

12. *Апресян, Ю. Д.* Экспериментальное исследование семантики русского глагола / Ю. Д. Апресян. – М. : Наука, 1967. – 252 с.
13. *Падучева, Е. В.* Динамические модели в семантике лексики / Е. В. Падучева. – М. : Языки слав. культуры, 2004. – 608 с.
14. *Михайлова, О. А.* Ограничения в лексической семантике русского слова : дис. ... д-ра филол. наук : 10.02.01 / О. А. Михайлова. – Екатеринбург, 1998. – 270 л.
15. *Филлмор, Ч.* Об организации семантической информации в словаре / Ч. Филлмор // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. – М., 1983. – Вып. 14 : Проблемы и методы лексикографии. – С. 52–92.

The article focuses on the problem of subject representation in the meaning of English and Russian dynamic verbs. Two ways of representation are distinguished – through a prototype subject incorporated in a concrete seme and through attributive characteristics of a subject presented as differential semantic features. In the English lexicon a special group of verbs, derived from names of a doer, is singled out as verbs with outer subject prototype.

**Z. G. Borbély**

Budapest, Balassi Institute

#### MEANS OF CONVEYING ENGLISH PASSIVE STRUCTURES INTO HUNGARIAN

Рассматриваются способы передачи английских пассивных конструкций на венгерский язык, в котором отсутствует понятие «страдательный залог». Такие способы предполагают использование бессубъектных структур венгерского языка, включающих причастие в функции обстоятельства и вспомогательный глагол. Приводятся примеры бессубъектных структур на венгерском языке.

Ways of conveying English passive structures into Hungarian is an actual problem in the translation process when we face English texts. Interpreting is a huge industry, texts should be consequent and correctly translated, and the interpreters need exact rules to follow, what makes the work efficient and economical.

But there are two main reasons, why it is worth to talk about passive in Hungarian: on the one hand, there is the expectation of quality work by interpreting, and on the other hand, it is a necessity in every language to use impersonal constructions if the speaker wants to stress the object of the action, and not the doer. And here arises a problem as Hungarian does not have the notion of a passive voice

In general, how is it possible to avoid specifying the agent? There are two main opportunities to do that (table 1).

Table 1

## Means of specifying the agent in English

Impersonal structures	Passive voice
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General agent: Sg2, P11, P13</li> <li>• By-phrase</li> <li>• Impersonal passive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Past participle</li> <li>• Thematic rules: actual agent – actual object/thematic agent – thematic patient</li> </ul>

As you see, if I mention passive voice, I am talking about constructions where Past participle appears and the grammatical object and the grammatical subject change their places, but the thematic roles remain. For example: *The teacher gave a book to all of us.* → *We were all given a book by the teacher.*

If we consider Hungarian, there is no passive voice where Past participle appears, there is no active-passive system, there could not be appropriate transformation. But there are some possibilities to interpret the English/Indo-European passive (table 2).

Table 2

## Means of specifying agentless structures in Hungarian

Impersonal	Passive: morphological and syntactical
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General agent: Sg3, P11, P12, P13</li> </ul> <p><i>Mindenki követ el hibát. We all make mistakes.</i></p> <p><i>Elvitték minden pénzemet. They took all my money.</i></p> <p><i>Sosem tudhatjuk... You can never know...</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infinitive</li> </ul> <p><i>Dohányozni tilos. Smoking is forbidden.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medial</li> </ul> <p><i>Sötétedik. It is getting dark.</i></p>	<p><i>The problem is being solved.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• -atik/-etik, -tatik/-tetik</li> </ul> <p><i>A probléma megoldatik.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• -ódik/-ődik</li> </ul> <p><i>A probléma megoldódik.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adverbial participle</li> </ul> <p><i>A probléma meg van oldva.</i></p>

As can be seen from table 2, there are many ways for conveying the English passive into Hungarian. I would like to present the last one on that list above, the most interesting, the most problematic and the most creative one: The adverbial participle with the auxiliary verb *to be*.

This construction has been judged as Germanism, at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, it cannot be true, because it is made of the adverbial participle, not of the past participle. It must be an original Hungarian or Finno-Ugric construction, because it can be found by the Hanti and Mansi, who are our closest relatives [1]. It occurs in the correspondence and in the oeuvre of the greatest Hungarian writer, who also defended it in several articles.

We are insecure using it, because it was marked as wrong, and in the last 150 years it was pursued in the school and culture – more or less.

Linguists have been dealing with it from time to time and it was an agreement that this construction can be used to describe states [2]. But this is not working, because some versions answer the question: *What happened?* [3].

For the same reason, linguists made up the rule, that only adverbial participles made of transitive verbs can be used creating this construction. But it is also not working, because there are some common exceptions when the base is an intransitive verb: for example, when the so called passive structure has some more exact meaning than the corresponding active phrase. Consider the examples:

*Eltutaztam. "I was travelling."*

*El **vagyok** utazva. "I am away."*

This second variant with an adverbial participle and auxiliary verb implies that I am still not at home at the moment of the talking.

