Professor **O.A. Zhaboruke** (1949-2019)
**Zhaboruke I. A.,**
*PhD, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department*
*of Germanic Philology and Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages*
*South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K.D. Ushinsky*

**Boieva E. V.,**
*PhD, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department*
*of Ukrainian and Foreign Literature*
*South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University named after K.D. Ushinsky*

# THE GRAMMATICAL HOMONYMS OF THE ENGLISH STRUCTURE BE+-ED

**Summary.** The English structure be + -ed is an extremely complex and problematic phenomenon. Among the issues related to the analysis of this structure, the problem of distinguishing grammatical homonyms within it should be highlighted, as it has not yet been definitively resolved.

In modern linguistic thought, two main directions are noticeable in the interpretation of the nature of this structure.

While the supporters of the first direction see in the passive voice the possibility of expressing a state, understanding it as the result of a previously performed action, the followers of the second direction categorically deny this possibility. Any state, they argue, has nothing to do with the verb, in particular with its passive form, and, in principle, cannot have anything to do with it. The reasons for differences in views on the state category lie in different, not always scientifically based, approaches to the interpretation of such defining concepts for this category as "action", "state" and "process". Action" is often reduced to the activity of a person, his versatile life. Other authors expand this concept, understanding by it, in addition to human activity, the processes that take place in this or that material object, as well as various kinds of events – movement, that is, everything that has an element of dynamics.

Regarding the state, it is most often defined as a way of being of a substance in time and space. The state is the most general level of a person's mental perception of the world around him – in the specifics of the existence of the substances surrounding him at a certain moment or during a certain period of time.

A person's understanding of the surrounding world is inextricably linked with nomination, that is, with a person's desire to convey anything put into words what they saw and understood This means that every concept, every idea, which in one way or another reflects the surrounding world, must have certain means of linguistic representation. The task of the linguist in this regard is to find them, correctly establish the relationship between concepts, ideas and linguistic means that reflect them.

**Key words:** grammatical structure, state, action, process, voice, state-property, state-relation, state-non-relation.

**Problem statement.** The English structure be + -ed is an extremely complex and problematic phenomenon. Among the issues related to the analysis of this structure, the problem of distinguishing grammatical homonyms within it should be highlighted, as it has not yet been definitively resolved [1, p.203].

**Theoretical Background.** In modern linguistic thought, two main directions are noticeable in the interpretation of the nature of this structure.

Advocates of one direction believe that the structure be + -ed should be considered exclusively as a state, distinguishing only two subtypes of state within it: the passive of action and the passive of state. This viewpoint is held by O. Jesperson, J. Svartvik [2, p. 107; 3, p. 85] and others.

According to the statements of the representatives of the second direction, the structure consists of two homonyms: the analytical form of the verb in the passive state (when it expresses an action) and a free syntactic combination of a linking verb with a predicate (when this structure expresses a state). This opinion is held by the majority of linguists, among whom should be named G. Scheurweghs [4, p. 156], F. Palmer [5, p. 68], I. Willis [1, p.2 04] and others.

However, some linguists (O.M. Gordon, I.P. Krylova) take a compromise position on this issue. On the one hand, they recognise the passive of action and the passive of state within the structure, and on the other hand, they also recognise the combination be with an adjective, which they consider as a nominal compound predicate. In addition, all researchers agree that it is necessary to distinguish grammatical homonyms in the structure: in the first case, one subtype of state from another, and in the second, the passive voice from the nominal compound predicate, depending on whether the structure expresses an action or a state.

However, while the supporters of the first direction see in the passive voice the possibility of expressing a state, understanding it as the result of a previously performed action, the followers of the second direction categorically deny this possibility. Any state, they argue, has nothing to do with the verb, in particular with its passive form, and, in principle, cannot have anything to do with it. The reasons for differences in views on the state category lie in different, not always scientifically based, approaches to the interpretation of such defining concepts for this category as "action", "state" and "process". Action" is often reduced to the activity of a person, his versatile life. Other authors expand this concept, understanding by it, in addition to human activity, the processes that take place in this or that material object, as well as various kinds of events – movement, that is, everything that has an element of dynamics.

