Q_{ord}NV_{inf}$	the first film to be seen	перше бажання виграти
$Q_{prep}ID$	ten of those behind/ opposite	двоє з тих попереду/зверху троє із наших там
$Q_{prep}Iprep AN$	three of those in the(old) hut	три з тих у (старій) хатин троє із малих коло хатини
$Q_{prep}N(V_{ing})N/I$	two of the workers, awaiting us	один із човнів (корегуючих рух)
$Q_{prep}N(subcl.)$	ten of the girls who were absent	двоє з робітників, що не були присутні

As can be observed from the given above paradigmatic models of numerical word-groups, only one of them is missing in English - that one which is presented in Ukrainian by the Q<N(I) model *(багато часу, мало нас),* etc., since *much* or *many* are not numerals in English.

One more characteristic feature of most Ukrainian numerical word-groups (except those with the sub-clauses) is their considerably free permutation (change of place) of the immediate constituents, which is impossible in English word-groups of the same structural models. Cf. *двох з того класу - - з того класу двох; перший співати співати перший; п 'ятий із тих попереду - - із тих попереду п 'ятий; чимало грошей - - грошей чимало,* etc.

Isomorphic, however, is the ability of numerical word-groups to become extended. For example, the Qord NVinf *the second man to come* may be extend to

QordNVD *(the first man to come here)* or even to QordNVmf D+D: *the first man to come here tomorrow,* etc. Similarly in Ukrainian: перше бажання виграти - перше бажання виграти *там* -перше бажання виграти *там узавтра.*

6. Adverbial Word-Groups in both contrasted languages can be headed by adverbs or by adverbial phrases. The adjuncts/complements may be expressed by adverbs or by adverbial (usually prepositional) phrases used in pre-position as well as in postposition to the head adverb. This position, i.e. placement is predetermined by the meaning of the adjunct and by its structural form, the structurally complicated adjuncts having usually a fixed position even in Ukrainian word-groups. This is not so with simple adjuncts which may change their place in Ukrainian under the influence of some type of stress. Cf.

Model	English	Ukrainian
D>D	terribly well, simply awfully	де там, страшно добре, надто швидко, дуже прудко
D< D	well enough, far away	далеко звідси - - звідси далеко
N>D	hours later, heaps better	
NP>D	two hours later, six weeks ago	годиною пізніше, багато краще
		двома годинами пізніше -пізніше двома годинами
D<INP	late that autumn evening	пізніше того осіннього вечора
DprepN(P)	high in the air	високо в повітрі/в повітря
Dprep I	far from that, close to me	близько до цього/далеко від нас
Dprep IP	far from all that/this	далеко від усього цього
Dconjsub.cl.	earlier than he could see, eailier than I could think of	задалеко, щоб він міг побачити раніше, ніж він міг подумати
Dco-conj D	so and so, here or there	скрізь і всюди, там і сям/ так чи сяк
Dneg.part D	just not so, quite not so	далеко не так, зовсім не так
Neg. part. DD	not quite (so) well	не зовсім погано/не зовсім добре

There is, therefore, a complete coincidence in the form of structural models of

adverbial word-groups in the contrasted languages. Allomorphism can be observed only in the placement of some Ukrainian components which can be free in Ukrainian as in *далеко звідси -- звідси далеко* or the use of the English *once a y ear* corresponding to the Ukrainian prepositional word-groups of the same meaning - - DprepN(P)p<25 *на рік/ раз на весь рік.*

7. Statival Word-Groups rarely correlate in the contrasted languages semantically and structurally. This is because English statives have few direct lexical equivalents in Ukrainian and vice versa. Moreover, Ukrainian statives are often identified only at the syntactic level, since the same word may be in one word-group or sentence an adverb and in another—a stative. Or: *Він живе добре* (adverb); *Кому там добре* (stative); Надворі вже *краще* (adverb). Йому вже *краще* (stative). The English equivalent of *"добре",* however, is either an adverb (well) or an adjective *(good).* Eg. *He speaks good French.* Despite all this, the structural patterns of statival word-groups in English and Ukrainian are mostly common, though their components almost never coincide lexically. For example:

English statival patterns	Ukrainian statival patterns
Stative < Vinf: afraid to answer	(йому) страшно самому спати
Stative prepVger: afraid of asking/of being asked	
Stative prepN(P): ashamed of the deed	легко/важко на душі
Stative prepI(N): ashamed of that/ of all that/ of the behavior легше на душі	(їй) краще від них (пілюль)
Stative D(P): ablaze all around	(їм) добре скрізь/ їй важко тут
Stative prepD(P): ablaze from behind	легше (їй) від четверга/ від учора
Stative co-cjStative: afraid and ashamed (йому коле й болить)	(їм) краще й краще
EKStative: soon asleep, horribly afraid	значно тепліше (йому), страшно всім
EKStative prepN(P): never afraid of the rain скрізь болить від уколів	завжди прикро за примхи
D<Stative prep I(P): always ashamed of it/ of its effect	тепер (нам) соромно від того/ за те зараз (їм) прикро за те

Gerundial complements, naturally, pertain only to English statival word-groups (cf. *afraid of being sent away).* Also, English statives have a fixed position for a certain morphological class of word-groups as, for example, in the word-group *ashamed/afraid of something,* but: soon *asleep.* The placement of Ukrainian statives in such word-groups is generally free, eg: *йому добре тут - - тут йому добре - - добре йому тут,* нам *добре* скрізь -- скрізь нам *добре.*

It should be added that the function of any paradigmatic class of word-group in the sentence coincides in both languages with the function of its head word. For example, in the sentence *He knew his subject very well* the substantival word-group *his subject* performs the function of the noun, i.e. the object, and the adverbial word-groups *very well* performs the function of an adverbial modifier of attendent circumstances. Both these functions of the word-groups are identical in Ukrainian. Cf. Він знав *свій*

предмет (extended object) *дуже добре* (adv. modifier).

Similarly with other morphological/paradigmatic classes of word-groups. For example, in the sentence *She was neither ashamed nor adraid of saying that quite aloud* the italicized word-groups perform the functions respectively of the predicative *(neither ashamed nor afraid),* of a prepositional object (the substantival function of the gerun-dial word-group *of saying that)* and of the adverbial modifier, which coincides with the adverbial nature and meaning of the word-group *quite aloud.* No need to emphasize that the meaning and functions of these word-groups in Ukrainian are the same. Cf. їй було *ні соромно ні страшно* (predicative) *за все сказане* (prep/ object) *на весь голос* (adv. modifier).

III. Predicative Word-Groups

Unlike the previous two types of word-groups, i.e. the co-ordinate and subordinate word-groups, the extensively used in English predicative word-groups are only partly found in present-day Ukrainian. Completely isomorphic, naturally, are primary predication word-groups, which are singled out in the sentence and comprise the subject and the predicate. For example: *The student works hard. The book was published* last year. *Студент багато працює. Книжка була опублікована* торік.

The syntactic interdependence between the components *The student* and *works, The book* and *was published* remains unchanged when the predicative word-group is singled out of the sentence. So are the syntagmatic relations between the components reflected by the verb **works** (The student *works* and *was published* (the book) - - *Студент працює.* Книжка *опублікована була.*

Secondary Predication Word-Groups/Syntagmemes. Apart from the primary predication word-groups there also exist the so-called "comlex-es" [10; 16; *251-260;* 19, *96-106; 41,261J* or "clauses" *[54,317-318]* which are mostly termed by our grammarians as *"secondaiy predication word-groups".* These pertain to the English language, though Ukrainian utterances are not always devoid of some similar structures either.

Secondary predication syntagmemes/word-groups are represented in English in the following structural types or syntactic constructions which are often referred to as complexes:

1. *The objective with the infinitive* constructions which are per tained not only to English, but also to German, French, Italian, etc. may have the following structural models: NVinf, IVinf, NPVinfNP, N/Iinf prepN and some others. For example: Again he saw *Michael moisten his lips.* (Galsworthy), I heard *him roll in blankets.* (Hemingway) This almost caused *Jemima to faint with terror.* (Thackarey)

2. *The subjective with the infinitive* constructions in English are of the following models: NVinf, IVinf, NPIVinfNP, eg: *Irene* was known *to take* very sudden decisions. (Galsworthy) *He* is reported *to have been taken* into custody. (F. News) *The young man s ears* seemed *to droop* on his skull. (Galsworthy) *He* was a fool *to attempt to make a pretence* that way. (London)

3. *The infinitival prepositional* constructions of the forN/I Vinf, or the forNPVinfN(I), forN(I)VinfD, etc. models: *For you to go there* fast

now would be to walk into a trap with your eyes open. (Voynich) The only thing to do *is for you to whip him,* Edward. (Mansfield) The boy stood aside *for me to go by.* (Galsworthy)

4. ***The objective with the participle*** constructions in English are of the following models: NVing, IVing, I/NVen(D), VenNP, NPVphrase, etc: I'm sorry to have kept jw/ *waiting...* (Saroyan) Morning found *him still reading.* (London) I saw *Fleur coming.* (Galsworthy) He could see *her face bent* over the little kitten in her arms. (Ibid.)

