

10. Рей А. Терминология: имена и понятия // Общественные науки за рубежом: Реф. Журн. – Сер.6. – 1981. – №2.
11. Стишов О.А. Українська лексика кінця ХХ століття (на матеріалі мови засобів масової інформації): Монографія. – К.: Вид-во КНЛУ, 2003. – 388 с.
12. Туровська Л.В., Василькова Л.М. Нові слова та значення. Словник. – К.: Довіра, 2008. – 271 с.
13. Шафф А. Введение в семантику. – М.: Изд-во иностранной литературы, 1963. – 376 с.

*Анотація.* У статті виділено основні стратифікаційні розряди української термінологічної лексики: власне терміни, номени, професіоналізми, терміноїди. Подано їх коротку характеристику та виокремлено найсуттєвіші ознаки.

*Ключові слова:* стратифікаційні розряди, терміни, номени, професіоналізми, терміноїди.

*Summary.* In the article it is selected basic stratific categories (digits) of the Ukrainian terminology vocabulary: actually terms, nomens, professionalises, terminoids. They are given short description and the main signs are selected.

*Key words:* stratific categories (digits), actually terms, nomens, professionalises, terminoids.

**УДК 811. 111' 367.6**

**УМАНЕЦЬ А.В.**

## **PARTS OF SPEECH AND THEIR SEMANTIC ROLES**

Every language contains classes of words. When describing them, we should analyze whether one word separates or unites them into classes possessing more or less common features. Linguists make use of both approaches. Grammar mostly deals with classes of words, traditionally called “parts of speech”. The term “part of speech” is conventional. The well-known linguist Shcherba Z.V., Professor Smirnitsky A.I. preferred the term “lexical-grammatical categories”; Professor Blokh M. Ya. operates with the term “grammatical classes of words”; Charles Fries calls them “positional classes”; Professor Ilyish B.A., the linguists Khaimovich B.S., and Rogovskaya B.I. identified “lexical-grammatical classes of word”. Fortunatov F.F. considered parts of speech to be “formal grammatical classes”. His classification was purely morphological. He divided all the words into changeable and unchangeable. A.A. Shakhmatov’s classification followed the syntactical principle. It proved to be one-sided.

Nowadays English linguistic theories prefer the term “word classes”, emphasizing morphological status and combinability of words. They freely involve “semantic factor” in parts of speech classifications. Cogitating on the questions of cognition of speech and communication laws, American and British scientists encompass the problems of semantic roles which correlate with parts of speech. They refer to “sentence semantics”, “semantic roles”, “semantic configurations”, “case frames” [2; 3; 5]. A. Fauconnier considers that an apparent language constitutes only an iceberg top of a hidden meaning structure which functions simultaneously with our thinking, speaking, and acting. This implicit background cognition determines our mental and social life. Language is one of the means of this manifestation [1, c. 1-2].

Besides, there appeared “corporeal semantics” which considers to the fullest extent the role of the “body” in cognition and language nomination as opposed to “formal semantic”. In his books “The Body in Language”, “Semantics and the Body: Meaning from Frege to the Postmodern” [4; 5], Ruthrof criticizes different points of view on “sentence semantics”, and substantiates the necessity of transition to basically new trends in analyzing language phenomena, adhering to “corporeal approach”, according to which a language entity remains empty when it does not refer to the mutual product of perceptive interpreting of conceived reality. As a result, there appeared different classifications of “semantic roles”. Semantic roles have been discussed at three levels of generalization [6, p. 47]. The first is “verb specific” semantic roles, e.g. *observer, speaker, etc.* The second are semantic relations which are generalizations across the verb-specific roles, e.g. *patient, agent, locative, mode.* The third are semantic macroroles, e.g. *dress-maker, on-looker,* which are generalizations across semantic relations. “Dress-maker” is a generalization across agent, nominative, instrument, and other roles. All of them are topical in the discourse analysis.

