

УДК 81-26

POSSESSIVENESS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

*Данилова В.В.,
магистр педагогики и психологии,
старший преподаватель, КГПИ
Каримбаева А.А.,
студентка 4 курса, КГПИ,
г. Костанай, Казахстан*

Аннотация

Мақала ағылшын тілінің тәуелдік септікте түрлену мәселелеріне арналған. Авторлар тәуелдік септіктің түрлеріне назар аударады. Олар тәуелдік септіктің аналикалық және синтетикалық түрлерін көрсетеді. Зерттеудің практикалық маңызы ағылшын тіліндегі Elizabeth Gilbert «Eat, Pray, Love» атты заманауи туындыны тәуелдік септіктің аналитикалық және синтетикалық түрлерін салыстыру негізінде анықталған.

Аннотация

Данная статья посвящена проблеме притяжательного падежа в английском языке. Авторы указывают типы притяжательного падежа и способы его выражения – аналитический и синтетический. Практическая значимость исследования состоит в сопоставительном анализе аналитического и синтетического видов притяжательности на основе современного английского произведения Elizabeth Gilbert «Eat, Pray, Love».

Abstract

The given article is devoted to the problem of possessive case in the English language. The authors identify the types of possessive case as well as the ways of its expression – analytical and synthetic. Practical value of the research consists in comparative analysis of analytical and synthetic types of possessiveness on the basis of modern English prose Elizabeth Gilbert “Eat, Pray, Love”.

Түйінді сөздер: *тәуелдік септік, тәуелділік, аналитикалық түрі, синтетикалық түрі.*

Ключевые слова: *притяжательный падеж, притяжательность, аналитическая форма, синтетическая форма.*

Key words: *possessive case, possessiveness, analytical form, synthetic form.*

1. Introduction.

Every language has a mechanism for expressing possession, within a noun phrase and within a clause. Some languages have a dedicated, possessive, construction. Others express possessive meanings through a more general, 'associative', noun phrase. The nature of the Possessor (Pr), of the Possessee (Pe), and of the Relationship between them (PRel) underlies the gamut of cross-linguistic variation. These are intertwined.

Just as every language has a way of expressing possession and similar relations, every society has a way of conceptualizing ownership, and concomitant relations of association and identification. The linguistic expression of possession and ownership often has overtones of power, and control.

In this regard the research of such important type of the relations as possessiveness, gains the special importance as, first, opens a wide range of opportunities of language in the characteristic of these relations; secondly, helps to understand interrelation subtleties in consciousness of the person of the possessive relations and their verbal representative; thirdly, promotes development of the effective instrument of harmonization of interaction between people – at least in aspect of verbalization and interpretation of the relations of possessiveness, satisfying both parties.

2. Materials and methods.

Research supposition consists in the following: examples of expression of possessiveness as *morpheme* - 's(synthetic) and by means of a *pretext of* (analytical) are not equivalent in all cases, sometimes the meaning of the expression with such replacements can be changed considerably.

The material of our research is the novel of modern English author: Elizabeth Gilbert "Eat, pray, love"

Research methods: theoretical - method of the component analysis, systematization, induction; practical - root analysis, qualitative and quantity analysis and functional analysis.

The possessive nominations possess ability to express various meanings, for example, "part, an element of the whole", "abilities", "the social relations", "action", "authorship" and many others. Thus for business communication within a legal framework the pragma-semantic sense plays an important role, in particular that sense of «property". It is formed by the common nouns of concrete subject semantics expressing object of the possessive relation and designating property, for example, by property, ownership, land, house, plant, company, automobile, jewelry, and concretized as "real estate" , "personal estate" and "the capital belonging to the subject" (Daniel Jettka, 2010).

The possessive relation in modern English is represented in language levels Morphological level is presented by **genitive case of a noun and a construction (N's+N)**.

To lexical level we refer verbs denoting possession, for example: to have, to possess, to own, to belong

Syntactic level is presented by construction with of (N of N) (the kindness of the Muellers), a construction with with (N with N) (a man with a small head), a construction: possessive pronoun + a noun (Pos. Pron. + N) (his dignity), construction: noun + noun (N+N) (law student) (Anttila, A., 2004).

In this work we consider 2 ways of expression of possessiveness- analytic and synthetic Synthetical –is formed within the frames of the basic element (word, group of words) by adding some element ('s/').