This 'more exact' meaning can be the key to using the structure, although it is still hard to identify and to give an exact rule to the speakers. There are interesting semantic options to find something grammatical and ungrammatical [4; 5].

- When we speak about an actual thing, this phrases are correct:

*A könyv el **van** olvasva. "The book has been read."*

- When it is not an actual thing, the phrase can be false:

*\*A történet el **van** olvasva. "The story has been read."*

- When the object is completely destroyed this construction cannot be used:

*\*A lufi ki **van** lyukadva. \*"The balloon is holed.", "There is a hole in the balloon."*

- When the object is just damaged, the construction is perfect:

*A zokni ki **van** lyukadva. \*"The socks are holed." "The socks are tattered."*

It is worth researching this construction, it has great potential in expressing ourselves and also in interpreting foreign languages. It can be used to convey the different aspects in verb pairs in English, like: *get arrested – has been arrested*, or *get married – has been married*, and it is perfect to convey the two different passive voices in German, 'Zustandspassiv' (state passive) and 'Vorgangspassiv' (process passive).

The Hungarian language generally focuses on the result of an action and not its temporal procession. There is a telic-atelic opposition instead of a perfect-imperfect [6]. That is the reason for this adverbial construction, and that is why we can use it very well, but not only for describing states.

The problem with this construction propounds two main questions:

- What kind of linguistic would we like to have? Prescriptive linguistics, which gives us rules and strict orders, however this can be false and can lead to autocracy and damage in the language, or just descriptive linguistics, which is only observing the language without giving guidelines to keep our lingual culture. Where is the ideal balance between the two approaches?

- The other question is set up from the teacher's view: if this construction means so much trouble, in which form and on what level should I teach it to my students?

## LITERATURE

1. Szepesy, Gy. Nyelvi babonák / Gy. Szepesy. – Gondolat Kiadó, 1986. – C. 20–57.
2. Grétsy, L. Nyelvművelő Kézikönyv I / L. Grétsy, M. Kovalovszky. – Budapest : Akadémiai Kiadó, 1983. – 820.o.
3. Kiefer, F. Jelentéelmélet / F. Kiefler. – Corvina Kiadó. – C. 210–212.
4. Alberti, G. Passzivizálási művelet a magyarban / G. Alberti // Büky L., Maleczki M. Néprajz és Nyelvtudomány XXXVII. Acta Universitas Szegediensis de Attila József Nominatae. Sectio Ethnografica et Linguistica. – Szeged, 1996. – C. 7–46. – 34.o.
5. Kertész, J. Eseményszerkezet, aspektus, mondatszerkezet. Szakdolgozat / J. Kertész. – ELTE BTK : 2005.
6. Szili, K. A perfekтивitás mibenlétéről a magyar nyelvben a *meg* igekötő funkciói kapcsán / K. Szili // Magyar Nyelv. – 2001. – 268.o.

This article tries to answer the question of how it is possible to interpret the English and Indo-European passive constructions into Hungarian – although there is no active-passive correlation. The basic idea is to introduce the non-agent structures of Hungarian, focusing on the adverbial participle with the auxiliary verb *van*. Examples of the agentless sentences in Hungarian are given and the selected construction is considered in the historical frame.

**В. М. Гапеева**

Мінск, МДЛУ

## СЕМАНТЫКА І ПРАГМАТЫКА ВЫКЛІЧНІКАЎ У КАНТРАСТЫЎНЫМ АСПЕКЦЕ: ДА ПЫТАННЯ КЛАСІФІКАЦЫІ

В работе рассматриваются подходы белорусских и зарубежных лингвистов к проблеме междометий с точки зрения выделения их как класса и дальнейших классификаций. Автор сравнивает таксономические основания различных авторов и дает им критическую оценку. Особое внимание уделено группам, базирующимся на семантическом критерии, и, в частности, волеизъявительным интеръективам. Также автор рассматривает междометия как особый феномен, где соприкасаются семантика и прагматика, актуализируя проблематику сосуществования и разграничения семантического и прагматического значений языковых единиц.

Знаходзячыся на перыферыі тыповых граматычных класаў і валодаючы размытай і залежнай ад кантэксту семантыкай, выклічнікі утвараюць асаблівы клас, скаладанасць і нявызначанасць якога спараджае актыўнасць навуковай думкі і разгортвае новыя магчымыя ракурсы і падыходы да лінгвістычных адзінак. Выклічнікі выступаюць тым феноменам, які, сярод іншага, выяўляе вастрывню семантыка-прагматычнага падзелу, калі значэнне прысутнічае як такое і не залежыць (або залежыць не цалкам) ад кантэксту і калі яно з’яўляецца вынікам ўжывання адзінкі ў пэўным кантэксце. «Аспекты мовы, якія кантэкстуальна звязаныя, з’яўляюцца такім чынам не пытаннем значэння, але ўжывання/узуса» [1, р. 76]. А. Вежбіцкая адзначае,