5. *The subjective with the participle* constructions in English are of the following models: N... VingNP, NP...VenNP, NR..Ving: *He* could be *seen following* her with his eyes. (Galsworthy) From time to time *their voices* could be heard *uplifted* in clamorous argument. (Norris) *The rain* was heard *clattering...* (J. Trease)

6. *The gerundial constructions/complexes* are of the following mod els: IpossVger, N'sIVger, prepN/IVgerNP: Hope you don't mind *my comings.* (London) I wonder at *Jolyon's allowing this* engagement... (Galsworthy) Excuse *my being busy.* (Dickens) He was aware of *Tan ya watching his face.* (Hailey).

7. *The objective with the adjective, stative, or noun* constructions are in English of the following models: VI/NA: Get the *coffee/it ready.* (Bronte) VNStative I woke... and found *George awake.* (J. K. Jerome) VNN: They called the *baby Arthur.* (Lawrence)

Note. As will be shown further, the above-mentioned predicative constructions of the last two models (NStative and Nappos.N) are pertained to the Ukrainian language as well (cf. Він назвав хлопця сином. NDStative: Тепер дитині значно легше).

8. *The nominative absolute participle* constructions which exist in English in the following structural models: N VingNP: The two walked in silence, *Soams watching him out of the corner of bis* eye. (Galswor thy), IVingNP: *They having the keys,* no entrance was possible. (Ibid.) INDVing: Jame's face protruded naively,.., *his mouth slowly opening.* (Ibid.) IVingD: *This being so,* I should like to go out. (Ibid.)

Nominative absolute participle constructions may have extended or contracted forms of models like ND and NprepN, which appear as a result of contaminating the participial constructions, eg: *The lesson having been over,* the students left the room - *- The lesson being over,* the students left the room, *The lesson over,* the students left the room.

The Ukrainian language has only two structurally similar, if not identical, models of syntagmemes expressing the so-called secondary predication. They are: 1) the participle constructions having the same grammatical nature and semantic meaning as the corresponding English constructions of the NVing, IVing, NPVing, NVen, I Yen, NPVen and NA models. For example: *Пам'ятаю хлопця/його накульгуючим;* дівчина/вона застала *двері зачиненими/вікно розбитим;* санітарка знайшла *бійця пораненим;* читачі вважають *роман цікавим;* ми/студенти пам'ятаємо цього *викладача молодим/об'єктивним; 2)* the second type of objective secondary

predication constructions in Ukrainian constitute the NN and IN models/patterns word-groups which are used in the following sentences: Ми вибрали *Іваненка головою;* Вони назвали *хлопця Петром.*

The italicized parts of the sentences are treated in Ukrainian as the so-called *double predicates* (like the NVen or NA patterns predicative constructions above: дівчина *прийшла стомлена,* Ми його *знали молодим,* etc.).

Typology of the Sentence

Unlike *word-groups* which are subject of investigation in Minor syntax, *the sentence* is investigated in the so-called Major syntax. Hence, the sentence in the contrasted languages has a large number of typolog-ically relevant features in common. The existence of such isomorphic features both in the simple and in the composite sentence is predetermined by the main common types of aspects characteristic of the sentence as a peculiar language unit. These aspects are three: 1) structural; 2) semantic and 3) pragmatic. This aspective trichotomy directly correlates with the meaning, form and functioning of the sentence in speech where it realizes its explicit form of an utterance corresponding to a logically complete proposition.

These three aspects are practically of universal nature; they constitute the main basis for a systemic arrangement and systemic contrasting of simple and composite sentences in all languages. Apart from this, the mentioned aspects can also serve as reliable distinguishing features between the main syntactic units, i. e. sentences on the one hand and the word-groups that are used to form sentences, on the other.

The principal distinguishing features characterizing the sentence as a universal language unit are as follows: 1) the sentence is the main language unit; 2) it is the main syntactic unit and 3) it is the main integral part of speech, in other words - the principal communicative unit. Unlike word-groups, sentences in the contrasted languages are distinguished from word-groups and words, that are as lower in rank language units, by some peculiar features, the main of which are the following four: 1) an intonation contour; 2) predication; 3) modality; 4) and a relative sense completion.

Structural Types of Sentences in English and Ukrainian

According to the way in which the expressed content correlates with reality, there are distinguished in the contrasted languages the following common structural types of sentences: 1) two-member sentences 2) one-member sentences.
Binary sentence structures are more characteristic of English, i.e. they are represented by a larger variety of paradigmatic subtypes than in Ukrainian. This quantitative correlation of two-member sentences in English and Ukrainian constitutes the main typological difference in the system of simple sentences of the two languages.

As a result, English two-member sentences are represented by a larger variety of extended and expanded models, than Ukrainian two-member sentences.

Consequently, English two-member sentences are represented by a larger variety of paradigmatic subtypes than in Ukrainian.

The basic kernel structure of two-member sentences constitutes the binary S—P (Subject- - Predicate) model which can be extended through complementation to S—P—O, S—P—O—M, S—P—O—M— M, etc. Thus, a kernel (ядерна основа) of the

simple extended sentence *Dave stayed in the house for another four months* (Cardwell) is, of course, *Dave stayed* which is enlarged (extended) to Dave *stayed in the house* and then to the complete sentence Dave *stayed in the house for another four months...* (Caldwell). This process of extention can be observed in Ukrainian as well: Дейв залишився, Дейв *залишився в будинку,* Дейв *залишався жити в будинку ще якихось чотири місяці,*

Simple two-member sentences in the contrasted languages are equally exposed to the syntactic process of expansion, i. e. enlargement of their component part through the co-ordinate catenation of homogeneous elements/parts of the sentence. Cf.: *Mr. Dick and* I soon became the best of friends... (Dickens) *Fields, trees, hedges* streamed by. (Mansfield) The woman... *turned round, traversed* the crowded room... and *clutched* the lean arm of her host. (D. Parker) Similarly in Ukrainian: *Містер Дік і я* невдовзі стали найкращими друзями. Пробігали *поля, дерева, живоплоти.*

Two-member sentences in the contrasted languages may be of two subkinds: 1) conventionally complete and 2) properly complete. The former are elliptical sentences in which any part/some parts of the sentence is/are deleted: "And when are you going?" "On *Monday"*. (Galsworthy) Nobody under the table, nobody under the sofa. (Dickens) "What time is it now, Dick?".- *"Quarterpast nine"*. (Steinbeck) The same in Ukrainian: "І коли ви від'їжджаєте?" "В *понеділок "*. "Нікого під столом, нікого під канапою". "Котра година, Діку?" *"Чверть на дев'яту"*.

These elliptical sentences in English and Ukrainian are connected with their preceding kernel sentences, as a result of which they can easily be completed. Cf. "And when are you going ' -1 am going on Monday. Nobody is/was under the table, nobody was under the sofa, etc.

Note. Many English sentences, traditionally qualified as elliptical, are structurally close to Ukrainian definite personal sentences. Cf. "Much obliged to you". (Galsworthy) "Sleeping in this morning?" (Prichard). "Hear them coming yet?" (Steinbeck) Looks like rain.

These and other sentences of the kind do not in any way depend on the preceding sentences. They lack the subject (or the subject and the predicate), which is easy to define, however, from the content of the sentence. Cf. (I am) much obliged to you. (Are/were you) sleeping in this morning? (It) looks like rain, etc.

But whatever the nature of these sentences, they can be easily replanished completed which is a convincing testimony to the existence of typologically common sentence structures in the system of simple utterances of the contrasted languages. At the same time two-member sentences have a larger representation in English than in Ukrainian, which constitutes a typologically allomorphic feature of the two languages. The only two-member sentences, which are non-existent in Ukrainian, are the following:

1. Impersonal sentences which are introduced by the impersonal pronoun/subject *it.* It is thundering. It drizzles. It snowed. It has rained/snowed.

2. Indefinite personal sentences in which the subject is expressed by the indefinite personal pronouns *one, they, you,* eg: **One** says. **They** say. **You** don't say so.

3. Sentences with the above-mentioned introductory "it" or "there" like **It** is time to start. **There** is nothing/much to say.

4. Sentences with the implicit agent and passive predicate verb fol lowed by a preposition like He was **sent for.** The project is **objected to** everywhere.

5. Sentences with the above-metntioned secondary predication con structions as the following:

I thought *him to be a teacher.* We saw *her cross the street.* She made *herself seem* friendly. All were waiting for *the results to be announced. He* is said *to be a sportsman. She* was seen *crossing* the street. She is said *to be preparing* for the examination. He entered the room, *pipe in month.*

Such English two-member sentences have in Ukrainian either simple or complex definite personal sentences for their semantic equivalents. Cf. Я думав, що він учитель. Ми бачили, *як він переходив вулицю.* Кажуть, *що він спортсмен.* Усі чекали оголошення наслідків/w/o *оголосять наслідки.* Він зайшов у кімнату *з люлькою в зубах.*

6. Sentences with the gerundial complexes used as predicative (sec ondary predication) constructions. These sentences have in Ukrainian complex or simple sentences for their semantic equivalents. For exam ple: We learnt of *his being decorated.* They spoke of *her passing* all exams successfully. You can rely on *her coming* in time. Ми дізналися про *його нагородження* (про те, що його нагороджено). Ви можете розраховувати на *її вчасний прихід* (на те, що вона вчасно прийде). Говорять про *її успішне складання всіх іспитів*/що вона успішно склала всі іспити.

