

## Ағылшын газет мәтіндерінде неологизмдердің жасалу тәсілдері

Мақала газет мәтіні шеңберінде қазіргі ағылшын тілінде жаңа сөздердің құрылу тәсілдерін зерттеуге арналған. Газет жаңа нысандардың пайда болуы мен қоршаған орта құбылыстарының әсеріне түсетін сала болып саналады және соның негізінде газет саласы неологизмдердің пайда болуына жағымды алғышарттар туғызады. Газет — әдеби тілге ену ұстанымы бар лексикалық инновациялардың пайда болуын тіркейтін бірінші жазбаша фиксатор. Мақалада публицистикалық мәтіндерде көп қолданылатын неологизмнің үш басты түрі көрсетілген.

The article is devoted to the study of ways of forming new words in modern English in the framework of newspaper text. The newspaper is a sphere, the most responsive to the appearance of new objects and phenomena of reality, and, therefore, it creates favorable conditions for the emergence of neologisms. The newspaper is the first written retainer, recording the appearance of lexical innovations, which tend to penetrate into the literary language. The paper presents three main types of neologisms, commonly used in publicistic texts.

UDK 811.111

F.A.Kakzhanova, A.K.Temirbulatova, T.B.Zharkynbay

*Y.A.Buketov Karaganda State University*

### The Problem of Participle in English

The problem of participle in English language is considered in the article. Further it is mentioned that this grammatical phenomenon is one of the relevant topics at the present stage of English language studying. The problem of participle is one of the most difficult and inconsistent phenomena of language. In spite of the position concerning the language status of the participle, all researchers converge in one: the participle is the language formation combining both verb and adjective peculiarities. Many linguists agree in opinion that participle is very complicated. A lot of linguists pay special attention to this phenomenon in English grammar.

*Key words:* non-finite forms, participle-I, participle-II, verbid, verb, infinitive, gerund, synchrony.

Linguists say that participle — I and gerund are homonyms. However it mentions that, gerund has, along with its verbal qualities, also there are substantive qualities; at a participle-I, along with its verbal qualities, is adjective qualities. And the analysis of the grammatical categories expressed in the second participle, is a great difficulty question and consequently is a problem of detection of its place among other participles. When the second participle becomes a part of the analytical form, it loses some of own features, and there can be a doubt a participle or an adjective.

B.A.Ilish specifies in that that at one of verbal are not present a category of the person or the inclination, also is not present a number category.

It is possible to agree with B.A.Ilish's opinion, that in certain syntactic designs we cannot speak about gerund and participle differentiation — I.If to analyze an example resulted by Ilish. «Do you mind her smoking?» In which her if is a possessive pronoun then smoking will be a gerund but if the pronoun costs in an objective case then smoking is a participle. Hence in some syntactic contexts the opposition between these two forms will be neutralized [1].

But at the same time it would be noticed that participle have never fulfilled the function of object, because it has no quality of a noun.

M.J.Blokh writes that the participle-I is the non-finite form of the verb which combines properties of verb, adjective and adverb, and the participle-II is the non-finite form of a verb which combines properties of a verb and property of an adjective, and is the unique form which has no own paradigm. In difference from a participle-I it does not have a property of an adverb. According to the author distinction between these forms is available as they possess different properties [2].

K.N.Kachalova and E.E.Izrailevich say that the participle in English language represents the non-finite form of a verb which along with verbal properties has properties of an adjective and an adverb. And depend-

ing on that it has what properties, the participle in the offer will carry out different functions: circumstances, definitions or additions. Authors do not differentiate the Participle-I, the Participle-II defining that it is a single form participle [3].

Most of modern linguists pay considerable attention to studying of the language phenomena in functional aspect. It is of current importance because it studies language phenomena from the view of functional grammar.

The participle problem is one of relevant topics in modern English language. Participle — is non-finite form of the verb possessing synthesized properties.

A.I.Smirnitsky gives the definition: participle is the third non-predicative (nominal) form of a verb which has a number of the lines which are pulling together it with an adjective [4].

I.P.Ivanova, V.V.Burlakova, G.G.Pocheptsov do not give the exact definition of a participle, only saying that the combination theory of non-finite forms — an infinitive, a participle and a gerund-in much is close to a verb: except a participle II, all these forms are capable to be combined with a direct object and all can be defined by an adverb. Verbal property is also that, except a participle of the second, all these forms have a specific paradigm. The category of the person and numbers at them is absent; time category as that also is absent: they are incapable to place action in this or that time piece, they specify only a parity of time of action designated by them with verb-predicate action [5].