Analytic-with of-phrase

Here you can see the suggested classification on the basis of learned theory (Kobrina)

- Belonging.
- Denoting relations.
- Measure.
- Part of the whole.

They have following functions of denoting.

- Origin of material.

- Geographic location.
- Blood relations.
- Social relations.
- Quality.
- Object-subject relations.
- Authorship.
- Object relations.

3. Analysis.

The material of our analysis is the modern novel of Elizabeth Gilbert “Eat,pray,love”. This novel is full of interesting psychological characters and also we face with problems of our time.

The book consists of 108 chapters

22 chapters (35 pages) are taken for the analysis

66 examples of sentences are analysed

Let's consider examples on synthetic way

All it really means is that we meet a few evenings a week here in Rome to practice each other's languages.

Classification: **belonging**.

Function: **the attributive function**, as the language cannot be a property of a person, but characterize and specify him under national identity.

The replacement is **impossible**, as with morpheme-s it has some property of an attribute.

I mean we're pressed up against each other's bodies beneath this moonlight... and of course it would be a terrible mistake.

Classification: **belonging**.

Function: **of ownership under “subject-object” criterion**, a person owns his body (viewed as part of the whole).

The replacement is **possible, but not desirable**.

My mother's family were Swedish immigrant farmers,

Classification: **relation**.

Function: **blood relations, denoting family system**.

The replacement is **possible**.

I heard my ex-husband's voice speaking disdainfully in my ear: So this is what you gave up everything for?

Classification: **part of a whole**.

Function: **objective relations**

The replacement is **possible**.

Another long night's sleep ahead of me, with nobody and nothing in my bed except a pile of Italian phrasebooks and dictionaries.

Classification: **measure**.

Function: **the specifying of an object quality** (long night's sleep).

The replacement is **impossible**, as with morpheme-s it has some property of an attribute.

Examples with of phrase-analytic way

In the flickering, candlelit shadows of the Roman cafe, it was impossible to tell whose hands were caress.

Classification: **belonging**.

Function: ownership is expressed in **objective relations**, as the shadow belongs to cafe.

Also we may say about **origin**.

The replacement is **possible, but not justified and equal**.

This part of my story is not a happy one, I know.

Classification: **part of a whole**

Function: **expression of a part of a whole** at the subject relations level.

The replacement is **possible, but not justified**

We had more fun waiting in line together at the Department of Motor Vehicles than most couples have on their honey-moons.

Classification: **relations**.

Function: **Expression of objective relations**

The replacement is **possible**, but not used in such situations.

And she's a really responsible, practical woman – a mother of five from Australia.

Classification: **relations**.

Function: **blood relationship**.

The replacement is **impossible** as we lose the meaning.

My guilt at having left him forbade me from thinking I should be allowed to keep even a dime of the money I'd made in the last decade.

Classification: **measure**.

Function: **Subject-object relations**.

The replacement is **impossible**

4. Results.

We came to the following results

We analysed 66 sentences and within them found 43 examples on analytic way and 30 examples on synthetic.

According to the classification there are 31 examples of relations, 21 of belonging, 19 examples denoting part of the whole and 2 of measure.

Distribution under function origin or material-1 example, geographic location-1, blood relations-4, social relations-5, quality-13, subjective relations-5, attributive 6, objective relations-21.

The possibility to replace morpheme-s with of-phrase

Equal replacement is possible	11
Equal replacement is impossible	9
Replacement is possible, but would lead to the shifting of meaning (not equal)	9

The possibility to replace of-phrase with morpheme-s

Equal replacement is possible	14
Equal replacement is impossible	20
Replacement is possible, but not desirable	7

5. Discussions.

Examples of possessiveness expression with *morpheme-s* are more stable and not often could be equivalently replaced with *of-phrase*. The examples with *of-phrase* have more opportunities in number (but not also always) to be replaced with *morpheme – 's*. Sometimes the replacements are possible, but would lead to meaning shifting and “awkward-to-sound” effect. So, our hypothesis, that analytical and synthetic means of possessiveness expression cannot be always equally replaced, has been proved.

We defined, that possessive noun phrases can usually describe:

(A) ownership (of property);

(B) whole–part relations, including body parts and plant parts;

(C) kinship relations, covering (C1) blood or consanguineal relations, such as ‘mother’ or ‘father’ and (C2) affinal relations, such as ‘spouse’.

