

T. Kovalchuk

THE CATEGORY OF MOOD: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

The category of Mood, being one of the most controversial ones, remains "in the state of making and change" and it "continues to be a tremendously interesting field of analytical observation", M. Y. Blokh [1:202-203] a leading Russian linguist states.

First of all, the fact of existence of a great number of definitions of "mood" confirms the great and constant attention of linguists to the problem. And the definitions of the category of Mood given by different authors show the evolution of understanding of its essence:

The category of Mood is treated by R. W. Pence [6:126] as the quality of the verb which shows how the verb forms are considered.

G. O. Curm defines mood as "the changes in the form of the verb to show the various ways in which the action or state is thought by the speaker" [2:223].

H. Sweet regards the mood of the verb as "grammatical forms expressing different relations between subject and predicate" [7:105].

Opposing H. Sweet's view, O. Jespersen [5:313] argues that mood expresses "certain attitudes of mind of the speaker towards the contents of the sentence" rather than different relations between subject and predicate, as H. Sweet says.

H. Whitehall suggests the following definition: "Mood establishes the speaker's or writer's mood about the actuality of a happening" [8:81].

The Russian academician V. V. Vinogradov [11:472] also, connecting the category of Mood with morphological characteristics of the verb, stresses that

it is a grammatical category in the system of the verb which shows the modality of the action, i. e. it denotes the attitude of the action towards the reality as established by the speaker.

The above mentioned definitions of the category of Mood show that starting with a narrow, restricted consideration of only paradigmatic forms of the verb through comprehension of the meaning, which these forms have in the sentence, linguistics has come to realization of the role of these forms for expressing modality.

The number of moods in English is also a matter of argument. Distinguished by different theoreticians, it varies from two (H. Sweet, L. S. Barkhudarov, D. A. Shteling) to sixteen (M. Deutschbein).

What is the Subjunctive Mood? What are its forms and classification?

The answers of different researchers to these questions greatly depend on their approaches to the analyses of the problem: the functional (semantic) or the formal (categoric).

Thus, O. G. Curm writes: "The function of the subjunctive is to present something not as an actual reality, but as formed in the mind of the speaker as a desire, wish, volition, plan, conception, thought, sometimes with more or less hope of realization, or, in the case of a statement, with more or less belief; sometimes with little or no hope or faith" [2:225]. The author speaks of two entirely different forms of the Subjunctive: the old simple forms and the new ones (the combination of the modal verbs with the infinitive). O. G. Curm divides the Subjunctive into "Optative" to express a desired, demanded or required action and "Potential" to express, on the one hand, a mere conception of the mind that may be a reality and, on the other hand, something that is contrary to reality. Thus, the researcher considers the forms of the Indicative as well as combinations of different modal verbs with the infinitive to be the Subjunctive.

G. Sweet [7:106] subdivides «Thought-mood» into «Conditional Mood» (should/ would + infinitive), «Permissive Mood» (may/might + infinitive) and «Compulsive Mood» (the combination of the verb to be with the supine). The distinction of synthetic and analytic forms by G. Sweet was really a great progress but the forms coinciding with these of Past Perfect were not included in his classification.

O. Jespersen includes only the old synthetic forms into the sphere of the Subjunctive. The author calls the forms of the Indicative with the meaning of unreality, impossibility "imaginative tenses or tenses of imagination" [4:112]. Thus, the scientist doesn't mention the analytical forms of the Subjunctive.

R. W. Zandvoort [9:101] subdivides the Subjunctive into "Optative" to express wish, "Potential" – possibility and "Irrealis" – unreality. The forms should/would/might + infinitive, called "Modal Preterit", are included into his classification.

There's a great diversity of opinion as to the problem of the Subjunctive among native scholars.

A. I. Smirnitskiy [13:343-352] distinguishes Subjunctive I (actions that are problematic but not contradicting reality), Subjunctive II (actions that are contrary to reality), Suppositional (should/ would + infinitive with any subject) and Conditional (analytical forms should / would in the main clause of the conditional sentence). M. Ganshina and N. Vasilevskaya [3:163-172] also follow this classification.