M.J.Blokh defines participle as forms of the intermediary of a verb in many respects because of their lexical and grammatical features between a verb and not remedial parts of speech. The mixed features of these forms are shown in the basic spheres of the characteristic of parts of speech, that is in their value, structural marks, compatibility, and syntactic functions.

R.Murphy gives the definition of the Participle I and the Gerund are = *ing* forms. And a participle — II it is not mentioned at all, it considers it as a part of an adjective with the ending *-ed* [6].

From the above-stated it is necessary to draw a conclusion that exist defined the contradiction between the Participle I both the Participle II and the Gerund and the Participle I. And the problem of these forms in linguistics remains debatable a question to this day.

Participle II or Past Participle is the participle of last time describing the person, a subject or concept on action already made over it. Participles specify, when there was an action concerning the basic action in the offer.

Recollecting studied before a present participle that it is better to understand this law:

I see Kate writing the letter. — I see (I observe at the moment, action in the present) as Kate writes the letter. Kate writes the letter (simultaneously how I see, too in the present).

I see the letter being written. — I see (I observe at the moment, action in the present) as she writes the letter (simultaneously how I see, too in the present).

I saw Kate writing the letter. — I saw (observed in the past, action in the last time) as Kate wrote the letter (simultaneously how I saw in the past, too in the last time).

I saw the letter being written. — I saw (observed in the past, action in the last time) as she wrote the letter (simultaneously how I saw in the past, too in the last time).

I will see Kate writing the letter. — I will see (I will observe in the future, action in the future time) as Kate will write the letter (simultaneously how I will observe, too in the future time).

I will see the letter being written. — I will see (I will observe in the future, action in the future time) as the the letter will be written (simultaneously how I will observe, too in the future time).

The present perfect participles (Present Participles Perfect) having booked / having been booked — action has occurred to action in the basic offer (has just ended, or comes to an end directly by the time of the action described by a verb-predicate):

Having been told the new phone number Kate types it into the database. — Having been told new telephone number (by the time of in the present), Katya types (in the present) it in a database.

Having been told the new phone number Kate typed it into the database. — Having learnt (literally: being told) new telephone number (by the time of in the past), Katya has brought (in the past) it in a database.

Non-finite forms of the verb, the infinitive, the gerund, participle I (present participle) and participle II (past participle), are otherwise called «verbals», or «verbids». The term, introduced by O.Jespersen, implies that they are not verbs in the proper sense of the word, because they combine features of the verb with features of other notional parts of speech. Their mixed, hybrid nature is revealed in all the spheres of the parts-of-speech characterization: meaning, formal features, and functions. The non-verbal features of verbids are as follows: they do not denote pure processes, but present them as specific kinds of substances and proper-

ties; they are not conjugated according to the categories of person and number, have no tense or mood forms; in some contexts they are combined with the verbs like non-verbal parts of speech; they never function as independent predicates; their functions are those characteristic for other notional parts of speech. The verbal features of verbids are as follows: their grammatical meaning is basically processual; like finites, they do have (at least, most of them have) aspect and voice forms and verbal combinability with direct objects and adverbial modifiers; they can express predication in specific semi-predicative constructions. Thus, verbids can be characterized as intermediary phenomena between verbs and other non-verbal parts of speech.

The opposition between finite and non-finite forms of verbs expresses the category of «finitude». The grammatical meaning, the content of this category is the expression of verbal predication: the finite forms of the verb render full (primary, complete, genuine) predication, the non-finite forms render semi-predication, or secondary (potential) predication. The formal differential feature is constituted by the expression of verbal time and mood, which underlie the predicative function: having no immediate means of expressing time-mood categorial semantics, the verbids are the weak member of the opposition.

At a participle II or only one unchangeable form, this participle always passive and always made, i.e., unlike a participle-I has no neither valid, nor imperfect forms. The Participle — II has no separate categories of time and pledge as can express the actions concerning by any time depending on time of a predicate.

Participle I (present participle) is fully homonymous with the gerund: it is also an 'ing-form' (or, rather, four 'ing-forms', cf.: writing, being written, having written, having been written). But its semantics is different: it denotes processual quality, combining verbal features with features of the adjective and the adverb; participle I can be characterized as a phenomenon of hybrid processual-qualifying nature, intermediary between the verb and the adjective/adverb. The triple nature of participle I finds its expression in its mixed valency and syntactic functions. The verb-type combinability of participle I is revealed in its combinations with nouns denoting the subject and the object of the action, e.g.: her entering the room, with modifying adverbs and with auxiliary verbs in the analytical forms of the verb; the adjective-type combinability of participle I is manifested in its combinations with modified nouns and modifying adverbs of degree, e.g.: an extremely maddening presence; the adverb-type combinability of the participle is revealed in its combinations with modified verbs, e.g.: to speak stuttering at every word. In its free use, participle I can function as a predicative, e.g.: Her presence is extremely maddening to me; as an attribute, e.g.: The fence surrounding the garden was newly painted; and as an adverbial modifier, e.g.: While waiting he whistled.