The bulk of two-member sentences are of common structural form in the contrasted languages. These are sentences with the subject expressed by a notional word or its equivalent and the predicate expressed by a finite verb, eg: Breakfast was not yet over... (Mansfield) She looks entirely different off the stage. (Parker) That was Coleman. (Maken) At dark the rain stopped. (Caldwell)

Such sentences have their structural and semantic equivalents in Ukrainian as well: Ідуть дощі. (Коцюбинський) Сава Андрійович раптом замовк. Любив дід гарну бесіду й добре слово. (Довженко)

Note. There are no equivalents in Ukrainian to the English two-member sentences with the formal "there" and "it" as formal subject. Cf. There is a book on the table. It is necessary to read more. На столі книжка. Необхідно/треба читати більше.

Common in the contrasted languages are also two-member sentences with the simple nominal predicate expressed by a noun, an adjective, a numeral, an infinitive, a participle or a phrase. Such a predicate may follow the subject or precede it. Hence, there may be a) the S—P model sentences and b) the P—S model sentences. For example, the S—P model sentences: Anything *the matter,* Michael? (Galsworthy) My idea obsolete!!! (B. Shaw) The Future, how, *how unchartedl* (Galsworthy) The P—S model sentences: *Poor* little thing. (Maugham) *Nice manners* and everything. (Parker) *Bad* to stick, sir. (Galsworthy) Моя пропозиція *непотрібна???* Майбутнє, як, як *невизначене! Бідна* вона. *Гарні* манери і все інше. Нас троє.

One-Member Sentences in English and Ukrainian

Unlike two-member sentences, which have a larger quantitative representation of paradigmatic/structural types in English, one-member sentences, on the contrary, have a larger number of paradigmatic classes in Ukrainian. This is due to the morphological nature of Ukrainian as a mainly synthetic structure language. Nevertheless, there exist common types of one-member sentences in both contrasted languages. The latter, naturally, are not devoid of some divergent features in English or Ukrainian either. Common in English and Ukrainian are the following paradigmatic types of one-member sentences:

Nominal sentences. Being typologically isomorphic, this paradigmatic type of sentences, however, is characterized in English and Ukrainian both by some common or isomorphic or by some allomorphic/diver-gent features. Isomorphic common is the structural form of nominal sentences which can be either extended or expanded. The former consist of one or two nominal components which may be nouns or other parts of speech. Expanded nominal sentences consist of two or more nominal components connected by means of co-ordinate conjunctions. The components in extended English nominal sentences may be connected both syndetically (usually with the help of prepositions) or asyndetically, whereas in Ukrainian the synthetic and analytico-synthetic connection prevails. The surface structures of nominal sentences in English and Ukrainian are common, however. They have the following models:

A. The N model sentences which may consist in English of a single noun, a noun with a preceding determining article, a proper name with or without the family name, a pronoun or a numeral. Eg: Sensation. Сенсація. Seventeen. Сімнадцять. (B. Shaw) A wood. The same. (Shakespeare) Ліс. Той самий ліс.

B. The NN/NNN model sentences: *Mr. Surface.* (B. S.) *Sir Ralph Bloomfield Bonington.* (Sheridan) *Містер Серфіс.* Сер Ральф *Блумфілд Бонінгтон.* Nominal sentences in English may include nouns in the genitive case like *Lady Sneenvell's* bedroom. (Ibid.) *The French King's tent.* (Shakespeare) *Спальня леді Снірвел. Намет короля Франції.* The AN model nominal sentences are no less frequent. Eg: *Universal laughter.* (B. Shaw) *A personal explanation.* (Ibid.) *The welcome rain.* (Longfellow) *Загальний сміх. Особисте зауваження. Давно очікуваний дощ.*

C. Nominal sentences of the AN model (like of the N/dN model) may often convey injunctive, requestive and other pragmatic meanings. Cf. *Silence! The handcuffs!* (B.Shaw) *Тиша!* (Замовкніть!). *Наручники!/* Дайте наручники! *Glorious night! Exquisite scenery! Capital dinner!* (B. Shaw) *Славетна ніч! Вишуканий пейзаж! Прекрасний обід!*

D. The N/AN co-cjN/AN model sentences: *Freedom and power!* (B. Shaw) *Nice manners and everything.* (Parker) *Dankness and dead silence. General laughter and good humour.* (B. Shaw) *Свобода і влада! Гарні манери і взагалі. Темінь і мертва тиша. Загальний регіт і гарний настрій!*

E. Nominal sentences with the prepositional connection of compo-nental parts are presented in English and Ukrainian by both the isomor-phic and allomorphic structural models. The deep structures of allomor-phic nominal sentences reflect the non-existence of the equivalent gram-maticalized prepositions *of, to, by* and *with* in Ukrainian and lack of inflexions in English nouns. Isomorphic models of nominal sentences with prepositional connection may be simple and complite by their structure, the simplest in the contrasted languages being the N/lprepN/Q, etc. models like *Half past eleven.* (B. Shaw) *Confidence for confidence.* (Ibid.) *Пів на дванадцяту. Довір 'я за довір 'я.*

Many nominal sentences have structurally complicated prepositional models in both contrasted languages, eg: dNprepdNprepN: *The garden of a villa in Granada.* INprepIN: *Another room in the same home.* dQANQcjQprepdNN: *The two adjoining rooms 109 and 110 in the Hotel Florida.* ANprepdNVinf prepN: *Nice time for a rector to come down for breakfast.* (B. Shaw)

These and other sentences of the type have their structural equivalents in Ukrainian: *Сад коло вілли в Гранаді. Інша кімната в тому самому домі. Два суміжних номери 109 і 110у готелі "Флорида". Слушний час для священика зійти на сніданок.*

Since English and Ukrainian are structurally different language types, there is generally no identity in the grammatical means of connection of the same component parts in the same nominal sentences. It can be observed in the deep structure of several common nominal sentences of the contrasted languages. Thus, in English the component parts are mostly connected with the help of analytical means, whereas in the same Ukrainian nominal sentences synthetic or analytico-synthetic means are used. For example, analytical asyndetic connection: *The Under shaft torpe-do\ The Under shaft submarine!* (B. Shaw). In sentences like The garden *of a* villa in Granada or Another burst *of* applause. (B. Shaw) the analytical syndetic connection is employed in English. These same components in their Ukrainian equivalent sentences are connected in the synthetic way, i. e. with the help of the inflexion. Cf. Торпеди Андершафта! Субмарини Андершафта! Ще один вибух аплодисментів.

Other types of one-member sentences in English and Ukrainian may have both common and divergent features. The latter usually pertain to the structural form of sentences as well as to the means of grammatical connection of their component parts. These one-member sentences are as follows:

A. **Imperative (or inducive) sentences** containing a verb and having a V or VP pattern structures: *Keep aside, keep aside! Pass on, pass on!* (M. R. Anand) *Open the door!* (Ibid.) *Не підходь, не підходь! Проходьте, проходьте! Відчиніть двері!*

Note. Imperative sentences in English and Ukrainian may sometimes be two-membered, eg: *Don't you do that again! Don 't anybody switch the light! Mary and Pete, open the windows! Не робіть ви більше цього! Ніхто не вмикайте світла! Маріє і Петре, відчиніть вікна!*

B. **Exclamatory sentences** may structurally often coincide in En glish and Ukrainian with nominal and infinitival sentences, eg: *Thieves! Fire! How funny! To think of it! Damn your money!* (Maugham) *Злодії!*

Вогонь! Як гарно! Подумати тільки! К бісу твої гроші!

C. **Infinitival sentences** in both contrasted languages have practically identical structural forms. They may be unextended or extended. Eg: *To be or not to be?* (Shakespeare) *To be alive! To have youth and the world before one!* (Dreiser) *Бути чи не бути? Бути живим! Бути молодим і мати весь світ попереду. Матір ні купити, ні заслужити.* (Saying).

Other allomorphic features observed in the types of one-member sentences have a larger representation in Ukrainian than in English. Thus, among these Ukrainian types are the following not pertained to the English syntactic system:

A. The definite personal sentences, which are widely used in literary and colloquial Ukrainian speech. The doer of the action in these sentences is indicated by the finite verb and its personal ending correlating with the main part of the sentence. E.g: Люблю (я) пісні мойого краю. (Рильський) Пам'ятаєш (ти) перший клас? (Павличко) Любіть (ви/всі) Україну всім серцем своїм... (Сосюра)

> **Note.** One-member sentences of similar nature can be observed among English elliptical sentences, e.g: Much obliged to you (i. e. I am much obliged to you). Going home? i. e. Are you going home? Understand? i. e. Do you understand? etc. In these elliptical sentences, like in some types of Ukrainian sentences, the finite verb is equally associated with a more or less definite performer of the action as well. The same sentences are also observed in other European languages as Italian, Russian, Belorussian. Cf. *Abbiamo molti compiti (We have many assignments). Подумаєм об зтом. (We shall think it over),* etc.