Similar disagreements are also characteristic of the definition of the concept of state

1. In our mind, the idea of a certain state in which the object is located arises only if the feature conveyed by the predicate is thought to exist for a certain period of time, that is, in other words, it is characterized by duration in time [цит. за 6]

2. A state is a feature directly inherent in an object. In our minds, a state is not directly related to time (long or short), but to a certain object.

Comparing the above statements, we see that in the first of them the concept of state is associated with time, while in the second this connection is actually denied.

No less controversial is the interpretation of concepts "action", "state" in O.M.Gordon and I.P. Krylova`s "A grammar of Present Day English" Thus, when defining the verb the authors treat the notion of "state" as such that is included into the concept of "action", whereas in other cases, particularly, when it goes about passive, these two notions are mutually exclusive .

The disagreement of the scientific definitions of the notions "action", "state", and "process" is partularly evident when analyzing practical materal. It can be illustrated by the attempt of L. Ryndma to interpret a sentence *The earth was surrounded by oceans.* The English structure be + -ed, according to L. Ryndma, may also express action …which is perceived as a process and is a passive. The action in this case is a well-known fact characterized by a certain duration which brings it closer to state [цит. за 6].

So, action in this sentence has simultaneously three meanings: of an action, of a process, and of a state. So, this conclusion does not give an answer to the question of the actual expression of the structure be + -ed but once again it makes us think about the essence of concepts "action", "process", and "state". It should be noted that the analysis of statements like *The earth was surrounded by oceans*, in general, is a "stumbling block" for linguists, regardless of what views they hold on the category of state. since this statement does not fit into any of the existing interpretations of the structure be + -ed. It is significant that linguists in their writings mostly prefer not to mention them at all, or, in the worst case, try to artificially squeeze them into a certain system, thereby actually showing their helplessness.

**Goal of the article**. In general, the question of the status of such constructions still remains open, and in the meantime its solution would be tantamount to solving the problem of the state (voice), because in such cases the whole range of contradictions associated with this category – starting from contradictions of a purely theoretical nature – was concentrated in the definition of the basic concepts, grammatical status of the structure be + -ed etc. and ending with the fact of inconsistencies between the actual use of this structure and the methods of its interpretation.

**Material Presentation.** So, as you can see, everything is based on the concepts of "action", "state" and "process." Let's try to understand these complex philosophical concepts. It is unlikely that today any of the philosophers will be able to deny the truth that the world is a single continuous universal substance in eternal motion, changing in nature and time. In other words, the world is a continuous global process, or more precisely – a set of processes [цит. за 6]. Outside of the process, the existence of the world, that is, the substance, is unthinkable, since it is the only possible way of its existence. Thus, the concepts of "substance" and "process" are inseparable concepts, inconceivable one without the other. Hence,

a process is one or more substances (or the relationship between the latter) that change in time and space. And that's why you can completely agree with U. Quine, who in his well-known work "The Word and the Object" states that material objects, which are understood in four dimensions in space and time, should not be distinguished from processes [7, p. 221].

Regarding the state, it is most often defined as a way of being of a substance in time and space. In other words, it is the same process, but "suspended" in time, grasped by human consciousness as such – in the specifics of its existence at a certain moment (or in a certain period of time). If a process is the existence of a substance in general, regardless of the specifics of its flow in time, then the state, on the contrary, implies the very feature of this flow, it is a process, the specifics of the flow of which is realized by man at a certain moment or period of time.

Thus, the definition of a state is, in fact, nothing more than the definition of a process, but from the standpoint of a person's awareness of it. Awareness of the specificity of the process, the existence of a certain substance as a whole occurs due to the ability of the human brain to "suspend" (deaden) matter and split it, grabbing this or that process from it.

Therefore, the state is the most general level of a person's mental perception of the world around him – in the specifics of the existence of the substances surrounding him at a certain moment or during a certain period of time.

The concept of action should be understood only as a special case of a state in which a characteristic feature of the existence of a substance is dynamism: a certain manifestation of energy, movement in space, transition from one state to another.