6. Conclusion.

Possessive constructions vary depending on the meanings of the Possessor, the Possessee and the Possessive relationship. In the majority a Possessor tends to be animate, or human. A content interrogative often refers just to an animate Possessor. The Possessor is often expressed with a personal pronoun or a proper name (Dixon R., 1991).

The English possessive *-s* clearly began life as an affix, and was still a genitive case morpheme in Old English, existing alongside a variety of genitive case allomorphs distributed according to declensional class. Gradually, the *-s* morpheme spread at the expense of other morphemes (Bittner M., 1996).

After finishing our research, we came to the following conclusions.

The terms, ‘possession’ is somewhat ambiguous. The term “possession” is more or less equivalent to “ownership”. In traditional grammatical usage “possession” and “possessive” are construed much more broadly. The linguistic expression of ‘possession’ within a noun phrase can be viewed as one of the realizations of a broader concept of association or relationship between two nouns or there may be one or more dedicated possessive noun phrase types which cover the core meanings associated with Possessive relationship.

As for functional specifics of the objects, involved in possessive relations most adequately is revealed from the positions of functional lingua - synergetics.

Lingua – synergetics studies language (speech) as not- limited difficult nonlinear self-organizing pragmatic system. In other words, it develops the theory of systemacity of the language and the speech in dynamic aspect. Systemacity is a basic property of the language and the speech thanks to which, even at all variety of speech constructions, implementation of speech communication and mutual understanding between people are possible.

Creation of possessive sense depends not only on semantics of the units expressing subject and object of the possessive relation, but also on discourse system as a whole, and also extralinguistic factors (for example, background knowledge of participants of communication). Interpretation of possessive sense is interesting to that for its formation some cure both one, and different language levels can be used. Semantic types of possession, as we have shown are as follows: Inalienable possession, Alienable possession, Noun-noun compounding.

As for modification, it is a change undergone by a word when used in a construction under influence of another dependent, included in a phrase. We presented the basic semantic characterization of adnominal dependents, excluding quantifiers and determiners: Modification-By-Noun, Attributive modification, Relational adjectives.

Having analyzed the examples from the novel «Eat, Pray, Love» we obtained the following results:

As for the quantitative rate of the analytical and synthetic ways of possession expression, we see, that analytic ways of possession expression – *of-phrase* in our collection of the examples prevail. They are more popular, as they have more flexible structure and could be added not only to a word, but a phrase, word combination, composite words and sentences and besides, could be used doubly in one sentence in succession. As for the ‘s – it is used with more, then one word very rare, as a rule it is added to a single word.

As for the classification of the character of such possessive expressions, they have been distributed under following criteria:

- Relations.
- Belonging.
- Part of a whole.
- Measure.

The majority of the examples belong to the group of “relation”. Within a sentence, as a structure, when expressing possessiveness the main word and subordinate one enter into different interconnections, that are presented by social, blood, subjective and objective relations. So this group is more wide. At the same time, other groups are more limited by only one feature (belonging or ownership, part of a whole, measure).

As for the functions of the possessive phrase – objective and subjective functions are the most frequent, as the components of the possession model usually treat each other as a subject and an object and it depends which of them goes the first.

Also in our analyses we touched the question of a possibility to replace the analytical way by synthetical or vice versa, according to our hypothesis. Examples of possessiveness expression with morpheme-*s* are more stable and not often could be equivalently replaced with *of*-phrase. The examples with *of*-phrase have more opportunities in number (but not also always) to be replaced with morpheme – *'s*. Sometimes the replacements are possible, but would lead to meaning shifting and “awkward-to-sound” effect. So, our hypothesis, that analytical and synthetical means of possessiveness expression cannot be always equally replaced, has been proved.

Perspective of the work. The work could be continued as the attention could be paid not only to the possibility of transferring/non-transferring of the possessiveness, but also to other features of such structures and as a variant to compare the methods of possession constructing in different languages, so called “a cross linguistic analyses”.

References

- Anttila, A. & Fong, V., 2004. Variation, ambiguity, and noun classes in English. In *Lingua*, Vol. 114.
- Bittner, Maria and Ken Hale. 1996. The structural determination of case and agreement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27.
- Daniel Jettka. *Variation in English possessives*, University of Dublin, Hilary Term, 2010.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 1991. *A New Approach to English Grammar, on Semantic Principles*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.