Like any other verbid, participle I can form semi-predicative constructions if it is combined with the noun or the pronoun denoting the subject of the action; for example, complex object with participle I, e.g.: I saw her entering the room; complex subject with participle I (the passive transformation of the complex object constructions), e.g.: She was seen entering the room. In addition, participle I can form a detached semi-predicative construction, known as the absolute participial construction, which does not intersect in any of its components with the primary sentence part, e.g.: The weather being fine, we decided to take a walk; I won't speak with him staring at me like that.

In complex object and complex subject constructions the difference between the infinitive and participle I lies in the aspective presentation of the process: participle I presents the process as developing, cf.: I often heard her sing in the backyard. — I hear her singing in the backyard.

The absolute homonymy of the gerund and participle I has made some linguists, among them American descriptivists, the Russian linguists V.Y.Plotkin, L.S.Barkhudarov, and some others, treat them not as two different verbids, but as generalized cases of substantive and qualitative functioning of one and the same «ing-form» verbid. Particularly disputable is the status of the semi-predicative construction, traditionally defined as the «half-gerund» construction, in which the semantics of the «ing-form» is neither clearly processual-substantive nor processual-qualifying and it is combined with the noun in the common case form, e.g.: I remember the boy singing in the backyard.

The dubious cases can be clarified if the gerund and the participle are distinctly opposed as polar phenomena. In gerundial constructions the semantic accent is on the substantivized process itself; the nominal character of the verbid can be shown by a number of tests, for example, by a question-forming test, cf.: I remember the boy's singing (his singing). — What do you remember?; the noun denoting the subject of the action semantically and syntactically modifies the gerund — Whose singing do you remember? In participial constructions the semantic emphasis is on the doer of the action, e.g.: I remember him singing. — Whom do you remember?; the present participle modifies its subject, denoting processual quality. In half-gerund constructions the semantic accent is on the event described, on the situational content with the processual substance as its core, cf.: I remember the boy singing in the backyard. — What do you remember about the boy?

This case can be treated as the neutralization of the opposition, as a transferred participle, or a gerundial participle.

In the attributive function, the semantic differences between participle I and the gerund are unquestionable: the noun modified by participle I denotes the actual doer of the action, and the participle denotes its processual qualification; the meaning of the gerund in the attributive function is non-dynamic; the difference can be demonstrated in the following tests, cf.: a sleeping girl à a girl who is sleeping (participle I); a sleeping pill à a pill taken to induce sleep (the gerund).

Participle II, like participle I, denotes processual quality and can be characterized as a phenomenon of hybrid processual-qualifying nature. It has only one form, traditionally treated in practical grammar as the verbal «third form», used to build the analytical forms of the passive and the perfect of finites, e.g.: is taken; has taken. The categorial meanings of the perfect and the passive are implicitly conveyed by participle II in its free use, for example, when it functions as a predicative or an attribute, e.g.: I saw the written book (participle II as an attribute); The book was brightly illustrated (participle II as a predicative). The functioning of participle II is often seen as adverbial in cases like the following: When asked he answered to all questions. But such constructions present cases of syntactic compression rather than an independent participle II used adverbially, cf.: When asked directly ‘ When he was asked directly... Thus, participle II can be characterized as a verbid combining verbal features (processual semantics and combinability) with the features of the adjective.

Like any other verbid, participle II can form semi-predicative constructions if combined with the inner subject of its own; they include complex object with participle II, e.g.: I’d like to have my hair cut; We found the door locked; complex subject with participle II (the passive transformation of the complex object constructions), e.g.: The door was found firmly locked; and absolute participial construction with participle II, e.g.: She approached us, head half turned; He couldn’t walk far with his leg broken.

The meaning of the perfect is rendered by participle II in correlation with the aspective lexico-grammatical character of the verb: with limitive verbs participle II denotes priority («relative past») while participle I denotes simultaneity («relative present»), cf.: burnt leaves (‘the leaves have already been burnt’; relative past) — burning leaves (‘the leaves are burning now’; relative present); hence the alternative terms: participle I — present participle, participle II — past participle. With unlimitive verbs this difference is neutralized and participle II denotes simultaneity, e.g.: a brightly lit room. In addition, participle I and participle II are sometimes opposed as the active participle and the passive participle, cf.: the problem discussed (passive) — though participle II also participates in the structural formation of the passive and the perfect of participle I, e.g.: being discussed, having discussed. This, together with the other differential properties, supports the status of participle II as a separate verbid.