A similar understanding of the relationship between the concepts of "action", "state" and "process" can also be found in L. Tenier. Processes, he points out, are states and actions by means of which objects manifest their existence [цит.за 6].

A person's understanding of the surrounding world is inextricably linked with nomination, that is, with a person's desire to convey anything and, first of all, to put into words what they saw and understood nothing more than the direct reality of thought. This means that every concept, every idea, which in one way or another reflects the surrounding world, must have certain means of linguistic representation. The task of the linguist in this regard is to find them, correctly establish the relationship between concepts, ideas and linguistic means that reflect them.

The first steps on this path have already been taken. It was established, in particular, that the state (process) is related in the language to the structure of predication, and its components (substance, changes occurring in it) to the components of the structure of predication (with subject and predicate, respectively [8]. Depending on the number of substances and the nature of their relationship, the human mind distinguishes two types of state (process). The first type involves one substance and the changes that occur in it. It can be conditionally called a state-(process-) non-relationship.

The second type involves at least two substances and changes in the relationship between them, which occur in time and space. Accordingly, this type is called a state-(process-) – relationship. In the language state non-relation is conveyed by two types of predication structure (*He laughed; They were surprised*), state-relation by one (*I have new shoes*). The structure of predication (*He laughed*) contains only one element that can be correlated with the substance, and the structure of predication (*I have new shoes*) – two.

The human mind distinguishes not only this, but also another aspect of state. Splitting the processes (states) of the objective environment into components, the human brain is able to focus attention on one of them – either on the substance itself, which has certain properties, or on the peculiarities of its existence (being) in time and space. Accordingly, the states can be divided into two types: the state of the property of the substance and the state of existence (changes) of the substance in time and space. This type of state is called "verb state " [9].

The first type of state can be conventionally called a state-property. This is a process that is reflected in human consciousness as a substance that exists in time and space and has a certain property. In other words, the way of being of this substance is determined by its property. The property itself can be perceived as something constant, unchanged in time, or something that was added to the substance from the outside, as an imprint of a previously committed action. In the latter case, this state always has a performance value. A characteristic feature of a state-property is that it is a state-non-relation.

The second type of state conveys the nature of the changes that happen with the substance over time. A person's attention is focused on the second component of the state – on the nature of the substance's existence in time, which actually determines the qualitative difference of this type of state from the state- property.

The state-existence, unlike the state-property, can be both a non-relational state- non-relation and a state-relation. State-property and state-existence are correlated at the language level with two types of predicate – a compound noun and a simple verb. Thus, in the expression *They were surprised*, the pronoun *they* corresponds to a certain substance, *surprised* indicates its property, the verb *were* – to its existence in time as having this property. As we can see, the way of existence (being) of a substance is determined by its property, which means that we have an expression that correlates with state-property. At the same time, it should be considered in relation to the process (state) of non-relation. If, during the semantic analysis, we do not regard each element of this statement separately, but the components of the structure of predication, then the relationship with the components of the state will be as follows: the subject *they* is correlated with the substance, the nominal compound predicate *were surprised* characterizes its way of being at a certain moment (or interval) of time due to the presence of a certain property in it, perceived by the speaker. As we can see, it is the predicate – nominal compound predicate – that takes on the main semantic load, which determines the specificity of this state. This gives us reason to consider it a linguistic means that expresses a state-property.

Let us consider the expression *He laughed*. Like the previous one, it is a subject non-relation. The subject of the sentence *he* is related to a certain substance, the predicate verb *laughed* indicates the way this substance changes in time. Attention is focused here not on the substance, as in the previous statement, but on the specificity of the changes that happen to this substance. So, before us is a state of existence expressed by a simple verb predicate.

The state-existence also has different manifestations. In some cases, changes with the substance proceed dynamically, they are accompanied by its movement in space, associated with energy costs, etc. In others, they are so slow that a person perceives them as being of a substance in a state of rest – in statics. Accordingly, we will call the first type of state-existence a state of dynamics (or

action), the second a state of rest (a state of statics). It is quite obvious that the state of rest cannot be associated with the result of a previously committed action, and therefore it is always unresultative.