B. **The indefinite personal sentences** may also be structurally identical to the above-given Ukrainian definite personal one-member sentences. They have their actor, i. e. the logico-grammatical doer which is not definitely indicated. Their main part, the verbal component, also correlates with the finite verb in the third person plural. Its action may refer to present, past or future in the indicative, imperative or in the subjunctive mood. Eg: *Сіяли* всю *ніч. Дзвонять* в усі дзвони. (Шиян) Давніх друзів *не забувають.* (Ukr. saying) Нам *дають* чаю, гарячого, міцного. (Коцюбинський)

Sometimes the Ukrainian principal or subordinate clause may have the structural form of an indefinite personal sentence as well. Cf. *Не за те вовка б'ють,* що сірий, а за те, що овечку вкрав. (Saying) Він розпорядився, щоб *подали* вечерю. Коли б Мирославі *не говорили* це, вона б заспокоїлась. (А. Головко)

C. Similar to the definite personal sentences are *Ukrainian generalized personal sentences.* The action of their main part in such sentences refers to any (generalized) person correlating with the second (rarer—other) person in singular or plural in the indicative or imperative mood. For example: **За** правду й за народ *ставай* життям! (Павличко) *Дивиться* лисицею, а *думає* вовком! *Вибирай* дівку, коли в глині, а не коли в калині. *Поживемо - - побачимо!* Дурнів не *орють,* не *сіють,* а вони самі *родяться.* Подарунок назад *не беруть.* (Sayings)

D. One more group of one-member sentences in Ukrainian is pre

sented by impersonal sentences which are represented in some sub types, the most common of which are the following:

a) **Impersonal proper (власне безособові) one-member sentences** with the principal part expressed by the finite (predicate) verb, eg: *Світає*. Край неба *палає*. (Шевченко) І *світає* й не *світає*. (Тичина) *Весніє* вже. (Гончар) Тепер тобі одразу *полегшає*. (Ibid.) The principal part in impersonal one-member sentences may sometimes be expressed by a personal verb form. Eg: *Мело, крутило,скаженіло,* огортаючи присмерковий край. (Гончар) По правді роби, по правді й *буде*. Вік *живи,* вік *учись*. (Нар. творчість)

b) **Impersonal sentences** with the main part/finite verb expressing the state of the agent used in the dative case form, eg: Раз якось Остапові не спалось. (Коцюбинський) Забажалось королеві завоювати чуже царство. (Л. Українка)

c) **Impersonal sentences** with the principal part expressed by verbs in *-но, -то:* Роботу покинуто. (Коцюбинський) Зал залито яскравим, сліпучим світлом. (Яновський) Убито, Яноша вбито! (Гончар)

и

...Його оддавано в рекрути, засилано на Сибір, катовано канчуками, тавровано, мов худобу. (Коцюбинський)

d) **Impersonal sentences** with the finite verb referring to a person but expressing impersonal meaning as in Венеру за душу щипало (Котляревський) Йому кололо в боки. Impersonal sentences with statives: Дітям спочатку було дуже *нудно* (Н. Лев.)

e) **Impersonal sentences with modal predicative** phrases functioning as part of the modal verbal predicate, eg: Йому *не слід було дивитись*. (Коцюбинський) "Дядька, Іване, *треба розуміти"...* (Стельмах) ...*Неможливо знищити* того, кому симпатизує народ. (Гончар)

One-Word Sentences/Quasi-Sentences in English and Ukrainian

Among other features and phenomena testifying to the existence of isomorphism in the syntactic systems of the contrasted languages are the so-called one-word or quasi-sentences. [15, *174]* They are speech units devoid of the binary S—P (or a single S or P) structure. They may consist of a single word or of a functionally equivalent phrase expressing affirmation, negation, an address or some emotive/incentive meanings. One-word sentences serve to establish or to disjoin the speech contact, they may sometimes perform a meta-communicative function.

As to their communicative direction and meaning, one-word/quasi-sentences may be:

1. Affirmative, i. e. expressing affirmation. These are usually short answers to the preceding questions or to an interrogative inquiry/one's consent to an inquiry, eg: "Think it?" - - *"All right".* (Collier) "A real beauty?"   *"Indeed".* (Bates) "Do you love me?"   *"Uh huh ".* (Hemingway) *"Excellent!"* said Stickly-Pickly. (Kipling) "House?" — *"Of course".* (Bates.) *"Yes",* said her host. *"Yes, indeed".* (Parker)-*Аякже...* Гріх казати...—гуділи мужики. (Коцюбинський) І Ольга усміхнулась.- - *Гаразд.-* "Ото народу збереться".-   *"Еге". ..* (Микитенко) *Так! Я* буду крізь сльози

сміятись. (Л. Українка)

2. Negative quasi-sentences/one-word sentences express negation. Their most common components in English and Ukrainian are negative particles and phrases *not, no, not yet, not at all, ні, зовсім ні, не так, та ні, ще ні,* eg: *Oh, no, no, no",* said her host. *"No, no".* (Parker) „Got a cigarette, Root?" *"No".* (Steinbeck) "Hear anything?" — 'Wo. *Not a thing".* (Ibid.) "You can't help us at all?" -*"Not at all".* (G.Greene) "You don't mind if I do" *"No,* no, *of course, not".* (Ibid.) Similarly in Ukrainian: *"Ні.* Сьогодні він не хоче спогадів". (Головко) "Не хочеш?" - *Ні! - - Так ні! - - Ні!!* (Шумило) *Ні, ні!* Що ти кажеш? Може, й випадково. *Ні.* (Кочерга)

3. Interrogative one-word/quasi-sentences convey questions, inquiry, doubt and are expressed in the contrasted languages by separate components or by phrases. For example: "...what on earth's the matter?" Nothing. *Why?* (Maugham.) Her voice trembled a little. *"WellT* (Ibid.) "Just a Lucy?" *"Yes? "* (Trevor) "I congratulate you" — *"Eh?"* (Christie). "От і добре".- *"Добре?'* "Здоровенькі були, діду!" *"Га?* (Вишня) "В мене екзамен був".- - *Ну і як?..* (Гончар)

4. Emotional and exclamatory one-word/quasi-sentences may be expressed by interjections and other functional words together with some notionals. Such sentences are mostly evaluative though they may be purely exclamatory as well, as in this sentence: *Honk! Honk!* The horn of a lorry barked... (M. R. Anand) Emotional and exclamatory meanings are expressed in the following sentences: Hypolito. *Alas! Alas* See you are in love. *O, God* My evil genius. (Longfellow). *Goodness sakes!* Would a runaway nigger run south?" (Twain). *Not time yet!* (Caldwell). Кайло враз спинилось. *Бах!* (Будько) *Го-го!* Як танцювати, то танцювати. (Коцюбинський) *"Ах, он які* Розумію". (Довженко) *"Господь з вами!* Моя дочка удовиця..." "Хай *йому цур!"* (Коцюбинський)

5. Incentive and evaluative quasi-sentences present one more common sybtype of one-member sentences. They are also formed from interjactions or from their functional equivalents, which may be phrases or notional words by nature, eg: *Bosh!* Don't be moral. (B. Shaw) *Pooh!* In what way? (Ibid.) *"Ssh!"* said the Daddy, and frowned to himself... (Kipling) "Good *Lord, ma'am!* What is it... a baby?" (J. K. Jerome) *"Stuff!* stealing cattle and such things ain't robbery... (Twain) Той ще стояв, огинався. *"Ну!"* (Загребельний) *"їй-богу ж ні!"* (Кочерга) *"Овва.* То вже мені й погуляти не вольно..." *"Хі-хі...* І з географії п'ять." "Ф'/о-ю/Нема вже в барона маєтку." (Коцюбинський) Хома услід Віталієві: *"Тьфу!"* (К.-Карий) Свічка: ***"Геть!"*** (Кочерга) "Весела дівчина! - -*Вогонь!"* (С. Чорнобривець) Софія (до Гната): ***"Прощай!"*** "Батьківщина гине, а вони..." (С. Скляренко)

6. Vocative quasi-sentences/one-word sentences in both contrasted languages express direct address. Their main component is usually a noun which may often be preceded or followed by an interjection or an attributive adjunct. Vocative quasi-sentences are more meta-communi-cative in the contrasted languages, than any other of the above-given one-member sentences. They mostly require a response. For example: *"Tom!*

