

Дружинин Андрей Сергеевич

ПРОТОТИПИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИХ ФОРМ "PRESENT SIMPLE" И "PRESENT PROGRESSIVE"

В статье рассматривается проблема формулирования прототипического или инвариантного значения различных языковых форм, в том числе грамматических конструкций. В частности, в центре внимания видо-временные глагольные формы, среди которых подробному анализу подвергаются так называемые "present simple" и "present progressive". Автор предлагает семантический прототип данных грамматических форм, который может использоваться в целях интерпретации их различных речевых примеров, попадающих как под традиционное объяснения, так и выходящих за его рамки.

Адрес статьи: www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/9-2/25.html

Источник

Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики

Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. № 9(63): в 3-х ч. Ч. 2. С. 91-93. ISSN 1997-2911.

Адрес журнала: www.gramota.net/editions/2.html

Содержание данного номера журнала: www.gramota.net/materials/2/2016/9-2/

© Издательство "Грамота"

Информация о возможности публикации статей в журнале размещена на Интернет сайте издательства: www.gramota.net

Вопросы, связанные с публикациями научных материалов, редакция просит направлять на адрес: phil@gramota.net

ON BASIC CHARACTERISTIC OF ENGLISH DETERMINATIVES

Dolmatova Olesya Vladimirovna, Ph. D. in Philology, Associate Professor
Pyatigorsk State University
olena.dolmatova2012@mail.ru

The article considers the issue of a basic property of determinatives. Traditionally, such property is definiteness / indefiniteness. The peculiarities of functioning of some determinatives in real conditions (including by corpus data) make us reconsider this thesis and state their neutrality in relation to definiteness / indefiniteness. Deixis is assumed as a basic characteristic, peculiar to all determinatives constantly and reflecting their essence as operators of communicative situation.

Key words and phrases: determinatives; deixis; definiteness; indefiniteness; operator of communicative situation.

УДК 81-119

The article discusses the problem of formulating invariant or prototype meanings of language forms including grammatical constructions. In particular, English tense-aspect verb forms are in the focus of attention with the so-called 'present simple' and 'present progressive' constructions analysed on the basis of the principles of prototype and bio-cognitive semantics. The author propounds a semantic prototype of the given grammatical forms which could be used for interpreting different discourse examples of them either fitting in with traditional explanations or failing to do so.

Key words and phrases: grammatical prototype; prototype semantics; semantic invariant; tense-aspect verb forms; present simple grammatical form; present progressive grammatical form.

Druzhinin Andrey Sergeevich, Ph. D. in Philology
MGIMO University
andrey.druzhinin.89@mail.ru

SEMANTIC PROTOTYPING OF 'PRESENT SIMPLE' AND 'PRESENT PROGRESSIVE' GRAMMATICAL FORMS

Despite the fact that the theory of lexical prototypes seems to have confidently gained in popularity with cognitivists and quite a few researchers have been done with a view to formulating lexical prototypes of different words, the problem of grammar constructions appears to have been left underestimated in this respect. Within the scope of bio-cognitive semantics and bio-socio-cultural approach there have been endeavors to analyse the essence of English grammar phenomena, in particular, but they do seem to partake of excessive theorism, which should have been adapted to the practical meta-language methodology or, at least, allowed for some universality (similar to lexemes), so vital for the needs of learners. For example, I. Arkhipov, E. Zhulina, E. Malutina have convincingly disproved the theory of analytical grammar forms, such as *be doing, have done, have been doing*, viewing them as free word combinations used by the English speaker to refer to specific types of their categorized knowledge and experience (i.e. cognitive structures) [9]. The works of A. Kravchenko and T. Verkhoturova develop the theory of observer and percipient, observation and perception, thus clarifying the epistemic and semiotic character of the word combinations in question [1; 7]. Yet, one of the most ambitious and challenging tasks, the formulation of prototypical or invariant meaning of grammatical construction (as distinct from grammatical meaning), still faces linguists today. In this article, we will propound a possible solution and undertake an attempt to define the semantic prototype of the so-called 'progressive' and 'simple' verb forms.

In the very first place, we should focus on the recurrent formants (schematizing elements) or verb forms by which we naturally recognize a grammatical construction as a 'simple' or a 'progressive' one. These are the bare infinitive (e.g. *dance*) and participle (*dancing*) respectively, the latter being part of the combination with the verb 'be'. These two language forms are "nothing short of a person's language competence as a body of knowledge they have to be sure that they can make themselves clear and describe what they have perceived and conceived (i.e. categorized) in order to be adequately understood" [3, c. 111; 4, c. 3]. Obviously, these two language forms reflect two distinct types of the languager's knowledge of the world, thus, referring to two different fragments of reality this languaging person has cognized [2]. In particular, we should speak here of (1) abstracted actions "beyond time and space existing infinitely in human's mind" [8, c. 161], and (2) concrete observed processes in their visualized dynamics [6, c. 5]. The infinitive (1), therefore, helps the languager to describe their structural, conceptual, knowledge shared by other members of the language community [Там же], while the participle (2) reflects the person's phenomenological knowledge and helps identify the figure of the observer of the action [8, c. 162].