As we see, Subjunctive I and Suppositional both express problematic actions but not contradicting reality, and Subjunctive II and Conditional represent actions as contrary to reality. The form of Subjunctive I differs from Suppositional only as a synthetic form from an analytic one. The same is true of Subjunctive II and Conditional. To say differently, they have different forms but express one and the same meaning. Thus, according to this classification, there are four moods expressing only two shades of the same modal meaning of supposition, but the forms expressing the same meaning can belong to only one grammatical category. Thus, we should not speak of different moods but about different forms of one and the same mood.

I. B. Hlebnikova confirms the existence of a clear category of the Subjunctive Mood in English which she subdivides into two types: Conditional (analytic forms) and Subjunctive (synthetic forms). The author emphasizes that they both are the varieties of one and the same category and they are not opposed to each other but "сополагаются в единой микросхеме" [14:186].

B. A. Ilyish [12:134-145] tries to analyze the category of mood from the point of view of its semantic and formal features. He distinguishes four general meanings: inducement, possibility, unreal condition and consequence of unreal condition. Thus, either three moods can be counted (if the meanings of unreal condition and consequence of unreal condition are united into one) or only two ones (if the latter three meanings are joined under one general title "unreal action"). But if the ways of expression are taken into account we shall find as many as six moods (including Imperative) which proves B. A. Ilyish doesn't suggest any definite classification. L. S. Barkhudarov and D. A. Shteling's is an outermost position in the attempt to solve the problem of English mood. They distinguish only two moods: Indicative and Subjunctive. The latter of which is subdivided into Subjunctive I and Subjunctive II. The Imperative and the Conjunctive are treated as forms outside the category of mood [10:115-120].

The analyses of different theories and conceptions as to the problem of the Subjunctive mood in English undertaken by native and foreign linguists confirms, on the one hand, the complexity and the variety of the phenomenon itself and, on the other hand, show that there is no unanimity in the treatment of this category as a whole and its individual manifestations. Thus, the constant

and firm interest of scholars to the Subjunctive Mood can be explained by the urge “to remove” the existent contradictions. And one of the possible ways of learning and studying this many-sided phenomenon is seen in the solution of the following concrete aims:

- make up a complete list of forms which are referred to the category of the Subjunctive Mood.

- study the concrete usage of the given forms in varied functional types of texts.

- reveal typical features and models the semantic-syntactic structures of utterances referred to as the Subjunctive Mood.

- define the essential grammatical content of the structures and the forms of the Subjunctive Mood, and determine the interdependence between each of the forms and their content.

1. **Blokh M. Y.** Theoretical English Grammar. — M., 1983.
2. **Curme O. G.** A Grammar of the English Language. — Boston -NY. — 1935. — Vol. 2.
3. **Ganshina M. A., Vasilevskaya N. M.** English Grammar. — M., 1964.
4. **Jespersen O.** A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. — Heidelberg, 1931. — Part IV. — Vol. 3; Jespersen O. The Philosophy of Grammar. — London, 1951 (f. p. 1924).
5. **Pence P. W., Emery D. W.** A Grammar of Present — Day English. — N. Y., 1963.
5. **Sweet H.** A New English Grammar, Logical and Historical. — Oxford University Press, 1955 (f. ed. 1891). — Part I.
6. **Whitehall H.** Structural Essentials of English. — N. Y., 1956.
7. **Zandvoort R. W.** A Handbook of English Grammar. — London:Gronigen, 1948.
8. **Бархударов Л. С., Штелинг Д. А.** Грамматика английского языка. — М., 1973.
9. **Виноградов В. В.** Русский язык: Грамматическое учение о слове. — М.-Л., 1986.
10. **Ильиш Б. А.** Строй современного английского языка. — Л., 1971.
11. **Смирницкий А. И.** Морфология английского языка. — М., 1959,
12. **Хлебникова И. Б.** Некоторые вопросы теории наклонения в современном английском языке // Вопросы филологии. — 1962. — Вып. 1.