Tom!" -No answer. (Twain) *"Hullo Pyle".* (Greene) Trench (hotly). *"Cokane!"* (B. Shaw) *"Eal Chrispa! Chrispa!"* Padre. *"Hy-polito!"* (Longfellow) *"GoodLord, ma'am.* What is it... a baby?" (J. K. Jerome) *"Чіпко! Чіпко!"* - Чіпка лежить на полу, мовчить. (Мирний) *"Браво, Жан, браво!"* *"Кумонько, кумо... "* (Коцюбинський) *"Мамо!* - Соромились би..." (Тулуб) *"Тітко Клаво!* Фашист!" (Донченко) *Україно!* Ти для мене диво! (Симоненко)

Equally meta-communicative in English and Ukrainian (like in many other languages) are also many quasi-sentences that express greeting, request, excuse, and order. Such meta-communicative quasi-sentenses usually require a response sentence or are followed by response sentences having in both contrasted languages an identical or similar meaning, eg: *"How do you do!"* - "Oh, *how do you do,* Mister Williams", she said. *"Well,* how do *you do. "* (Parker) Lickcheese. *"Good morning, sir".* Sartorius. *"Good morning..."* (B. Shaw) *"Здорові були,* сват!" *"Добривечір..." (Коцюбинський)* *"Чолом,* панове!" *"Чолом,* пане Максиме!" (Панч) *"Здрастуйте,* дідусю!" закричало радісно дитя. (Мирний)

Communicative Types of Sentences in English and Ukrainian

According to the role in the performance of communication and due to the modality/intention expressed, all sentences in the contrasted languages fall into the following five common semantic types: 1) *declarative sentences (statements);* 2) *interrogative sentences;* 3) *imperative and inducive sentences;* 4) *sentences of hypothetic modality;* 5) *exclamatory sentences.* Interrogative sentences include some common paradigmatic classes which may be in English and Ukrainian either affirmative or negative (see Table 25 below).

Consequently, the communicative types of sentences and their paradigmatic classes are absolutely isomorphic/common in English and Ukrainian. As will be shown further there still exist some minor structural divergences, however, in some of these classes of sentences in both contrasted languages.
Declarative sentences in both their paradigmatic classes (the affirmative and the negative statements) may be in English and Ukrainian of real, wishful or conditional modality. Equally common are also the structural forms of the affirmative and negative statements which may be either two-member sentences or one-member sentences in each of the contrasted languages. For example:
a)   Affirmative statements of real modality:

"Thank you again very much."   Ще раз вам дуже дякую.
(Hemingway)
The door opened. (Mansfeild)   Двері відчинилися.
Suddenly Coleman laughed. (Maken)   Раптом Колмен засміявся.
That was Coleman. (Ibid.)   Це був Колмен.
b)   Affirmative   statements   of   wishful   or   conditional   modality:
It's time we got out. (Cusack)   Час   би   вже   вибратися   звідси.
I had better tell him... (Galsworthy)   Краще б я був сказав йому...

Communicate Types of Sentences

English Communicative type	Paradigmatic form	Affirmative	Negative	Ukrainian Communicative type	Paradigmatic form	Ствер-джувальні	Заперечні
Declarative	Common	+ .	+	Розповідні	Common	+	^
Interrogative	General questions	+	+	Запитальні	Загальні запитання	+	+
	Disjunctive questions	+	+		Дис'юнктивні	+	+
	Alternative questions Special questions	+	+		Альтернативні Спеціальні	+	+
	Rhetorical questions	>	+		Риторичні	+	+
	Suggestive questions	+	+		Сугестивні	+	+
Imperative and inducive sentences		+	+	Наказові та спонукальні речення		+	+
Exclamatory sentences		+	+	Вигукові речення		+	+
Sentences of hypothetic modality		+	+	Речення гіпотетичної модальності		+	+

c) Negative statements of different kinds of modality have also common and divergent features in English and Ukrainian. Common are state ments with the negation to the finite verb expressed by the negative particle *not,* by the double conjunction *neither nor/either or,* and by the negative pronoun *no.* They have their equivalents in the Ukrainian negative particles *не, ні* and in the double conjunction /—/, as in the following sentences:

Neither George nor I dared to turn round. (Jerome)	Ні Джордж, ні я не насмілювались повернутись.
Johnny didn't start the fire. (Saroyan)	Джонні не підпалював будинка.
Irene made no reply. (Galsworthy)	Ірен не відповіла/не дала відповіді.
...He neither spoke nor moved. (Bronte)	...Він і не віповідав, і не ворушився.

Allomorphism is observed in English negative statements with the negative pronouns and negative adverbs *no, nobody, nothing, nowhere, never,* etc. which have double negation in Ukrainian where it is formed by the negative pronoun or negative adverb and the negative particle *не,* eg:

Mrs. Dyke was **nowhere** to be seen. (Norris)	Пані Дайк **ніде не** було видно.
No dog was to be seen. (Irving)	**Не** було видно **жодного** собаки.
But really I **know nothing...** (Doyle)	Я і справді **нічого не знаю...**
I never had such a wonderful holiday... (Cusack)	У мене ще **ніколи не було** такого чудового свята...

Sentences of interrogative modality, however, have a common communicative function and mostly identical structural forms in both contrasted languages.

Their types are as follows: **general questions** ("yes-no" questions) and **special questions** ("pronominal" or "wh"-questions). All other sentences of interrogative modality ("tag-questions", rhetorical and alternative questions) are in both languages practically structural and communicative modifications of these two structural types.

A. General Questions in English mostly open with an auxiliary, modal or linking verb followed by the subject. Ukrainian general questions may open with any part of the sentence. Rather often Ukrainian general questions also open with a particle: *"Did you* do it?" (Saroyan) *То,* може, ти це зробив? *Це* каже хто? *А можна/Хіба* можна так сказати? *Shall* we pack up and go? (M. Spark) *Може* спакуємось і поїдемо?

Note. To express inquiry, suggestion or uncertainty, general questions may open in colloquial English with the finite verb or with the subject of the sentence (as in Ukrainian): *"Got* a cigarette, Root?" "Hear anything?" *"Scared of the* dark, kid?" (Steinbeck) *"Know* them?" (Mansfield) *"You know* our new neighbour?" (H. Munro). Hence, the colloquial forms of English general questions testify to the existence of similarity, if not identity in the structural forms of general questions in English and Ukrainian.

B. Disjunctive/Tag-Questions have in English and Ukrainian se mantic and structural equivalents as well. Structural identity is observed in disjunctive questions consisting of an affirmative or negative state ment followed, respectively, by a negative and/or affirmative question tag. "She is rather sweet, *isn 't shel"* "Вона гарненька, чи не так?" "You're not afraid, are you?" (Steinbeck) "Ти ж не боїшся, *так?/*

правда?/ Чи не так?'

Allomorphism is observed, however, in the ability of some Ukrainian tag-questions to be transformed into general questions. For example: "You are all right, aren't you?" "У тебе все гаразд, чи не так? or Правда ж, у тебе все гаразд?"

C. **Alternative Questions** are characterized in both contrasted lan guages by absolutely isomorphic features only. The latter manifest them selves in the existence of a semantically and structurally common alter native conjunction *or* corresponding to the Ukrainian *чи.* The introducto ry part in these sentences coincides in both languages and may be either a general question or a special question by its structure. The very exist ence of alternative questions, however, is regarded by some grammari ans as disputable today. Despite this the alternative questions can not be denied specific semantic and structural peculiarities of their own. Thus, the introductory part, whether a general or a special question by its form, is always pronounced before the alternative conjunction with a rising tone: Are there among the football hooligans only the British fans or there are some Belgians too? (F. News). То серед футбольних хуліганів ^тільки одні англійці чи є і бельгійці? Is he ^married or single? (Sheri dan) Він ^одружений чи ще ні?

D. **Special/Pronominal Questions** are characterized in the con trasted languages by generally common if not presumably universal fea tures. They open with an interrogative pronoun or adverb which may sometimes be preceded by prepositions, particles or interjections. For example: *Who* said so? (Hemingway) What did *you* say? (Spark.) *And what* is it? *With whom* have they come? Oh, *what* was it? These sentences have absolute structural equivalents in Ukrainian: *Хто* це так сказав? *Що* ти сказав? А *що* це таке? З *ким* вони прийшли? О, *що* то було? О, *то що* то було?

Allomorphic is only the often use of prepositions in the closing position of the special question in English: What are you quitting/or? (London) Where do you come/rom? (Conrad) What do you point *to?*

E. **Sentences of Hypothetic Modality** /Речення гіпотетичної модальності. The semantics of hypothesis may be expressed in the con trasted languages both with isomorphic as well as with allomorphic lexi cal means. Isomorphic is the expression of hypothetic modality by means of predicative parts or through the inserted notional words/phrases which are either modal words/phrases or predicates that include notional and modal verbs or their lexical equivalents. As, for example, in the follow ing sentences:

Perhaps he was really not so young as he looked. (Conrad)	*Може, він* і справді не був таким молодим, як із вигляду.
"They are *more likely* to tickle us". (Galsworthy)	*Більш імовірно,* що вони роз-смішать нас.