Interestingly, these conclusions may be easily arrived at in English classroom or by an ordinary English learner with the help of a simple association method. If we try to describe what associations are triggered in our mind when we hear the contrasted words *dance* vs. *dancing* irrespective of their temporal reference, we will probably say that there is one image out of the two that is easier to conjure up and is seen more vivid or lively (live). Beyond any doubt, it will be the image of *dancing*. The *ing*-form of the verb seems to suggest a higher degree of our involvement

in the action, it is as if we are eyewitnessing, observing the dance, and were part of it. On the contrary, the picture of the verb form *dance* appears to be rather obscure and requires some effort to paint in our imagination. Presumably, it would probably be a kind of sketch rather than a picture.

When it comes to the domain of the present time, i.e. when temporal characteristics are attributed to what is being described, it should be mentioned first and foremost that we are beginning to deal with tense-aspect forms. The 'present progressive' form is not already a tense, but aspect "referring not to real, but psychological time – to the speaker's perception of the temporal quality of the event" [12, p. 85]. In the overview of scientific conceptions of the categories of tense and aspect, A. Kravchenko maintains that the traditional paradigm has wisely grasped the idea of the figure of the observer by grouping *ing*-forms into aspect category, because the term 'aspect' itself suggests visual perception (from Latin *aspectus* "look at") and characterizes the way we view the situation being referred to [7]. With regard to the subject's cognitive and coordinating activity, these language forms are an epistemic product of the categorization of time-space relations as distinct from the 'simple' forms where the subject's orientation in space is not signaled. This very orientation in space implies the focal point around which this space continuum is perceived – the locus, which gets us back to what has been said about the figure of the observer. It is the observer (the subject) who through their visual perception can 'build up space' and only around themselves as the only figure of locus placed in this spatial continuum. This 'placement' can in other words be called existence, and for a very good reason the idea of existence finds its manifestation in the verb '*be*' featuring in the word combinations known as 'progressive forms'.

It should be noted that the methodology of prototype analysis applied to grammatical structures has never been elaborated in its pure form, neither has such an analysis ever been conducted before. Nevertheless we will proceed from the hypothesis that *grammatical prototypes are relevant to the system of language as an epistemic product of the languager's cognitive and speech activity, existing in their mind in the form of a typified image, idea or other meaningful mental substance representing this or that schematized routine combination of language forms*, and undertake a scientific endeavor to describe them semantically guided by the following prototype semantics methodology:

- the principles of concept analysis [13] based primarily on introspection which could help explore the speaker's "language mind" and formalize what one's intuition knows and what is expressed in the "collective unconscious" [11, c. 286]. This type of analysis relates here to the description of formants as schematizing elements (participle and infinitive);

- methods of semantic analysis necessary for identifying and representing the conceptual spectrum of each meaningful fragment associated in the speaker's mind with the language form [10, c. 178];

- elements of cognitive analysis and cognitive interpretation which enable one to formulate the averaged and integrated semantic prototype-based description out of the differentiating semes [9; 10].

Thus, initially we should delineate all the distinctive features characterizing and formalizing the mental representation of the infinitive and participle, 'present simple' and 'present progressive' forms which have already been mentioned, and which can be added to the list through the semantic analysis¹:

(1) known: familiar, accepted, understood;

common: shared, general, relating to many;

general: whole, relating to main features, undetailed, unspecified, abstract;

abstract: existing as an idea, general, theoretical;

(2) observed: noticed, seen, perceived visually;

specific: concrete, exact, specified, relating to one;

aspectual: relating to appearance, visual effect;

dynamic: developing, growing, changing, moving.

The property of dynamics, movement and development should be interpreted through the perspective of the subject's mind again. In terms of psychology of perception, we cannot speak here of the objective characteristic of the phenomenon observed, i.e. physical movement. Without delving into the findings of physiologists, we will briefly remark that the perception of motion is directly linked to and caused by the processes in the sensory organs affected by the outer stimuli. For example, such phenomena as false, perceived and apparent motion as well as visual or auditory hallucinations can be explained only by the changes in the activated organs of perception rather than the objective property of physical objects. That is why the semantic components describing dynamism are to be represented in the concept "*to affect*".

By 'averaging out' and totalizing the semantic components we can suggest the following extended prototype-based (invariant) semantic description of the 'present simple' and 'present progressive' forms respectively:

(1) **a present action understood generally on the basis of its main objective characteristics which are actual in the present, and known to or accepted by an unidentified number of the members of the given community;**

(2) **a present action perceived immediately by and affecting a concrete subject due to the subject's specific actual psychological² state of mind.**

The next stage of this kind of grammatical prototyping is the verification of the results in the form of semantic analysis where the formulated semantic invariant is to be tested on the basis of various more or less prototypical discourse examples – situational realizations of the grammatical constructions. This will be discussed in a further article.

¹ The analysis is based on the contemporary lexicography (Macmillan, Longman, Oxford, Cambridge, Merriam Webster's dictionaries of the English language).

² The component 'psychological state of mind' seems to represent in the best possible way the whole spectrum of perceptive and existential (space-related) properties of the described phenomenon discussed above.

