5.   *восклицательное предложение (Ausrufesatz, Exklamativsatz).*

Содержательный и формальный аспекты являются основой классификации немецких лингвистов Г.Гельбих и Й. Буша, которые также выделяют пять видов предложений: *Aussagesatz, Fragesatz, Aufforderungssatz, Wunschsatz, Ausrufesatz* [7, с. 610]. Под содержательным планом они понимают модальность выражения, а к формальным показателям относят интонационные, морфосинтаксические и лексические средства. Авторы справедливо отмечают, что формальные и содержательные показатели необязательно должны находиться в полном соответствии друг другу.

В советской лингвистике традиционным считалась классификация предложений по цели высказывания, где назывались три основных типа предложений: *повествовательные (Aussagesätze), вопросительные (Fragesätze), побудительные предложения (Befehlsätze).* При этом отмечалось, что каждый вид предложения характеризуется определенной моделью, количеством и типами структурных элементов, связью и интонацией [8, с. 247]. По мнению О. И. Москальской формы предложения следует рассматривать в рамках его парадигмы, базирующейся на трех синтаксических категориях. Выделяемые автором повествовательная, вопросительная и побудительная формы предложения образуют оппозицию *категории коммуникативной целенаправленности.* К средствам выражения каждой формы относятся интонация, порядок слов и грамматическая форма глагола [3, с. 244].

Суммируя вышесказанное, следует сказать, что лингвисты продолжают заниматься поисками дефиниций, вскрывающих сущность предложения как единицы языка и речи. Коммуникативная функция предложения признается одной из ведущих. Дальнейшая разработка коммуникативной направленности и коммуникативных типах предложения потребует новых глубоких исследований и откроет новые возможности всестороннего анализа предложения.

Источники и литература
1. Абрамов Б. А. Теоретическая грамматика немецкого языка. Сопоставительная типология немецкого и русского языков: Учеб. для студ.вузов /Под ред. Н. Н.Семенюк, О. А.Радченко, Л. И. Гришаевой. – М.: Гуманти.изд.центр ВЛАДОС, 2001.
2. Paul H. Deutsche Grammatik. Bde. I-V. Halle (Saale), 1955.; Schmidt W. Grundfragen der deutschen Grammatik: Eine Einführung in die funktionale Sprachlehre. – Berlin, 1988.
3. Москальская О. И. Теоретическая грамматика немецкого языка для ин-тов и фак-тов иностр.яз. Учебник – 3-е изд., испр.и доп. – М.: Высш.шк., 1983.
4. Engel U. Syntax der deutschen Gegenwartssprache/von Ulrich Engel. – 2., überarb. Aufl. – Berlin: E. Schmidt, 1982
5. Duden, Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache/hrsg. von der Dudenredaktion. Bearb. von Peter Eisenberg.– 6., neu bearb. Aufl.– Mannheim; Leipzig; Wien; Zürich: Dudenverlag, 1998.
6. Gross H. Einführung in die germanistische Linguistik/ Harro Gross.– 2. Aufl. – München: Iudicum–Verl.,1990.
7. Helbig G., Buscha J. Deutsche Grammatik. Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht.– Leipzig; Berlin; München; Wien; Zürich; New York: Langenscheidt, Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1999
8. Шендельс Е.И. Практическая грамматика немецкого языка. Учебник. – М.: Высш. школа, 1979.

Tatyana I. DOMBROVAN
THE ENGLISH PREPOSITION 'BY' FROM A COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVE

Cognitive linguistics as an integral part of cognitive science is a particular approach to the study of language 'which tries to interpret linguistic structures and categories in terms of our perception and experience of the world' [18, p.45]. Since language is a part of overall cognitive organization, the grammar of a given language should be conceived of as a complex unity of numerous approaches to the study of language – formal, generative, transformational, functional, cognitive etc. From a cognitive perspective, grammar is not so much constructive, for 'the expressions of a language do not constitute a well–defined, algorithmically computable set» [10, p.5], but is a system of symbolic units incorporating semantic and phonological structure with lexicon, morphology, and syntax, forming 'a continuum of symbolic structures' [ibidem]. Put differently, grammar describes 'the mappings from cognitive space into syntactic structures' [16, p.1].