Agent denotes living beings who reflect consciously the action expressed. It is the doer of a volitional act. Agent is expressed by the subject (e. g. *I wind up my watch*) and by the object of the subject (e. g. *The watch was wound up by me*).

**Nominative correlates with the agent. It is an indicator of a dynamic action (e. g. *The door wouldn't open*).**

Nominative can be expressed not only by a noun that expresses inanimate thing (e. g. *The dress doesn't fit*), but also by a noun that points at animate things or their parts (e. g. *Tim's heart sank*).

Patient points out the object (never the source) of the action. In the sentence patient is made up by the object (e. g. *The work was not completed*), or by the subject (e. g. *The dress should match the hat*).

Factitive semantic role correlates with the patient, but it shows the result of the action, not its object. It is expressed by the object (e. g. *Is the grub up?*)

**Instrument shows a conscious action. It can be used only in the role structures with an agent. It is the means by which an action is performed (e. g. *Jo cut hair with a razor*).**

Mode is the means of performing an act or achieving a goal. This semantic role is related to instrument because foregoing sentences can be easily extended (e. g. *He repaired the chair with a hammer*).

Locative is a position and is used with the verbs *to stand, to stay, to tie, to be, etc.* (e. g. *It rains in Spain*). It is the place where an action takes place. Locative is expressed by adverbial modifier of place or by the subject.

Theme describes the one or thing that undergoes an action (e. g. *Mary called Bill*).

Source is the place from which an action originates (e. g. *He flew from Iowa to Idaho*).

Experiencer is one who perceives something (e. g. *Helen heard Robert playing the piano*).

Causative represents a natural force that causes a change (e. g. *The wind damaged the roof*).

Possessor is one who has something (e. g. *The tail of the dog got caught*).

Time indicates the time the event occurs (e. g. *It rained in Spain last month*).

Reason marks the reason for an act (e. g. *She left because she was unhappy here*).

Semantic roles determine semantic relations. Presupposition is a very important notion in linguistics. The term is borrowed from logic. There are some definitions of presupposition:

1. It is previous knowledge about an object or an action.

2. It is conditions that should be realized before the sentence is used in a definite communicative function (Charles Fillmore).

The range of these conditions is rather wide from linguistic to extralinguistic. The presupposition of a sentence is a proposition that is taken for granted to be true, or an proposition that is assumed to be old or known or shared information. For example, when someone says: "*It was Carl who called*", we assume that "*Someone called*" or that the sentence is said only when the hearer knows that someone called and the only new information is that that someone is Carl. But the sentence "*Carl called*" does not have a presupposition. Some sentences contain new and given information. The given information is the presupposition (e. g. "*John was upset that Susan did not call him*" presupposes "*Susan did not call John*").

Questions generally have presuppositions. The famous interrogative question "*When did you stop beating your wife?*" presupposes that "*You used to beat your wife*".

The presupposition of a sentence is the same when a statement is changed to a negative statement or a question. For examples, the sentences "*John was upset that Susan did not call him*", "*John was not upset that Susan did not call him*" and "*Was John upset that Susan did not call him?*" all have the presupposition "*Susan did not call John*".

Presupposition expresses the author's attitude to the content of the sentence or to what he is asked about.

In the meaning of the sentences with subordinate clauses and with non-personal forms we can see the first rank (main) proposition and the second-rank (minor, secondary) proposition.

Mary knows that John is ill.      Mary thinks that John is ill.

1                                      2                                      1                                      2

Despite their identity, there are essential distinctions in their meaning. We see different attitude of the speaker to the second-rank proposition. In the first sentence the proposition "*John is ill*" is a true fact for him. But we cannot say the same about the second sentence. So, in these sentences except their literal content there is also presuppositional content. It is called factitive presupposition or factivity.

Factitive verbs: *to know, to admit, to confess, to discover, to ignore, to realize, to regret etc.*

Factitive adjectives: *glad, exciting, important, lucky, proud, regrettable etc.*

Non- factitive verbs: *to think, to imagine, to assume, to believe etc.*

Non- factitive adjectives: *certain, eager, likely, possible, sure etc.*

E.g. *He was happy to be helpful.* (F)

*He was eager to be helpful.* (NON-F)

Emotive predicate assumes certain subjective emotional attitude of the speaker to the complement.

