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ABSTRACT
The paper contains a description of the formal differences and similarities in the structure of English and Ruthenian verb constructions. It can be said that Ruthenian verb constructions are mainly formed synthetically, whereas English verb constructions are mainly formed analytically. The use of auxiliaries in English compensates for the sparseness of flexion. There are five auxiliaries in English verb constructions (BE, DO, HAVE, SHALL, WILL) whereas there is only one auxiliary in Ruthenian (БУЦ). Although the author mostly pays attention to the active verb constructions in the study, the passive verb constructions are included as well. The results may serve as a starting point for further contrastive investigations. The results can be used in teaching English in the Ruthenian speaking area and in teaching Ruthenian in the English speaking area as well as in translating both from English into Ruthenian and from Ruthenian into English.

Introduction
Generally speaking, the subject of this paper is morphological and syntactic contrastive analysis of English and Ruthenian. Emphasis is placed on the relations prevailing between morphosyntactic components and our attention is paid to the verb phrases in the grammatical systems of the Ruthenian and English languages. Some of the morphosyntactic characteristics of English and Ruthenian languages are visible in simple sentences. For ex. instead of English I write and I love the Ruthenian equivalents are both я пишем, я любим and пишем, любим. Whereas the subject (nouns, pronouns, NPs) expression is compulsory in English, in Ruthenian it is not the case. The concept of the first person singular in the Ruthenian language can be expressed by a noun phrase or by the verb morpheme {м}. This morpho-syntactic difference between the two languages is caused by the loss of flexion in English. If we take into consideration the possibility of changing the order of verbal elements in Ruthenian (for ex. the Ruthenian equivalents for English I wrote are: in main clauses Я писал and Писалом; in subordinate clauses Кедсомписал) we can distinguish two significant characteristics of the Ruthenian verbal system: the ability of varying...
constructions and free order of elements within constructions. On the other hand, the English verbal system is characterized by a greater degree of fixedness.

There are two analytical inflectional verb forms in both languages. According to traditional Ruthenian grammars, they are called the Present and the Perfect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Perfect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Япишем</td>
<td>я писал / писалсом</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ти пишеш</td>
<td>титисал / типисали</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Вон пише</td>
<td>вонписал</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Вонапише</td>
<td>вонаписала</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Вонопише</td>
<td>вонописал</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Митишеме</td>
<td>митисали / писались</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Витишее</td>
<td>витисали / писалице</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Вонитиш</td>
<td>вонитисали</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the subject is not expressed in the Perfect, the presence of the auxiliary БУЦ, that is its forms (сом,ши,зме,цє) is obligatory.

According to traditional English grammars, the two analytical inflectional verb forms are called the Present Simple Tense and the Simple Past Tense:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present Simple Tense</th>
<th>Simple Past Tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I write</td>
<td>I wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you write</td>
<td>you wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he writes</td>
<td>he wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she writes</td>
<td>she wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it writes</td>
<td>it wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we write</td>
<td>we wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you write</td>
<td>you wrote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they write</td>
<td>they wrote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unlike the Ruthenian forms, the English forms are not synthetic in interrogative and negative sentences. They become analytic and presence of the forms of the auxiliary DO – do/does or did – is obligatory. For ex. I do not write, Do you write?; I did not write, Did you write?

On the basis of verb functioning in the verb phrase anglists distinguish two main groups of verbs.
The first group consists of verbs that are called differently: main verbs (Leech & Svartvik, 1988: 242), full verbs (Palmer, 1988: 19; Quirk et al, 1991: 96), lexical verbs (Quirk & Greenbaum, 1998: 26), notional verbs (Nesfield, 1956: 53), and sometimes ordinary (Thomson & Martinet, 1990: 105). For the purposes of this paper the most acceptable term is lexical verbs.

Based on the criteria that were used by H. E. Palmer and F. T. Blendford for anomalous finite verbs and based on four basic transformations used by N. Chomsky, F. R. Palmer introduces four criteria applicable to this type of verbs (Palmer, 1988: 18-25). The first criterion is the inversion with the subject (for ex. He is coming. Is he coming?). The second criterion is the ability to appear with the negative particle not (for ex. He is not coming). The third criterion is the code, i.e. the ability of an auxiliary verb to take the meaning of a lexical verb, enabling absence of a lexical verb (for ex. I like it and so do they). The fourth is the emphatic affirmation (for ex. He has finished them). Based on these criteria, the following verbs can be treated as auxiliaries: BE, HAVE, DO, WILL, SHALL, CAN, MAY, MUST, OUGHT TO, DARE, NEED, USED TO. These verbs are not preceded by the particle to. They do not have an imperative form.