It is often assumed that semantic cases (also: theta–roles) are cognitive categories. According to W.Wilkins, theta–roles are 'components of the mental representation of objects and concepts' [19, p.191–2]. I.Schlesinger points out that case categories exist in cognition independently of language, presumably also prior to language and that the linguistic system then makes use of these independently existing categories [16, p.1]. This is, probably, what Ch.Fillmore had in mind when he wrote: 'The case notions comprise a set of universal, presumably innate, concepts which identify certain types of judgements human beings are capable of making about the events that are going on around them, judgements about such matters as who did it, who it happened to, and what got changed' [5, p.24].

There is no unanimity among linguists as to the amount and nomenclature of theta–roles. Thus D.Napoli distinguishes the following five thematic roles of arguments of a proposition: agent, theme, benefactive (or recipient), instrumental, and experiencer [12, p.102–3]. P.Sgall claims that the repertoire of arguments, or theta roles, is limited to the following five kinds: Actor, Patient (Objective), Addressee, Origin and Effect, while 'the repertory of complementations itself (i.e. of kinds of the dependency relation) comprises at least about 40 units'[17, p.16]. T. Givón writes about seven typical semantic roles, namely: agent, patient, dative, instrument, benefactive, locative, associative [7, p.92]. In his 'A Student's Dictionary of Language and Linguistics' (1997, p. 45) R.Trask defines eleven thematic roles – actor, agent, beneficiary, comitative, experiencer, goal, instrument, patient, recipient, resultative, and theme, while R.Quirk and co–authors speak of thirteen semantic roles, namely: affected, agentive, attribute, cognate, eventive, external causer, instrument, (prop) *it,* locative, positioner, recipient, resultant, temporal [14, p.754]. M.Halliday's classification includes fourteen key participants of the proposition: actor, goal, behaver, senser, phenomenon, sayer, target, token, value, carrier, attribute, identified, identifier, existent [8, p.131]. In spite of different approaches to studying semantic roles, resulting in different classifications of the latter, most linguists agree that thematic functions have an important role to play in any adequate description of certain areas of natural language Syntax, Semantics, and Morphology and that 'sentences have a thematic structure which is in large measure independent of their categorial constituent structure' [15, p.378].

It is often assumed that not all words are participants in some event, so not all words will get theta–roles [12, p.120]. This explains why prepositions (and other functional parts of speech) are usually referred to as thematically non–labeled words. Functional words are said to have a grammatical meaning; whether they have a lexical meaning remains disputable. Our own experience allows us to join those linguists who claim that both prepositions and conjunctions have a lexical meaning, and are NOT semantically empty words. Functional words are WORDS, not morphemes, and it is generally accepted among linguists that every word always has a definite lexical meaning. As A.Hornby rightly puts it, 'a word in isolation is a dead word. It comes to life when it occurs in a sentence' [3, p.V–VI]. This statement can fully be applied to prepositions as well. What is the semantic volume, say, of the preposition *by* ? It is only in the context that the preposition reveals not only its connective (relational) function but its own semantic contents as well.

The object of this article is to outline the cognitive space of the preposition *by*. The material for the investigation was taken from five single language dictionaries of contemporary English. The choice of dictionary entries for analysis can be justified by the fact that a dictionary entry gives the full and most consistent description of a word in all aspects of its existence in a language. Compare: 'Language dictionaries try to reflect knowledge of the people who use this language' [1, p.202].

Etymological information about the preposition *by* gives us every ground to consider this preposition as polysemantic as far as in the early written period of the English language; this is also supported by our observations of the usage of the preposition *by* in Old English texts.

Etymologically, the preposition *by* goes back through the Middle English form *bi* to the Old English form *bī,* meaning *'by the side of, near, from, after, according to'* and is akin to Old Frisian and Old Scandinavian *bī* (or *bi)* 'by', Old High German *bī,* German *bei,* Gothic *bi* 'around, about, by'. The Indo–European etymon would be **ambhi,* variant **umbhi,* often, perhaps even at that stage, shortened to **bhi* [13, p.66]. It is assumed that the modern preposition *by* expresses a relation of functional connection and result which determines its wide use in passive constructions [2, p.53–54]. However, the use of the preposition *by* in active constructions is but a common thing in the English language.

Let us consider the following sentences [20]:

(1) He walked by the church:
(2) They sell eggs by the dozen ;
(3) He travels by airplane ;
(4) The house was destroyed by the fire ;
(5) She did well by her seven children.

