

IMPERATIVE STATEMENTS IN THE GRAMMATICAL SYSTEM OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Kiriushchenko Olena

Graduate Student

Izmail State University of Humanities

Modern researchers have repeatedly noted that various linguistic means can participate in the expression of motivation: morphological, syntactic, lexical, prosodic and contextual. Scientists distinguish two groups of means of expressing imperativeness: monofunctional and polyfunctional. The group of monofunctional means of expressing imperativeness includes constructions with the verb form in the imperative and with performative verbs. However, the central place is occupied by the imperative form, since it shows minimal dependence on the context, it also participates in the expression of types and variants of motivation – from categorical to neutral and softened [1].

The imperative form of motivation, combined with an enhanced (incentive) intonation, belongs to the categorical type of motivation. This type of motivation concentrates the semantic features of an imperative situation with the greatest completeness, namely, the orientation of the expression to subordinate the speaker's will [9, p. 91].

N. I. Poroikova notes the following linguistic features of imperative motivation: a) categorical (imperative) motivation cannot be expressed by interrogative constructions; b) this type of motivation cannot be combined with modal words that express uncertainty, assumptions; c) in this type of motivation, there are no indicators of the addressee's orientation to the speaker's desire; d) in the imperative motivation, there are no indicators of the modal value of the possibility of performing an action that is relevant. The main meaning that characterizes the imperative type of motivation is the meaning of necessity, duty [9, p. 92]. The imperative is considered by linguists as the main means of expressing motivation.

V.S. Riabenko justifies the central position of the imperative in the system of means of motivation on the basis of such features: this form reflects the relationships of objective reality (the relationships between a sender and a receiver); the imperative conveys the meaning of motivation most definitely; it is the most common form; it is the most constant it is the most independent of the context; it includes a wide range of motivations (if the paradigm is poor – it is possible to convey different shades) [12, p. 3–4].

The central place among monofunctional imperative constructions is occupied by formations with a verb in the form of an imperative mood, which are aimed at encouraging the addressee to act. These constructions are part of

imperative sentences. The imperative of motivation is a message about the speaker's desire for the addressee to perform a certain action, and an attempt to cause its realization by the addressee [2, p. 22]. The specificity of an imperative sentence lies in its brightly expressed structural, lexical and semantic limitations – not every structural model of the sentence forms an imperative form; not every verb lexeme is able to perform the function of a predicate of an imperative sentence, and the semantic structure of its propositional concept always organizes the relationships “the doer – one's action” [8, p. 4]. An imperative sentence allows for structural variability for the expression of grammatical meanings within three grammatical categories: a) the category of “type of motivation”, which is represented by three oppositions – “direct motivation”, motivation to joint action, motivation to the 3rd person, “reverse motivation”; b) the category of statement/negativeness of the sentence; c) the category of emphaticity of the sentence [8, p. 7].

Imperative sentences are divided into affirmative and negative sentences. Verbs in an affirmative sentence denote an action that must be performed by the addressee at the request of the speaker. Situationally, such forms, of course, are associated with contacting a passive personality – a person who is still being encouraged to start an activity. Negative forms, on the contrary, are addressed to a person who is already engaged in any activity [7, p. 140].

Incentive constructions (further – ICs) that are part of the structure of an affirmative sentence include synthetic verb forms: the 2nd person singular and plural – *Come in*. Negative constructions of imperative sentences of the 2nd person include forms of analytical verbs of the *don't + inf.* type. – *Don't go there*.

Among imperative sentences, there are unextended and extended sentences. An unextended imperative sentence consists of a construction with only one nuclear component, while an extended sentence – of two or more components. The nuclear component of the unextended construction, a verb in the form of an imperative, is the basis of the sentence. It does not have a connection with other components [5]: *Look!*, *Listen!* This group also includes phrasal verbs with adverbs: *Calm down!* *Hurry up!* *Go ahead!*.

In extended imperative ICs, the core as a verb in the imperative mood, interacts with other components. Most often, the core is complicated by the pronoun *you* in the preposition: *You wait!* Neutral ICs are opposed by emphatic ICs, the core of which is amplified by the auxiliary verb *do*: *Do come!*.

In ICs with a nuclear component expressed by a transitive verb, a relationship is established with subsequent components in the form of a noun (*Elicit ideas!*), a personal pronoun in the object case (*Introduce me!*) or a reverse or a demonstrative pronoun (*Help yourself!* *Read this!*).

The analysis of ICs shows that non-personal verb forms – the infinitive, gerund, and participle – are also used in constructions, but these constructions

are much rarer: *Stop talking! Try to answer!* In English, there are ICs in which the nuclear component is expressed by the verb *to be* in the imperative mood. The most commonly used constructions are *to be + adjective (Be strong! Be quiet!)*. The least frequent construction is the conjugation of the verb *to be (get)* + the participle in the past tense form, for example: *be seated, be prepared*.

The core in ICs can be complicated by not only one, but also two (and/or three) dependent components: *Show me this professor!, Give me this piece of paper immediately!* In the extended ICs also enter conjugations of verbs and special words (like *please, kind*), for example: *Please, wait for me! Be so kind!* For ICs, as the examples demonstrate, the omission of the pronoun *you* is a characteristic feature, that is, the construction “verb in the form of the imperative mood +...” is used.