The first three verbs - BE, HAVE and DO - show certain common characteristics:

a) presence of the inflectional morpheme {s} for the third-person singular (is, has, does);
b) the existence of more than two finite forms (am, is, are, was, were; have, has, had; do, does, did);
(c) the existence of non-finite forms (be, being, been; have, having);
d) the use with the lexical verbs in which they do not change the meaning of lexical verbs; their function is purely grammatical.

Because of these characteristics BE, HAVE and DO are called primary auxiliary verbs, and the others – modal auxiliary verbs.

The remaining auxiliary verbs also share some common characteristics:

a) they do not have formal markers for the third person singular (*cans, *mays);
b) they are not found with the morpheme {ing} (*Canning, *maying);
c) they have only finite forms;
d) they do not have more than two finite forms, if we accept the view that should, would, could, might are forms of SHALL, WILL, CAN, MAY; MUST, OUGHT TO, NEED, DARE, USED TO, as members of this group have only one finite form;
(e) they cannot appear together (*He will should see, *He may can come);
f) they all carry meanings that modify the lexical verb in the statement (such as possibility, probability, necessity, permission, etc.)
There are 16 distinguished verb constructions (Palmer, 1988: 31). For the purposes of this paper we present them in the way Palmer does – in the third person singular. Italic letters are used to indicate auxiliaries and bold letters are used to indicate lexical verbs.

1. takes
2. took
3. istaking
4. wastaking
5. hastaken
6. had taken
7. has been taking
8. had been taking
9. is taken
10. was taken
11. is being taken
12. was being taken
13. has been taken
14. had been taken
15. has been being taken
16. had been being taken

The verb constructions are presented in two sets. The first set of formalized constructions is completely given symbolically. The second set retains only the symbolic representation of the lexical verb.

1. V-s
2. V-ed
3. BE-s+V-ing is+V-ing
4. BE-ed+V-ing was+V-ing
5. HAVE-s+V-en has+V-en
6. HAVE-ed+V-en had+V-en
7. HAVE-s+BE-en+V-ing has+been+V-ing
8. HAVE-ed+BE-en+V-ing had+been+V-ing
9. BE-s+V-en is+V-en
10. BE-ed+V-en was+V-en
11. BE-s+BE-ing+V-en is+being+V-en
12. BE-ed+BE-ing+V-en was+being+V-en
13. HAVE-s+BE-en+V-en has+been+V-en
14. HAVE-ed+BE-en+V-en had+been+V-en
15. HAVE-s+BE-en+BE-ing+V-en has+been+being+V-en
16. HAVE-ed+BE-en+BE-ing+V-en had+been+being+V-en
The auxiliary verb BE occurs in constructions 3, 9, 11 (as BE-s or is), 4, 10, 12 (as BE-ed or was), 7, 8, 13, 14 (as BE-en or been), 11, 12, 15, 16 (as BE-ing or being); in constructions 11, 12, 15, 16 we perceive two forms of the auxiliary verb BE. The auxiliary verb HAVE occurs in constructions 5, 7, 13, 15 (as HAVE-s or has), 6, 8, 14, 16 (as HAVE-ed or had).

The primary auxiliary verb DO (its forms do/does) is not found in affirmative sentences; it is found in interrogative and negative sentences of the verb construction 1 (takes - does not take, does S take). The form did is found in interrogative and negative sentences of the verb construction 2 (took - did not take, did S take).

The same number of constructions with the modal auxiliaries can be distinguished (Palmer, 1988: 94).

1/17 will take
2/18 would take
3/19 will betaking
4/20 would betaking
5/21 will havetaken
6/22 would have taken
7/23 will have been taking
8/24 would have been taking
9/25 will betaken
10/26 would betaken
11/27 will be being taken
12/28 would be being taken
13/29 will have been taken
14/30 would have been taken
15/31 will have been being taken
16/32 would have been being taken

These verb constructions can be presented in the following two ways:

1/17 Mod-Ø+V Mod+V
2/18 Mod-ed+V Mod-ed+V
If we separate the third person singular forms as representatives of other forms in a particular paradigm, as we did for verbs in English, the Ruthenian language has the following verb constructions:

1. бере
2. а) брали

б) брали // бралисом

3. а) булбрали

б) булбрали // булбралисом

4. будзебрац
5. а) брани

б) бранис

6. а) булбранис

б) булбранис // булбранисом

7. будзебранис

The first person singular forms have been given behind the two slashes (//) to indicate presence of the auxiliary verb that does not appear in the third person singular form.