In these sentences the preposition *by* is used in different senses, hence bearing different semantic (thematic) loading. In sentence (1) the preposition *by* introduces the noun phrase *the church* and, apparently, has a theta role of Locative. The theta role of Locative is heterogeneous as to its structure, for it can be further subdivided into Source (the identifying question is *where from?),* Destination//Direction (the identifying questions are *where to? Where by? Where?),* Location proper (the identifying question is *where?),* and Distance (the identifying question is *how far?).* Moreover, Ch.Fillmore considers Location proper as consisting of three concepts – simple location, surface location and interior location, each of which is introduced by a different preposition: 'Location of something in contact with a surface calls for the preposition *on.* Simple location, with no reference to surface or interior, calls for *at.* The word 'surface' is perhaps not too apt, since what I have in mind includes a line, as in *on the line, on the edge, on the border* etc' [6, p.30]. When reference is made to interior, the preposition *in* is used. Ch.Fillmore says nothing as to the preposition *by,* perhaps, because of the polysemantic structure of the latter.

In sentence (2) the preposition *by* followed by the noun *dozen* contributes to the realization of the concept 'Measure//Quantity' whereas in sentence (3) *by* in combination with *airplane* conceptualizes 'Means//Method'. In revealing the meaning of the preposition *by* a great role is played by the context and contextual surrounding of the analyzed element. Obviously, followed by nouns denoting measurements and/or quantity such as *the metre, the dozen, the kilo, the yard, the gallon, half (as* in: *larger by half)* etc, the preposition *by* is used to show measurements and/or amounts, e.g.

(6) Their wages were increased by 12% ;
(7) These telephones have sold by the thousand;
(8) We buy milk by the gallon ;
(9) We measured the cloth by the yard:
(10) sell cloth by the metre// eggs by the dozen.

When used before nouns denoting means of transports, such as *ship, plane, train, boat* etc, the preposition *by* is used to denote a method/means of moving from one place/position to another, e.g.

(11) They travelled across Europe by train/car;
(12) Wouldn't it be quicker to go by train rather than by car ?

Apparently, theta–roles within a sentence are determined by the predicate verb valency frames both on the semantic and the syntactic levels of language. Thus, the theta–role of Location and that of Means//Method are called for by verbs belonging to the semantic group 'Movement//Motion', while the semantic role Measure//Quantity is found with verbs of 'buying–selling' and 'measurement'. However, predicate verbs which can be used in sentences like (4) are practically unlimited in number and belong to the semantic class of 'Action' verbs (though some 'State' verbs are allowed here too), which are used transitively and in the passive voice form. The **by**–phrase in sentences like (4) conceptualizes the doer of the action: either the External Cause, if inanimate, as in (13) and (14), or the Agent, if animate, as in (15) and (16), e.g.

(13) He was killed by lightning;
(14) We were amazed by what she told us;
(15) The motorcycle was driven by a tiny bald man:
(16) The accident was regretted by all concerned?

In these sentences the **by**–phrase syntactically functions as a prepositional object while in 'active voice' transforms the theta–role External Cause//Agent shifts to the subject position, e.g.

(17) a. He was killed by lightning → *Lightning killed him.*
b. We were amazed by what she told us. → *What she told us amazed us.*
c.The motorcycle was driven by a tiny bald man. → *A tiny bald man drove the motorcycle.*
d.The accident was regretted by all concerned. → *All concerned regretted the accident.*

As we have already mentioned, practically any transitively used verb can be met in passive constructions with the **by**–phrase. However, in sentences like (5) the number of possible verbs to be used is restricted to only one – *do,* followed by an evaluative adverb, e.g.

(18) He did well by his family?
(19) If you do well or badly by someone, you treat them well or badly.

The meaning of the preposition *by* in such sentences is defined like 'in relation to, with respect to, regarding, concerning'[9, p.135], and the theta–role of the **by**–phrase in (5), (18), (19) can be labelled as Beneficiary, for the *by*–phrase here identifies the person(s) for whose benefit//harm something is done.

So far we have determined five theta–roles of the **by**–phrase: Location, Measure//Quantity, Means//Method, External Cause//Agent, and Beneficiary. Now, let us consider another set of sentences:

(20) They all work by the rules: to go by the rules:
(21) The sun shines by the dav:
(22) *The bridge was supposed to have been completed by 1992*

In (20) the preposition *by* is used in the meaning 'according to, on the evidence or authority of' and is usually followed by the noun phrase *the rules*. The identifying questions for the **by**–phrase in (20) are *How? In what way?* which means that in this use the **by**–phrase is conceptualizing the manner in which the action of the head verb is performed. Thus, the semantic role of the **by**–phrase in (20) is Manner.