The expression of hypothetic modality through modal words is therefore identical in both languages. So is, generally, the expression of this kind of modality by means of the modal verbal predicates. Pertaining to Ukrainian, however, is mostly the

predominant expression of hypothetic modality through the modal particles *б/би, десь, ледве, ніби, наче, либонь, чи не, ледве (чи) не, навряд чи* and some others. For example:

"Навряд чи й двоє з ним справились би ". (Гончар)	"Even both of them *would have hardly* managed to overpower him.".

Після нас *хоч (і)* потоп. After us the deluge.   (Saying)

F.   Rhetorical Questions have a modal meaning which does not contain any new information for the speaker. Structurally interrogative by form, these questions contain a negative or an affirmative statement with a respective implicit answer. Rhetorical questions realize structurally a statement and a question simultaneously. Cf.: Can the leopard change his spots? or: Have I not suffered things to be forgiven? (Byron) Is it fair to take advantage of a man like this? (B. Shaw) Or in Ukrainian: Хіба горбатого могила виправить? А кого це кортить? Що ти кому казатимеш? Що тут удієш?

G. Sentences of Incentive Modality /Речення спонукальної модальності. Incentive modality originates in English and Ukrainian from optative modality and may have the meaning of incentiveness proper or it may express wishful incentiveness. Hence, the two different structural types of sentences to express these varieties of incentiveness:

1.   *Imperative sentences,* i. e. such sentences in which the main in centive meaning constitutes a categorial demand which is expressed through the imperative mood forms of verbs denoting order, command, request, warning, prohibition, persuasion, etc. The incentive meaning of this type is realized through a) one-member sentences, eg: Silence! Stop talking! b) through two-member sentences, eg: Vanish the dream! Van ish the idle fears! (Longfellow) Згинь, ця думко! (Згинь же, безпід ставний страх!) "Clear the road, you bums." (Caldwell) Зійдіть з дороги, волоцюги!/ Тікайте з дороги, волоцюги!

Incentive modality may also be expressed in exclamatory sentences through the meaning of the auxiliary verb *"let"* and in Ukrainian by the particles *нум* or *нумо.* Cf. *"Let* me go and see him alone." (Maugham) *Хай /Нум* я сам зайду до нього. *Let* George do it. *Хай/Нехай* хтось інший робить це. Let bygones be bygones! Що було те загуло. (Saying)

3. Exclamatory as well as some other semantic types of sentences may have the form of a) affirmative or interrogative sentences: He took no notice of Mariam! (Lawrence) Він навіть не помічав Маріам! What a medley of opinions! (Goldsmith) Яка мішанина думок! "Isn't it mar vellous?" (Parker) Хіба ж це не чудово! b) Exclamatory sentences of this type may also have the form of unextended or extended infinitival sentences: But to sneak her (Fleur) like this! (Galsworthy) Щоб так оце викрасти її! c) They may also have the form/structure of nominal sen tences: The sky, the flowers, the songs of birds! (Galsworthy) - - Чисте небо, квіточки, пташиний спів! The rain. The welcome rain! (Longfellow) Дощ, давно очікуваний дощ!

The Structural Segmentation of the Sentence in English and Ukrainian

The structural segmentation of sentences in English and Ukrainian may be performed on the basis of some common principles. These are employed when segmenting sentences into their component parts at the surface level structure, as well as when contrasting the meaning of the component parts at the deep level sentence structure.

The most common and traditional segmentation of unextended and extended two-member sentences in all languages is that into the parts of the sentence. Common in the contrasted languages is also the segmentation of extended sentences into parts of the sentence and into syntactic units. The latter mostly perform the functions of extended or expanded parts of the sentence.

A deep level sentence structure segmentation may aim at identifying the meaning expressed in the contrasted languages by the same parts of the sentence and in structurally identical sentence patterns. Thus, depending on the lexico-grammatical semantics of the component nominals and verbs, the former, when endowed with some functional meanings, may denote 1) the subject of an action and the predicate of an action: *the student reads/студент читає;* 2) the subject of motion and the predicate of motion: *the child walks/дитина ходить;* 3) the subject of state and the predicate of state: *the child sleeps/дитина спить.*

Common with the same sentence structures in English and Ukrainian may also be the semantic homonymy of sentences. Thus, the N—V-Adv/S—P—D model sentence may sometimes express, depending on the lexico-grammatical characteristics of the verb, the active and the passive voice meaning. Cf. this girl *sells* well (active voice) - - this book *sells* well (passive voice). Similarly in Ukrainian: Ця дівчина давно прибирається (active voice). Ця вулиця давно прибирається (passive voice). Петренко будується (active voice). Місток будується (passive voice).

TYPOLOGY OF THE MAIN PARTS OF THE SENTENCE

All parts of the sentence in the contrasted languages have both an isomorphic functional meaning and lexico-grammatical nature. Common/ isomorphic is also the traditional subdivision of them into a) the main and into b) secondary parts of the sentence. The main parts are the subject (підмет) and the predicate (присудок). The secondary parts are the object, the attribute and different adverbial modifiers (додаток, означення, обставинні члени речення).

The subject and the predicate in the contrasted languages are considered to be interdependent parts of the sentence. They are bearers of predication forming the sentence. Cf. They laughed. (Hemingway) Вони засміялися. Other parts of the sentence are usually dependent on the subject, on the predicate or on one another. As in the folowing sentence. *Everyone knows his own business best.* (Pritchett) The constituent word-group of this sentence in English and in its Ukrainan variant in syntactic presentation (patterning) are as folows: 1) the primary predication (S-P) word-group *Everyone knows Кожен знає;* 2) the predicate-object word-group *knows<his own business знає свою власну справу;* 3) the attributive word-group *his own business свою власну справу* and 4) the predicate-adverbal modifier word-group *known best знає найкраще.* Therefore, the highest degree of combinability in this sen-

tense has the simple verbal predicate with its postpositive complements.

The structure of the parts of the sentence in the contrasted languages is characterized by isomorphic features in the main. There are distinguished the following structurally common types of them in English and Ukrainian: 1) simple, i. e. expressed by a single word-form (synthetic or analytical); 2) extended or expanded, i. e. expressed by a subordinate or by a co-ordinate word-group; 3) complex (when expressed by a secondary predication construction/word-group). Some parts of the sentence in English and Ukrainian may be expressed by a regular clause. For example: *What you told me is a lie.* (Twain) This subject can be substituted for a single word performing the same function: That/ it is a lie. Similarly in Ukrainian: *Те, що ти казав мені,-- брехня; Те (це) є брехня.*

TYPOLOGY OF THE COMPOSITE SENTENCE
Clauses in compound sentences of the contrasted languages are mostly joined by means of co-ordinate conjunctions which provide parataxal relations between them. Conjunctions joining clauses in compound sentences of the contrasted languages are practically of the same semantic nature: copulative, adversative, and causal/or (in English only). Equally common in the contrasted languages are various connectives that join co-ordinate clauses. These are as follows: therefore, consequently, accordingly, then, hence, so, while, as well as and some explanatory connective words (that is to say, such as, like, let me say and others), which have corresponding functional (and semantic) equivalents in Ukrai¬nian (отже, та, а саме, звідси, тобто, тоді, як-то, так-як, ...так, скажімо, то...то].

Co-ordinate conjunctions, as well as various connectives, realize their functional and semantic meaning in structurally and semantically identi¬cal English and Ukrainian compound sentences. This is to be explained by the existence of common relations that are created between the co¬ordinate clauses of compound sentences and to a large degree by the semantic meanings of conjunctions/connectives that join these clauses.

As a result, isomorphism, if not exact likeness, is observed in the nature of some subtypes of English and Ukrainian compound senences. These isomorphic features find their expressions in the existence of the following subtypes of them:

1. Compound Sentences with Free/Neutral Interrelations between Their Clauses

Co-ordinated clauses of this subtype of compound sentences change their position without effecting in any way their semantic structure or the communicative aim of the expression. Cf. It was like singing and it wasn 't like singing. (Faulkner) When transformed with the help of changing the position of clauses into "It

wasn't like singing and it was like singing" the content of the sentence does not change, though the order of actions becomes reverse. Similarly in the following sentence: I smiled and he smiled. (Dreiser) which may be tnansformed into "He smiled and I smiled. " Though the sequence (the order) of the events is changed, the general content of the sentence is not changed on the whole. This kind of transformation can be performed on the Ukrainian variants of the two sentences. Cf. Це було не схоже на спів і це було схоже на спів. Я засміявся і він засміявся. = Він засміявся і я

засміявся.