The Ruthenian verb constructions are symbolically presented like this:
1.  V-ø
2.  a)  V-л
   б)  V-л[+БУЦ-м] V-л[+сом]
3.  a)  БУЦ-л+V-лбул+V-л
   б)  БУЦ-л[+БУЦ-м]+V-л  бул[+сом]+V-л
4.  БУЦЗЕ-φ+V-ц
5.  a)  V-ни
   б)  V-ни+БУЦ-φV-ни+е
6.  a)  БУЦ-л+V-нибул+V-ни
   б)  БУЛ-л[+БУЦ-м]+V-нибул[+сом]+V-ни
7.  БУЦЗЕ-φ+V-нибулдзе+V-ни

The auxiliary verb БУЦ is included in the most of the active (2b, 3a, 3b and 4) and the most of the passive constructions (5b, 6a, 6b and 7). There are two forms of the auxiliary verb БУЦ in the construction 3b. Construction 1 and the variant constructions (with uttered subject) 2a and 5a are composed of lexical verbs. The constructions with the modal auxiliary БИ show even greater degree of variation:

8.  a) бибрац
    б) брац// брацбим

в) брацбим// брацбисом

9.  a) бибрад
    б) бралбим// бралбим

в) бралбим// бралбисом

10.  a) бибулбрад
    б) булбрад //булбимбрад

    в) бралбим// бралбисомбул 11.
    а) бибуцбрани
    б) буцбрани// буцбимбрани

в) бранибуц// бранибисомбуц

12.  а) бибулбрани

    б) булбрани// булбимбрани

в) бранибул// бранибисомбул
It should be emphasized that the construction 10 (together with the construction 3) was frequent in the Ruthenian language at the beginning of the twentieth century (Костельник, 1975: 271) but today it can be considered archaic.

8. а) БИ-φ+V-щ би+V-щ
   б) V-щ+би-φ V-щ+бим
   в) V-щ +БИ-φ [+БУЦ-щ] V-щ+бим+сом

9. а) БИ-φ+V-лби+V-л
   б) V-л+би-φ V-л+бим
   в) V-л+БИ-φ [+БУЦ-л] V-л+бим+сом

10. а) БИ-φ+БУЦ-л+V-лби+бул+V-л
   б) БУЦ-л+би-φ+V-л бул+бим+V-л
   в) V-л+БИ-φ [+БУЦ-л]+БУЦ-л V-л+бим+сом+бул

11. а) БИ-φ+БУЦ-φ+V-ни би+буц+V-ни
   б) БУЦ-φ+би-φ+V-ни буц+бим+V-ни
   в) V-ни+БИ-φ [+БУЦ-ни]+БУЦ-φV-ни+би [+сом]+буц

12. а) БИ-φ+БУЦ-л+V-ни би+бул+V-ни
   б) БУЦ-л+би-φ+V-ни бул+бим+V-ни
   в) V-ни+БИ-φ [+БУЦ-ни]+БУЦ-л V-ни+би [+сом]+бул

According to the diachronic point of view the modal auxiliary verb БИ is treated as an aorist form of БУЦ (Костельник, 1975: 277), which leads to the conclusion that there exists only the auxiliary БУЦ in the constructions with modal auxiliary БИ.

With regard to syntactic behavior the English language modal auxiliaries make a special group, and the Ruthenian language has only one modal auxiliary – БИ. The Ruthenian equivalents to the English modals are included in the group of lexical verbs in Ruthenian.

There are three primary auxiliary verbs (BE, HAVE, DO) included in the English verb constructions, whereas there is only one primary auxiliary verb (БУЦ) in the Ruthenian verb constructions. The maximum number of the forms of primary auxiliaries in the English verb constructions is three, whereas the maximum number of the forms of БУЦ in the Ruthenian verb constructions is two.

**Conclusion**

Using F. R. Palmer’s four criteria (inversion with the subject, ability to appear with the negative particle not, ability to take the meaning of a lexical verb, emphatic affirmation) the author treats
BE, HAVE, DO, WILL, SHALL, CAN, MAY, MUST, OUGHT TO, DARE, NEED, USED TO as auxiliaries. Since the first three verbs share certain common characteristics (presence of the inflectional morpheme {s} for the thirdperson singular, existence of more than two finite forms, existence of non-finite forms, purely grammatical function) they are treated as primary auxiliary verbs, and the remaining ones as modal auxiliaries. SHALL and WILL can also be used purely grammatically.

The comparison of the verb constructions of English and Ruthenian shows that there is only one primary auxiliary in the Ruthenian language – БУЦ. The maximum number of the forms of the primary auxiliaries in the English verb constructions is three, whereas the maximum number of the forms of БУЦ in the Ruthenian verb constructions is two.

With regard to syntactic behavior the English language modal auxiliaries make a special group. As far as the Ruthenian modals are concerned it can be said that the Ruthenian language has only one modal auxiliary – БИ. The remaining Ruthenian equivalents to the English modals are included in the group of lexical verbs in the Ruthenian language.
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