In (21) and (22) the semantic role of the prepositional phrase is determined as Temporal though the latter doesn't seem to be homogeneous. We distinguish between time periods (as in (21)) and time points (as in (22)), the identifying questions for which being *How long?* and *When?* respectively. Additionally, we can also speak about frequency of the event but this has nothing to do with the *by–phrase*. In (21) the preposition *by* is synonymous to 'during the course of,' while in (22) it is similar to 'before or at a particular time but not after it' .

Thus, preliminary results show that the preposition *by* is polysemantic and introduces phrases with different semantic (cognitive) loading. The typical theta–roles of the **by**–phrase are the following: 1) Locative; 2) Measure// Quantity; 3) Means//Method; 4) External Cause//Agent; 5) Beneficiary; 6) Manner; and 7) Temporal. The order in which the semantic roles are given here agrees with the order in which they are dealt with in the text of analysis and does not correspond either to their frequency rate or to the structure of dictionary entries for *by.* The theta–roles of the **by** –phrases, outlined in this article, make up the semantic paradigm of the preposition *by* and allow us to look upon the preposition not only as a function word. We do not claim that the list of the theta–roles for the preposition *by,* given above, is complete and irrefutable; yet, the research can be continued on a greater scale of language material (e.g. on texts belonging to different functional styles with further investigation of the dependence, if any, of the semantics of the analyzed unit on the stylistic characteristics of the text, aiming at establishing the theta–roles hierarchy based on the frequency rate of the latter, etc).

REFERENCES
1. Мостовий М Л. Лексикологія англійської мови. – Харків: Основа, 1993.
2. Рейман Е. А. Английские предлоги: значения и функции. – Л.: ЛО Наука, 1982.
 3. Хорнби А. С. Учебный словарь современного английского языка. – М.: Просвещение, 1984.
4. Cambridge International Dictionary of English. – Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995.
5. Fillmore, Ch.J.   The case for case // Eds. E.Bach and R.T.Harms. Universals in Linguistic Theory. – N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
6. Fillmore, Ch.J. Lectures on Deixis. – Stanford, California: CSLI Publications, 1997.
7. Givón, T. English Grammar: A Function–based Introduction. ~ Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993. – Vol.1.
8. Halliday, M.A.K. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. – L.: Edward Arnold Publ. House, 1985.
9. Halsey, W.D. (ed.) Scribner Dictionary. – Glencoe: Scribner Educational Publ., a division of Macmillan Inc., 1986.
10. Langacker, R.W. An overview of cognitive grammar // Topics in Cognitive Linguistics / Ed. by B. Rudzka–Ostyn. – Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988.
11. Longman Language Activator. – Harlow: Longman, 1993.
12. Napoli, D.J.   Syntax: Theory and Problems. – N.Y.; Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993.
13. Partridge, E. Origins:A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English. – L., Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.
14. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J.   A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. – L.; N.Y.: Longman, 1993.
15. Radford, A. Transformational Grammar: A First Course. — Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1995.
16. Schlesinger, I.M. Cognitive Space and Linguistic Case. – Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.
17. Sgall, P. Revisiting the classification of the dependents (Interesting results and tempting topics for further research) // Issues of Valency and Meaning. Studies in Honour of Jarmila Panevova / Ed. by E. Hajicova. – Prague: Charles Univ. Press, 1998.
18. Trask, R.L. A Student's Dictionary of Language and Linguistics. – L., N.Y., Sydney, Auckland: Edward Arnold Publ.House, 1997.
19. Wilkins, W.   Thematic structure and reflexivization // W.Wilkins (ed.) Syntax and Semantics. – Vol. XXI: Thematic relations. – an Diego: Academic Press, 1988.
20. The World Book Dictionary / Ed. by G.L.Barnhart and R.K.Barnhart. – Vol.I–Chicago: Doubleday @ Co. Igc, 1978.

Дорофеева М. С.
ИНФОРМАЦИОННАЯ АСИММЕТРИЯ В НЕМЕЦКОЙ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ РЕЧИ
(НА МАТЕРИАЛЕ ВЫСТУПЛЕНИЙ ФЕДЕРАЛЬНОГО КАНЦЛЕРА ФРГ А. МЕРКЕЛЬ)

Информационная асимметрия коммуникации вообще и политического выступления в частности, является основным элементом воздействия на массовое сознание адресатов сообщения. Именно на асимметричности подаваемой информации основывается эффект изменения картины реальных событий в сознании слушателей. *Целью* настоящей статьи является рассмотрение коммуникативных стратегий и установление набора языковых