In compound sentences consisting of more than two semantically neutral clauses, the first clause may not always change its place with other clauses. The restriction in transformation through the change of place is due to the semantic interrelation existing between the main clause and the other clauses of the compound sentence. Cf. They were all from Milan, 1) and one of them was to be a lawyer, 2) and one was

to be a painter, 3) and one had intended to be a soldier. (Hemingway) In this sentence the second and the third clauses can change their place with the preceding or with the succeeding clause without changing in any noticeable way the sense and the structure of the composite sen¬tence as a whole. Cf. They were all from Milan 1) and one of them was to be a lawyer, 2) and one of them was to be a painter. Or: They were all from Milan, 2) and one of them was to be a painter, 1) and one of them was to be a lawyer, 3) and one had intended to be a soldier. The Ukrai¬nian variant of this sentence undergoes similar transformation through the change of place of the same neutral clauses. Cf. Вони всі троє були з Мілана, 2) і один з них мав був стати художником, 3) один мав колись намір стати військовим, І) а один мав був стати правником. Transformations/transpositions of the kind are not always possible, however, in compound sentences whose clauses in the contrasted languages are joined with the help of some other copulative conjunctions. Cf.

The hall was not dark, nor was it   Передпокій не був темний, як не
lit... (Bronte)   був він і освітлений.

Nevertheless, a transformation through the change of position of claustes is not excluded in compound sentences with the conjunction "as" having "як" for its functional and semantic equivalent in Ukrainian. Cf.

He had never quite accepted it, as   Він ніколи не схвалював цієї,
he had never accepted other aspects   як не схвалював він і інших сторін
of his life. (Maltz) свого життя.

Cf. He had never accepted other aspects of his life, as he had never accepted it. Similarly in Ukrainian: Він ніколи не схвалював інших сторін свого життя, як не схвалював він і цієї.

2. Compound Sentences with Adversative Interrelations between Their Clauses

These relations are formed in English by the conjunctions but, still, and yet, whose equivalents in Ukrainian are а, але, проте, та, однак:

Two of the ways were alongside canals, but they were long.
(Hemingway)
Now and then it was hidden by the mist, yet it always came out
bri ght again. (O'Dell)

Два шляхи вели вздовж каналів, але вони були довшими.

Часом гору ховав туман, та вона знову виринала в яскравих променях сонця.

This type of the compound sentence in English and Ukrainian con¬sists of

clauses whose position is fixed. The second clauses in such com¬pound sentences may be introduced by different conjunctions or connec¬tors, and they may also be connected asyndetically. Whatever the means of connection, the main factors predetermining the fixed placement of most clauses in the contrasted languages are common. They are as follows: 1) the semantic dependence of the second clause on the action/ event in the main ("principial") clause; 2) the nature and meaning (structure) of the conjunction/connective word; 3) the semantic predetermin¬ing of the syndetically or asyndetically joined second/third clauses; 4) the existence of other than the main conjunction; 5) the existence of exten¬sion or expansion of component clauses through appending word-combinations or regular clauses. The realization of each of the above-mentioned factors can be observed in some common subtypes of compound sentences, the main groups of which in the contrasted languages are as follows:

A. Compound Sentences with Anaphoric Pronouns/ Складносурядні речення з анафоричними займенниками

The succeeding (second) clause joined to the preceding clause by the copulative conjunction "and" may depend semantically on a noun or any other notional word/part of the sentence performing some function in the first clause. This subtype of compound sentences is common in the con¬trasted languages; it has mostly equivalent structure forms of the same sentences:

We quarrel and that makes the time pass. (Hemingway)
Ми гиркаємося, і це коротає наш час.

You kept from thinking and it was all marvellous. (Ibid.)
Ти переставав задумуватись, і це було чудово.

The anaphoric pronoun may be located at some distance from the ante¬cedent noun,eg:

He had no prospects and he knew that. (M. Quin)
Він не мав жодних перспектив і він знав це.

Anaphoric may also be a predicative construction with a pronoun it as the subject of the clause:

In her dream she was at the house оп Long Island and it was night before her daughter's debut. (Hemingway)

їй снилася домівка на Лонг-Айленді, і ніби то був вечір перед доччиним дебютом.

Here the anaphoric pronoun it in the second clause is enclosed in the predicative word-group it was night which functions as a single anaphoric pronoun both in English and in Ukrainian (cf. то був вечір перед... дебютом).

The co-occurrence of compound sentences with anaphoric pronouns (word-groups with pronouns) is considerably high in English and Ukrainian.

B. Compound Sentences with Disjunctive Interrelations Be¬tween Clauses/ Складносурядні речення з роз'єднальними спо¬лучниками

Disjunctive relations are expressed in English through the conjunctions or, either...or whose semantic and partly structural equivalents in Ukrainian are або, або...або, чи...чи, чи то...чи то, не то...не то. Cf.

He can try for the ditch again or he can dodge around the house.
(P.Grimm)
...I must weep or else my heart will burst. (Byron)

Він може знову сховатися в рові, а чи хитро крутне за будинок.
...Я плакати мушу, а то в мене серце розірветься.

Note. Some repeating conjunctions of the group are often used to express co-ordinate actions excluding, in turn, each others. As a result, clauses in such sentences may sometimes change their position without losing their disjunctive interrelation, eg: Чи то було сьогодні, чи нічого не було? (Коцюбинський) Чи нічого не було, чи то було сьогодні? Or in English: Either it was today or it was nothing? Either it was nothing, or it was today?

C. Compound Sentences with Causative and Consecutive Interrelations between Clauses/Складносурядні речення з причин-но-наслідковими відношеннями між складовими (підрядни¬ми) реченнями в українських відповідниках.

The interrelations of cause and consequence are expressed through the causative and co-ordinate conjunction/or which has corresponding subordinate conjunctions in Ukrainian (бо, тим-то, оскільки):

But the scholarship would help him a great deal for they were not rich people. (Hughes) And he discharged me first/or my hair was white. (Reed)

Зате стипендія дуже допомогла б йому, адже/тому що вони були не з багатіїв. І він звільнив мене першим з ро¬боти, оскільки/бон вже був сивий.

D. Compound Sentences with Determining Clauses/Складносурядні речення з детермінованими складовими

The existence of compound sentences whose clauses are joined by different conjunctions and connectives which express determining is a testimony of some features being common in composite sentences of parataxal and hypotaxal ways of joining their clauses. Determining clauses in English and Ukrainian have more or less clear reference to some adverbial meaning- -temporal, causal, resultative, concessive, etc. which may be more or less clearly expressed in the second or third clauses. Cf. 1) The trucks ground up and away heading out of it all and the peasants plodded in ankle deep dust. (Hemingway) 2) Larry puffed at his pipe and Suzanne waited for him to go. (Maugham)

The second clauses in both compound sentences can change their place without any harm to their general content. Cf. *The peasants plodded in ankle deep dust and the trucks ground up and away heading out of it all*. Or in the second sentence: *Suzanne waited for him to go and Larry puffed at his pipe.* This same transposition can be

performed on the Ukrainian variants of both sentences. Cf. 1) Вантажні машини, буксуючи, обганяли всіх, а селяни брели по кісточки в пилюці. Or: Селяни брели по кісточки в пилюці, а вантажні машини обганяли всіх. 2) Лері попихкував люльку, а Сузанна чекала на нього. - Сузанна чекала на нього, а Лері попихкував люльку.

Apart from temporal determining meanings, copulated clauses may express additional support or justification of the action in the main clause, eg:

1 got the place with Harry and I like   Я працюватиму разом з Гаррі
Burt fine. (Anderson)   та ще я люблю там Берт.
But after all I had to work and there   Зрештою, я мусив стати до роботи,
was no work to be got. (Ibid.)   а роботи не можна було ніде знайти.

The place of the second clause ("and I like Burt fine") in the first sentence is fixed, because it presents an additional confirmation of the action in the first clause ("But I got a place with Harry"). If the place of clauses were changed, it would disrupt the (logic the content) of the sen¬tence as a whole. Cf. *I like Burt fine and I got the place with Harry...

No change of place/transposition of clauses is ever possible in the second sentence either. This is because of the justification contained in the second clause ("and there was no work to be got") which, when moved to the closing position, would make the sentence ungrammatical. "There was no other work to be got (and) /but after all I had to work". Beside that, the meaning of the conjunction "and" in Ukrainian is adver¬sative (a), which is emphasized by the introductory "but" (after all).

The bulk of copulative clauses in English and Ukrainian, however have an adverbial implicit (sometimes almost explicit) determining mean¬ing. These clauses are joined by different conjunctions wich may often be treated as regular connectives that introduce subordinate clauses. The adverbial implicit meaning in compound sentences of this subtype may be single, i.e. pure (those of time, cause, purpose, result, conces¬sion) or combined with other adverbial relations (such as cause and re¬sult, cause and consequence, time and result, time and cause, etc.)

Among the single/simple determining adverbial relations expressed by the second clauses, joined by copulative conjunctions, the following are most occurent:

1. The Relation of Result /Наслідкові відношення:

a)   Still life's life, and we have to work through it and ourselves somehow. (Dreiser)
b)   She was leaning back on the chair and the fire light shone on her... face. (Hemingway)

Однак життя є життя, і ми маємо зрештою якось переборювати і його, і себе.
Вона прихилилася спиною до крісла і полум'я освітило її приємне обличчя.