References

1. **Верхотурова Т. Л.** Лингвофилософская природа метакатегории “наблюдатель”: дисс. ... д. филол. н. Иркутск, 2009. 366 с.
2. **Дружинин А. С.** Знаковая сущность грамматической конструкции // Вестник МГИМО-Университета. 2012. № 5 (26). С. 210-214.
3. **Дружинин А. С.** К био-когнитивному осмыслению грамматики // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. Тамбов: Грамота, 2016. № 8-1 (62). С. 110-112.
4. **Дружинин А. С.** Когнитивно-прагматические особенности контрафактивных грамматических конструкций в американском предвыборном дискурсе 2000-2012 гг.: автореф. дисс. ... к. филол. н. М.: МГИМО-Университет, 2014. 20 с.
5. **Дружинин А. С., Песина С. А.** Анализ когнитивных оснований широкозначности // Когнитивные исследования языка. 2015. Вып. XXIII. С. 458-464.
6. **Жулина Е. Б.** Категория времени и вида в современном английском языке: дисс. ... к. филол. н. СПб., 2006. 200 с.
7. **Кравченко А. В.** Когнитивные структуры пространства и времени в современном языке // Известия РАН. Серия литературы и языка. 1996. Т. 55. № 3. С. 3-24.
8. **Кравченко А. В., Баклашкина О. Н.** О грамматическом значении английского причастия // Сибирский филологический журнал. 2012. № 4. С. 158-163.
9. **Малютина Е. И.** Глаголы широкой семантики в когнитивном аспекте: дисс. ... к. филол. н. СПб., 2008. 198 с.
10. **Песина С. А.** Исследование семантической структуры слова на основе прототипической семантики (на материале английских существительных): дисс. ... д. филол. н. СПб., 2005. 384 с.
11. **Чернейко Л. О.** Лингво-философский анализ абстрактного имени. М.: МГУ им. М. В. Ломоносова, 1997. 320 с.
12. **Lewis M.** The English Verb. An Exploration of Structure and Meaning. Hove, UK: Language Teaching Publications, 1986. 182 p.
13. **Wierzbicka A.** Lexicography and Conceptual Analysis. MI: Karoma publakers, 1985. 219 p.

**ПРОТОТИПИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ГРАММАТИЧЕСКИХ ФОРМ
«PRESENT SIMPLE» И «PRESENT PROGRESSIVE»**

Дружинин Андрей Сергеевич, к. филол. н.

*Московский государственный институт международных отношений (Университет)
andrey.druzhinin.89@mail.ru*

В статье рассматривается проблема формулирования прототипического или инвариантного значения различных языковых форм, в том числе грамматических конструкций. В частности, в центре внимания видо-временные глагольные формы, среди которых подробно анализу подвергаются так называемые «present simple» и «present progressive». Автор предлагает семантический прототип данных грамматических форм, который может использоваться в целях интерпретации их различных речевых примеров, попадающих как под традиционные объяснения, так и выходящих за его рамки.

Ключевые слова и фразы: грамматический прототип; прототипическая семантика; семантический инвариант; видо-временные глагольные формы; грамматическая форма «present simple»; грамматическая форма «present progressive».

УДК 811.161.1 + 81'38

В статье рассматриваются процессы производности в жанровом пространстве чаепития. Предполагается, что на деривационные изменения оказывают влияние мутационные и модификационные преобразования речевого жанра, его производность или непроизводность, а также единственность и неединственность, частичность и общность мотивации. Анализ языкового материала позволил автору объединить деривационные преобразования в различные комплексные единицы, выделить и описать мутационный и модификационный характер деривационных пар и деривационных цепочек в системе речевых жанров чаепития, что дает широкое представление и о дериватологии, и о речевых жанрах в целом.

Ключевые слова и фразы: речевой жанр; дериватология; жанровое пространство чаепития; модификационные и мутационные процессы производности; неединственность мотивации; комплексные единицы дериватологии; деривационная пара; деривационная цепочка.

Завязкина Ирина Николаевна, к. филол. н., доцент

*Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет
irina.zavyazkina@yandex.ru*

**О ПРОЦЕССАХ ПРОИЗВОДНОСТИ И КОМПЛЕКСНЫХ ЕДИНИЦАХ ДЕРИВАТОЛОГИИ
В СИСТЕМЕ РЕЧЕВЫХ ЖАНРОВ (НА ПРИМЕРЕ ЖАНРОВОГО ПРОСТРАНСТВА ЧАЕПИТИЯ)**

Рассмотрение деривационных отношений между текстами, типами высказываний на примере жанрового пространства чаепития (чайный рецепт, чайное меню, приглашение на чай, чайная беседа, чайный натюрморт и др.) дает возможность выявить и описать комплексные единицы дериватологии в системе речевых жанров (далее – РЖ). Высказанные ниже умозаключения сделаны на основании тех источников практического материала ([1; 6; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13] и др.), примеры из которых нами проанализированы в предыдущих исследованиях, где дана их систематизация по различным параметрам ([2-5] и др.). В данной работе приведены лишь примеры, касающиеся дериватологических группировок в системе жанров чаепития.