Participle is one of the most difficult and inconsistent phenomena of language. In spite of the position concerning the language status of the participle, all researchers converge in one: the participle — the language formation combining both verb and adjective peculiarities.

#### Referens

- 1 Ilish B.A. Structure of the English Language. — L.: Prosveshenie, 1971. — 363 p.
- 2 Blokh M.J. Theoretical grammar of the English language. — M.: High. School, 1983. — 383 p.
- 3 Kachalova K.N., Izrailevich E.E. Practical grammar of the English language with exercises and keys. — M.: Yunves, 1998. — 548 p.
- 4 Ivanova I.P., Burlakova V.V., Pocheptsov G.G. Theoretical grammar of modern English language. — M.: High School, 1981. — 285 p.
- 5 Smirnitky A.I. Morphology of English of language, 1959. — 428 p.
- 6 Murphy Raymond English grammar in USE. — Cambridge University Press, 2004. — 379 p.

Ф.А.Қақжанова, А.К.Термірбұлатова, Т.В.Жарқынбай

## Ағылшын тіліндегі есімшенің мәселесі

Мақалада ағылшын тіліндегі есімше мәселесі қарастырылған. Ағылшын тілін зерттеуде бұл грамматикалық ұғым қазіргі кезеңнің көкейкесті тақырыптарының бірі болып табылады. Есімше мәселесі өте күрделі және қарама-қайшылық тудыратын ұғым. Есімшенің статусына қатысты жағдайға қарамастан көптеген зерттеушілердің ойлары бір жерден шығып отыр: есімше — етістік және сын есім ерекшеліктерін үйлестіретін тіл құрылымы. Көп лингвистер есімше мәселесі өте күрделі екеніне келіседі. Сол себепті ағылшын тіліндегі осы мәселеге ерекше көңіл аударады.

В статье рассматривается проблема причастия в английском языке. Это грамматическое явление — одна из актуальных тем на современном этапе изучения английского языка. Проблема причастия является одним из самых сложных и противоречивых явлений языка. Несмотря на положения, касающиеся статуса причастия, все исследователи сходятся в одном: причастие — это формирование языка, сочетающее особенности глагола и прилагательного. Многие лингвисты сходятся во мнении, что причастие очень сложное явление в английской грамматике и обращают на него особое внимание.

УДК 81'22

Л.А.Нефедова

*Челябинский государственный университет, Россия*

## Когнитивные особенности статуса имплицитного и эксплицитного смыслов

В статье рассмотрены вопросы имплицитивной коммуникации, понимаемой как акт коммуникации, базирующийся на неявно выраженном смысле в результате когнитивной обработки получаемой информации. Определен статус имплицитного и эксплицитного смыслов с позиций осмысления говорящим ситуации как означаемого высказывания на сигнификативном уровне с учетом коммуникативно-релевантных условий коммуникативного акта.

*Ключевые слова:* коммуникативный акт, имплицитивная коммуникация, имплицитный смысл, эксплицитный смысл, концептуализация, виды категорий, смысловые трансформации.

В исследованиях ученых, занимающихся проблемой имплицитности, четко разграничиваются эксплицитный и имплицитный смыслы. Под имплицитным смыслом предлагается понимать такое информационное содержание, которое предназначено говорящим для сообщения и выражено или опосредовано путем эксплицитного выражения некоего другого содержания, из которого по законам логики следует определяемое [1; 36]. При этом выделяется три разновидности смысла: эксплицитный денотативно-коммуникативный смысл, имплицитный пресуппозициональный смысл и имплицитный, предназначенный для сообщения, т.е. коммуникативный смысл [1; 27]. Речь идет о том, что то информационное содержание, которое в одних высказываниях выражено имплицитно, в других может составлять их эксплицитный денотативно-коннотативный смысл. Исследователь подчеркивает, что имплицитный коммуникативный смысл — это невербализованное сигнификативное значение высказывания на глубинном уровне его семантической структуры, который может быть также назван его латентным смыслом, возникающим вследствие имплицитивной связи эксплицитного, манифестируемого смысла с фактами, сопровождающими вербальную коммуникацию и имеющими различительное коммуникативное значение [1; 44].

По мнению Ю.М.Скребнева, статус имплицитного и эксплицитного смыслов определяется их отношением к импликациям и экспликациям в области функционирования языковых единиц, где под экспликацией понимается область прямого, вербального выражения значений, а под импликацией — область непрямого, опосредованного выражения значений и смыслов [2; 16]. Онтологическая природа имплицитного коммуникативного смысла заключена в способе осмысления говорящим ситуации как означаемого высказывания на сигнификативном уровне, с учетом коммуникативно-релевантных условий коммуникативного акта.