The action of the verb-predicate in each second clause of the above-given compound sentences results from the action of the corresponding main clause. Thus, "We have to work through it and ourselves" as a result of the fact that "life's life" (a sentence), whereas the fire light could shine "on her pleasantly lined face" as a result

of her "leaning back on the chair" in the main clause of the sentence.

2. Cause or Causal Relations/Причину чи причинні відношення:
He didn't have any money and he was ashamed. (Quin) It was a Saturday and the shop was full... (R. Lardner)

Він був зовсім без грошей, і йому було соромно. Була одна із звичайних субот, і крамниця була повна людей...

Cf. "he was ashamed" because he had no money, "the shop was full because it was the weekend ("a Saturday").

3. Time or Temporal Relations/Час або часові відношення:

The dusk was blue and the birds were flying in it. (M. Le. Sueur) It was Easter Sunday and the Fascists were advancing toward the Ebro. (Hemingway)

Сутінки стали синіми / в них проліали птахи.

Була великодня неділя, / фашисти просувалися/рвалися до річки Ебро.

Temporal relations in both these sentences can be identified by means of the corresponding questions: 1) When were the birds flying? - - When it was dusk. 2) When were the Fascists advancing toward the Erbo? -On Easter Sunday.

Among the combined adverbial relations which can often be expressed by compound sentences or rather by second clauses in them, commonly observed in the contrasted languages are the following:

1. The Relations of Cause and Consequence/Причинно-наслідкові відношення:

The fire in the stove had gone out and he undressed in the cold.
(Anderson)

Money was by no means plentiful and in consequence there was endless borrowing and "paying up" among them. (Dreiser)

Вогонь у пічці потух, і він роздягався у холоді.

Грошей рідко коли вистачало і внаслідок цього серед них панували постійні позичання й "розплачування/віддавання".

The relation of cause and consequence can easily be established in any of the above-given sentences with the help of questions to the predicate of the second clauses. Cf. Why did he undress in the cold? The answer is given in the main clause: because "The fire in the stove had gone out".

2. The Relations of Time and Consequence (Result)/Часово-наслідкові відношення:
Like all other determining adverbial relations, temporal and consequence/resultative meanings in the contrasted languages are created by the predicate/verb in the main clause:

Father woke up and it was time for breakfast. (Faulkner) Then Jason got smoke in his eye, and he began to cry. (Ibid.)

Батько прокинувся, і (отож) був час снідати. Тоді у вічі Джейсонові зайшов дим, і він розплакався..

The partaking of food, or rather the breakfast of the family, becomes possible in the first sentence as a result of "Father's waking up". In other words, the action in the second clause results from the action in the dominant clause (father's waking up). This action is the consequence of the action performed in the first clause. Or in the second clause of the second sentence: "he began to cry" in consequence of the action performed in the clause "Jason got smoke in his eyes".

3. The Relation of Time and Concession /Часово-допустові відношення:

The interrelations existing between the action in the semantically domi¬nant clause and in the succeeding clause may be that of time and concession. Cf. It was getting dark in the swamps, and he had ten miles to go. (Caldwell) На болота спадала ніч, а йому ще було йти десять миль.

The concessive adverbial meaning/determination of the second clause becomes explicit when the sentence is transformed: "It was getting dark in the swamps" despite that "he had ten miles to go". In Ukrainian: "На болота спадала ніч, а (хоч) йому ще треба було йти десять миль".

English and Ukrainian co-ordinate clauses may be joined by connective words, whose meaning is close to that of the copulative conjunction. The most often used connectives of this group are so, while, then, hence, only, whereas, corresponding to Ukrainian тож, як /і, тимчасом, тоді, тільки.

When joined by these connectives, the clauses acquire some additional implicit meaning (causal, resultative, etc.).

He couldn't figure things fast, so he had figured them slow. (Benet)

Він не міг схоплювати чужі думки швидко, тож (і) він схоплював їх повільно.

The connective "so" introduces the clause of causal and resutative meaning being at the same time lexically close to the conjunction "and". So it is with some other English connectives of co-ordinate clauses:

He was in leash to the French school... only I did not know it at the time. (Dreiser)

Він був пов'язаний з цією французькою школою... тільки я не знав тоді цього.

The meaning of "only" in this sentence is close to the adversative meaning of the Ukrainian conjunctions а, але (only I did not know it at the time"- —тільки/але я не знав тоді про це). Such clauses are intermediary between copulative and adversative, they have the meaning of both of them. Their place in the sentence is fixed in both

languages.

Close to the copulative cojunction "and" are also some other determining connectives in both languages. For example, while:

A head waiter... escorted him to a table near the window while the occupants... gazed at him spell¬bound and whispered, "Conrad Green". (Lardner).

Старший офіціант... провів його до столу біля вікна, і/а приголомшені відвідувачі, затамувавши подих, зашепотіли: "Конрад Ґрін"

Like the simple and compound sentence, **the complex sentence** too presents a universal unit in the syntactic systems of all 5,651 languages of the world. Consequently, this type of composite sentence has some isomorphic features of its own. They are in the compared languages as follows:
a) the complex sentence has a polypredicative nature; b) it is characterized by the subordinate way of joining the clauses to the principal/matrix clause; c) it may consist of homogeneous clauses or of consecutively dependent clauses joined to the matrix clause or to each other syndetically or asyndetically; *d) the arsenal of syndetic means of connection includes conjunctions, connective pronouns, connective adverbs and subordinating connective words;* e) *the connectors join clauses and express some logico- grammatical relations formed within the complex sentence.* These include predicative, objective, attributive and various adverbial relations expressed by the corresponding clauses which may occupy either the preceding or the succeeding position/place in regard to the matrix clause.

The nature of the many logico-grammatical relations created between the subordinate and the matrix clause generally corresponds to the nature of relations created between the adjuncts/complements and their heads in subordinate word-groups. Hence, there are distinguished the following typologically relevant groups of subordinate clauses:

In English	In Ukrainian
Substantive-nominal:	**Субстантивно-номінативні:**
a) subject subordinate clauses;	а) підметові підрядні речення;
b) predicative subordinate clauses ;	б) присудкові підрядні речення;
c) objective subordinate clauses.	в) додаткові підрядні речення.
Qualitatively-nominal:	**Квалікативно-номінативні**
a) descriptive attributive clauses;	а) описові атрибутивні підрядні речения;
b) restrictive and limiting attributive clauses.	б) обмежуючі атрибутивні пірядні речення.
Adverbial Clauses:	**Адвербіальні підрядні речення:**
of time, place, purpose, cause, circumstances, condition, result, etc.	часу, місця, мети, причини, способу, attending дії, умови, допусту, наслідку, тощо. concession,

РЕКОМЕНДОВАНІ ДЖЕРЕЛА ІНФОРМАЦІЇ

Базові

1. Вихованець І., Городенська К. Теоретична морфологія української мови. Київ: Пульсари, 2004.
2. Волкова Л.М. Теоретична граматика англійської мови. Київ: Вид-во КНЛУ, 2007. 314 с.
3. Корунець Ґ.В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов. Навчальний посібник. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2003. 464 с.
4. Кочерган М. П. Основи зіставного мовознавства. Київ: Академія, 2006. 424 с.
5. Левицький А.Е. Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов: навчальний посіб. Київ: Освіта України, 2007. 138 с.
6. НМКНД Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов Для напряму підготовки 6.020303 Філологія. Переклад/ Абабілова Н. М., Усаченко І. В. Миколаїв: МНУ, 2017.
7. Плющ М. Граматика української мови. Морфеміка. Словотвір. Морфологія. Київ: Вища школа, 2005.
8. Плющ М. Я., Грипас Н, Я. Граматика української мови в таблицях. Київ: Вища школа, 2004.
9. Тексти (конспект) лекцій з дисципліни «Порівняльна граматика англійської та української мов» для студентів денної та заочної форм навчання спеціальності 7.030507 «переклад»/ Укл.: Е.О. Кущ. Запоріжжя: ЗНТУ, 2010. 58 с.
10. Чолкан В. До питання про морфологічний статус частки *Південний архів (філол. науки):* 36.наук.праць. Херсон, 2003. Вип. XIV. С.194-197.

Допоміжна

1. Довідник користувача ЄКТС [Електронний ресурс]. URL: http://mdu.in.ua/Ucheb/dovidnik_ koristuvacha_ ekts.pdf (дата звернення: 04.11.2023).
2. Steiner G. After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation, Newburyport, 2013. 520p.
3. Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida, Ed. J. Biguenet, R. Schulte, Chicago, 2012. 250p.

Навчальне видання

Бердник Лада Валеріївна

ПОРІВНЯЛЬНА ГРАМАТИКА
АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ ТА УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ МОВ

Конспект лекцій
для здобувачів ступеня бакалавра
освітньо-професійної програми «Германські мови та літератури
(переклад включно), перша – англійська»
зі спеціальності 035 Філологія

Видано в авторській редакції.

Електронний ресурс.
Підписано до видання 10.12.2024. Авт. арк. 6,0.