Thus, verbs are capable of expressing not only action, as is sometimes believed, but also a non-resultant state. In respect that the non-resultant type of state is peculiar to the verb, we will use the term verbal state instead of the term non-resultant state (or state of rest) in some cases. At the same time, we note that an action is, in fact, also a state, and more precisely, it is nothing more than a special case (aspect) of a state (state-existence). Any action can be realized as a state (*The girl is smiling – The smiling girl)*, although not every state is an action.

The relationship between the main types of states (processes) and the linguistic means of their expression can be presented as follows:

1) state-property (non-resultative /resultative) – nominal compound predicate;

2) state- existence (action /non-resultative state – simple verb predicate).

Having defined the content of the basic concepts and established the relationship between the types of states (processes) and linguistic means of their expression, we thereby created the necessary prerequisites for the analysis of the actual material. However, before starting it, we note that we will support the semantic analysis with a formal, in particular, transformational analysis.

Let's return to the statement *The earth was surrounded by ocean* and try to analyze it. This expression correlates with the state-relationship of *earth* and *ocean* – the substance, *was surrounded* – a certain spatial relationship between them. By its specificity, this relationship is a state of existence that does not have any signs of action – the movement of a substance in space, energy costs, etc. It cannot be realized as an imprint (result) of a previously performed action. So, before us is a typical case of a rest state, or a verb state. The verb character of this expression is also confirmed by its ability to transform itself into an active state. *Oceans surrounded the earth.* Since the deep structure of the original statement and its active "transform" coincide, *was surrounded* corresponds to *surrounded*, which means that *was surrounded* and *surrounded* are the stative forms of the verb *to surround*.

Let's give a few more examples of the verb state: *He is known to be one of the most influential member of one of the most secret societies in the country* [A.J. Cronin] – *People knew him to be an influential member...*

*This is meant to be part of my chest.* [T. Capote]
*He will be here when he is needed.* [E.Hemingway]
*I guess it is supposed to be me.* [G. McCullers]

Let's check the effectiveness of the proposed analysis procedure on other examples, in particular in cases of using the *be + -ed* structure, which expresses the resulting state (process). These cases, as already noted, are also problematic: some linguists consider them to be nominal compound predicates, while others consider them to be simple verbs. Let us consider a segment of speech *She lay in the lower bunk very big under the qeiet. Her head was turned to one side. In her lower bunk was her husband.*[E. Hemingway]. As the analysis shows, a segment of speech *her head was turned to one side*, in terms of its semantics, is analogous to an utterance *they were surprised*, where *her head* is a substance *turned- to-one –side* its property *was* indicates the existence of a substance that possesses the specified property. So, this segment of speech is correlated with

*her head* as a state-non-relation: a property state. Since the substance acquired this property as a result of an already performed action (*The woman had turned her head to one side*), it (this property) has the meaning of effectiveness (as opposed to *They were surprised*). As we can see, in terms of the number of components and its content, the semantic composition of the expression *her head was turned to one side* corresponds to the expression *They were surprised*. Since *They were surprised* is a nominal compound predicate (this is generally recognized), then *was turned* should also be qualified as a nominal compound predicate and not as a subtype of the passive state, as some linguists believe. The semantic analysis of the statement *her head was turned to one side* is fully consistent with the result of its transformational analysis, namely, the impossibility of transformation into the active state (*The woman had turned her head to one side*) and the possibility of transformation (*was turned to one side head*).

For greater persuasiveness, let's compare the previous segment of speech with a segment of a different nature, in which the structure be +-ed has the same lexical content – *was turned Doors banged, keys were turned in flour and sugar bins*[K.S.Prichard]. Semantically, this segment is qualitatively different from the previous one. It correlates with the state, in which the specifics of the existence of a substance, or rather, a set of substances, is connected with energy costs. In other words, we have a state of dynamics, state-relation, although at the level of the surface structure the previous substance is absent. As for the grammatical status of the structure be +-ed in this statement, there are no problems here – the predicate in sentences of this semantic type is always defined as a simple verb, therefore *was turned* is the analytical form of the verb in the passive voice. The result of the semantic analysis is confirmed by the possibility of transformation of this segment of speech into an active voice (*The servants*) *turned keys in flower and sugar bins* and the impossibility of transformation of the nominalization (*turned-in-flower-and- sugar-bins)*. All grammarians, without exception, consider the structure be +-ed, which expresses an action, to be a simple verb predicate (passive voice).