Despite the fact that imperative sentences are considered well studied, the question of whether they should be classified as two-part or one-part sentences still remains unresolved. The vast majority of foreign linguists, starting with the authors of classical scientific grammars and ending with modern structuralists [13; 14; 16], tend to consider imperative sentences as incomplete, having a two-part construction with the subject *you* and the predicate, since the imperative assumes a speech situation of direct appeal to the second person and the addressee of speech communication coincides with the subject of future action [6, p. 13].

Other scholars believe that the peculiarity of an imperative is that, in most cases, it forms monosyllabic sentences. Monosyllabic sentences should be understood as sentences whose block diagram is formed by one grammatical member, the absence of the second is inherent in the very structure of this sentence, that is, it cannot be at all, or formally it could be, but its absence does not create incompleteness, but is a structural feature of these sentences.

The subject in an imperative sentence is in most cases redundant, because these sentences are always directed to the second person – the addressee; the main purpose of an imperative sentence is to encourage the addressee to act. The subject, which is also the addressee, is always implicitly present in the verb form of a monosyllabic sentence.

N. D. Arutiunova notes that such speech acts as requests, orders and some others are meaningless if they are not addressed to anyone: it is impossible to discuss their content regardless of the author and addressee of the language [3, p. 38]. I. I. Prybytok indicates that the presence of a subject depends on the form in which the verb is used: analytical or synthetic [11].

In the case of using the analytical form, an imperative sentence is considered as a two-part sentence, in which the nominal component is represented by a determinant [11, p. 104]: *Let me look at my book*. R. Quirk believes that the missing subject is intuitively restored using the forms of the 2nd person pronoun singular. Proof of this is the use of interrogative

separating endings in imperative sentences *will you?: Be quiet, will you!* and in reflexive forms: *Behave yourself!* R. Quirk emphasizes that sentences containing the subject *you* are of a warning nature and very often express strong irritation: *You be quiet!* The scientist notes that imperative sentences without the subjects appeal to the 2nd person, and are most common in modern English [15, p. 403–405]. According to Thorne J. P., the subject *you* in these cases is assumed and there is no need to designate it, because this is the only possible subject [17, p. 70]. Most linguists refer imperative sentences to one-member sentences (V. S. Khrakovskiy, A. I. Smyrnytskyi, L. S. Barkhudarov, D. A. Shtelin, R. Quirk).

In English grammar, there are two-member imperative sentences, i.e. sentences with a subject. In an imperative sentence, the subject is required in two cases [9, p. 193]: with an undefined action agent: *Somebody, open the door!*; in the context of contrast: *It'll be lunch time soon. Will you call your father?* L. S. Barkhudarov, D. A. Shtelin pay attention to the fact that two-member sentences are always emphatic in nature [4, p. 285]. H. H. Pocheptsov claims that in the imperative mood, the subject expressed by the pronoun can appear only with a sharp emphase: *You stay here!* [10, p. 69]. In a two-member imperative sentence, the subject is always stressed [15].

The prospect of research is to analyze lexical and grammatical means of expressing speech imperativeness on the material of English fiction texts.

References:

1. Бархударов Л. С. Очерки по морфологии современного английского языка. Москва : Высш. шк., 1995. 156 с.
2. Апресян Ю. Д. Лексическая семантика: Синонимические средства языка. Москва : Наука, 1984. 346 с.
3. Арутюнова Н. Д. Предложение и его смысл: Логико-семантические проблемы. Москва : Наука, 2000. 383 с.
2. Бархударов Л. С. Штелинг Д. А. Грамматика английского языка. Москва : Высш. шк., 1983. 428 с.
3. Бархударов Л. С. Очерки по морфологии современного английского языка. Москва : Высш. шк., 1995. 156 с.
4. Зернов Б. Е. О некоторых особенностях императивных предложений в современном английском языке. *Вопросы структуры английского языка в синхронии и диахронии*. Донецк : ДНУ, 2014. С. 13–19.
5. Маслова Н. И., Паповянец Э. Г. Лингвистические средства выражения речевого акта прогнати́ва в английском языке. *Вісник ХДУ*. Харків : Константа, 1999. Вып. 461. С. 139–144.
6. Панина Н. А. Имплицитность речевого выражения и ее типы: Сб. науч. тр. Киев : КГУ, 2000. С. 49–58.
7. Поройкова Н. И. К семантической характеристике побудительных высказываний диалогической речи. Київ : Наук. думка, 1983. 218 с.
8. Почепцов Г. Г. Основы прагматического описания предложения. Київ : Вища шк., 1986. 116 с.

9. Пудровская Т. Н. Описание пропозитива как речевого акта (на материале английского языка). *Вісник ХДУ*. Харків : Константа, 1996. № 386. С. 101–105.
10. Рябенко В. С. Функционально-семантическое поле побудительности в современном немецком языке. Київ : Киев.ун-т, 2004. 245 с.
11. Francis W. N. *The Structure of American English*. N-Y., 1998. P. 382–383.
12. Katz J., Postal P. *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions*. Cambridge, 1994. P. 74–79.
13. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London : Longman, 2004. 1777 p.
14. Roberts P. *Understanding English*. N-Y., 1998. 184 p.
15. Thorne. J. P. Imperative Sentences. *Journal of Linguistics*. Cambridge, Vol. 2, A-1, 1996. P. 72–77.