E. g. *I dislike his attitude towards you. It is important that he has noticed their absence. I know his attitude towards you. It is unlikely that he has noticed their absence).*

Emotive verbs: *to bother, to regret, to resent etc.*

Emotive adjectives: *anxious, comical, vital etc.*

Emotive nouns: *happiness, pity, tragedy etc.*

Non-emotive verbs: *to forget, to know, to anticipate etc.*

Non-emotive adjectives: *probable, well-known, aware etc.*

Non-emotive nouns: *(keep in) mind etc.*

Factivity and emotivity are kinds of presupposition.

Implication is a hidden proposition of a non-presupposition type that results from the main sentence proposition (e. g. *She managed to conceal her distress from her friend*).

We have hidden proposition in "*she concealed...*"

Inference is a hidden proposition of a non-presupposition type that is possible, but it does not result from the main sentence proposition (e.g. *She tried to conceal her distress from her friend*).

Action might be carried out and failed.

Thus, nowadays we have no general agreed upon the opinion on the number and nomenclature of parts of speech, types of semantic roles, especially controversial is the problem of their delimiting on the basis of different criteria, and the research of semantic roles meets further requirements.

The prospects for future research will cover the investigation of interference and transposition factors while comparing semantic roles in the English and Ukrainian languages.

### Reference List

1. Fanconnier G. Mapping in Thought and Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997. – 205 p.
2. Fillmore C.J. The Case for Case // Universals in Linguistic Theory. – London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968. – P. 1-88.
3. Fillmore C.J., Atkins B.T. Toward a Frame-Based Lexicon: The Semantics of Risk and its Neighbours // Frames, Fields, and Contrasts: New Essays in Semantic and Lexical Organization. – Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1992. – P. 75-102.
4. Ruthrof H. The Body in Language. – London; New York: Cassell, 2000. – 193 p.
5. Ruthrof H. Semantics and the Body: Meaning from Frege to the Postmodern. – Melbourne: Melbourne Univ. Press, 1998. – 321 p.
6. Valin Van R. Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function. – Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1997. – P. 45-64.

*Анотація.* Стаття присвячена дослідженню класифікаційних характеристик частин мови, зокрема семантичних ролей у сучасній англійській мові. У ході дослідження дано аналіз різних підходам щодо класифікації, представлено раціональну класифікацію семантичних ролей та семантичних конфігурацій.

*Ключові слова:* частини мови, семантичні ролі, семантичні конфігурації, семантичні відношення.

*Summary.* The article analyzes the investigation of classificational characteristics of parts of speech in English and the problems of classification of semantic roles.

*In the course of investigation different approaches to the parts of speech classification were envisaged, and the classification of semantic roles and semantic configurations was analyzed.*

*Key words:* parts of speech, semantic roles, semantic configurations, semantic relations.

УДК 811'111'373.7

**Федірко С.М.**

## ВАРІАНТНІСТЬ ЯК ОДИН ІЗ МЕХАНІЗМІВ ФОРМУВАННЯ ФРАЗЕОЛОГІЧНИХ ІННОВАЦІЙ

Поняття синонімічного фразеологізму є тісно пов'язаним із поняттям фразеологічного варіанту. Про фразеологічні варіанти йде мова тоді, коли допустимі формальні зміни фразеологізмів, при яких зворот не втрачає свого фразеологічного значення [5, 116] а також тоді, коли фразеологізми мають аналогічну структуру, однакове значення, спільні ознаки, легко взаємозамінюються в будь-якому контексті.

При наявності декількох варіантів однієї фразеологічної одиниці утворюється варіантний ряд або більш складна фразеологічна парадигма, усередині якої не завжди виділяється основний варіант. Існують різні варіантні фразеологічні ряди. У залежності від типів змін фразеологічні