However, the homonymic composition of the structure be +-ed is not limited to only two grammatical homonyms – nominal compound and verbal predicates. Such a structure contains results of a double semantic and grammatical interpretation, and sometimes acts as a synonym for the perfect, which can be the object of a separate study.

*Література:*
1. Willis H. Modern Descriptive English Grammar. San Francisco, Toronto, 1972. 378 p.
2. Jesperson O.A. Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Copenhagen – London, 1949. 352 p.
3. Svartvik J. On the Voice in the English Verb. The Hague, 1966. 200 p.
4. Scheurweghs G. Present Day English Syntax. A Survey of English Patterns. London, 1961. P. 156-157.
5. Palmer F.R. A Linguistic Study of the English Verb. London, 1965. 165 p.
6. Жаборюк О.А. До питання про граматичне значення категорії стану як лінгвістичної універсалії/ Вісник Харківського державного університету. Романо-германська філологія. Харків: Константа, 1999. №435. С. 27-32.
7. Quine W. Word and Object. N.Y., 1960. 221 p.
8. Korsakov A.K., Korsakov A.A., Korsakov Al.A., Theoretical Foundations of Modern English grammar. Part I. Syntax. Odessa., 1982 (Manuscript). 324 p.
9. Жаборюк О.А. Еволюція категорії стану (на матеріалі англійської мови). Записки з романо-германської філології. Одеса: Латстар. 1999. Вип. 4. С. 57-71.

**Жаборюк О., Жаборюк І., Боєва Е. Граматичні омоніми англійської структури BE + -ED**

**Анотація.** Англійська структура be + -ed є надзвичайно складним і проблематичним явищем. Серед питань, пов'язаних з аналізом цієї структури, слід звернути особливу увагу на проблему виокремлення в ній граматичних омонімів, оскільки вона ще остаточно не вирішена.

Сучасна лінгвістична література пропонує два основних напрямки у розумінні природи цієї структури.

Якщо прихильники першого напряму бачать у пасиві можливість вираження стану, розуміючи його як результат раніше виконаної дії, то прихильники другого напряму категорично заперечують таку можливість. Будь-який стан, на їхню думку, не має нічого спільного з пасивною формою дієслова в принципі.

Причини таких різних поглядів на категорію стану полягають у різних, підходах до тлумачення таких важливих понять для категорії стану як «дія», «стан» і «процес». Дія" часто розуміється лише, як діяльність людини, її різноманітної життєдіяльності. Інші автори тлумачать це поняття ширше, крім діяльності людини, вони ще мають на увазі процеси, що відбуваються в матеріальному світі, а також всілякі події – все те, що має в собі елемент динаміки.

Стан найчастіше трактують як спосіб буття матерії в часі та просторі. Стан – це найбільш загальний рівень сприйняття людиною навколишнього світу – у специфіці існування матеріальних предметів, що її оточують у конкретний момент або на протязі певного часу.

Людині притаманне бажання передати словами те, що вона побачила і зрозуміла в своєму оточенні, тобто номінація. Таким чином людина прагне зрозуміти навколишній світ. Це означає, що кожне поняття, кожен образ, які якимсь чином віддзеркалюють світ навколо неї, повинні мати свої власні засоби мовної репрезентації. Завдання лінгвіста в цьому відношенні – знайти їх, правильно встановлюючи зв`язки та взаємовідношення між поняттями, образами та мовними засобами, що служать для їх відображення.

**Ключові слова:** Граматична структура, стан, дія, процес, дієслівний стан, стан-властивість, стан-відношення, стан-невідношення.