

Міністерство освіти і науки України
Київський національний лінгвістичний університет
Кафедра германської філології та фіно-угорської філології

Курсова робота
На тему: Functioning of prepositions in Modern English

Студентки групи Мла 04-19
Факультету германської філології і перекладу
Денної форми здобуття освіти
Спеціальності 035 Філологія
Рубан В.О.

Науковий керівник:
Проф. Волкова Л.М.
Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів _____
Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ 2023

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Kyiv National Linguistic University
Department of German and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Term Paper
Functioning of prepositions in Modern English

Ruban Vitalina
Group MLa 04-19
Germanic Philology and Translation Faculty

Research adviser
Prof. Volkova L.M.
PhD (Philology)

Kyiv 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	Помилка! Закладку не визначено.
Chapter 1. Theoretical part.....	7
1.1. Definition of the concept of "preposition"	7
1.2. Classification of prepositions according to functional characteristics	8
1.3. The syntactic role of prepositions in a sentence	10
Chapter 2. Empirical part	12
2.1. Analysis of the functioning of prepositions in Modern English.....	12
2.2. Studying the peculiarities of the use of prepositions in different contexts	15
Chapter 3. Practical part	19
3.1. Use of prepositions in different types of speech: oral and written	19
3.2. Definition of the most frequently used prepositions and their contextual use.....	24
Conclusion.....	27
List of reference materials.....	Помилка! Закладку не визначено.

INTRODUCTION

Relevance of the performed research. For languages with an analytical structure, special words are of special importance, which are the main indicators of connections between meaningful parts of speech (words). The construction of an English sentence is also based on analyticity, since the main role in the expression of syntactic meanings between the members of the sentence belongs to function words. Thus, English prepositions occupy a special place in the language system, as they are one of the most widespread types of grammatical devices. That is why the study of prepositions is extremely important, since they are widely used to convey relationships between objects and to construct sentences.

Prepositions are service words that precede a noun or a word that replaces it, contributing to its inclusion in a phrase and a sentence. The meaning of a preposition is a typical, often repeated relationship between objects and phenomena, that is, spatial, temporal, causal, object, goal, etc. So, the question of the status of English prepositions is of quite great importance. This is confirmed by both domestic and foreign scientists dealing with this problem.

The study of the meaning of the word and the meaning of the preposition in particular involves clarifying a number of problematic issues that attract the attention of various linguistic schools (B.M. Aksyonenko, M.I. Balla, V.V. Vinograov, S.O. Gurskyi, B.O. Ilyish, O.M. Mukhin O.I. Smirnytskyi, DC Bennet, BK Bergen, S. Brorstöm, C. Chang Nancy, D. Cruse, ,Meyer, R. Pence, etc.)

The semantics of the preposition is relatively deeply covered in the special literature. However, researchers, clarifying the substantive aspect of the preposition as a unit that realizes itself at different levels of language, do not fully outline its semantic structure and the degree of context dependence.

Many scientific studies have been devoted to the question of the functional features of prepositions: from elucidation of valence functions to studies of their semantic space. However, a purely one-dimensional, syntagmatic approach to the essence and functioning of prepositions without an analysis of their paradigmatic

status does not provide an opportunity to reveal all the regularities of their functioning, since, firstly, the description of the semantics of prepositions at the syntagmatic level puts them in complete dependence on the semantics of adjacent words, which means deprivation each of the prepositions has its own meaning; secondly, the singled out different meanings of the preposition are described, usually in a ready-made form, without elucidating linguistic and speech factors, which is important for overcoming contradictions. Linguistic literature and lexicographical sources do not clarify

The aim of the study - highlight the interpretation of the meaning of the preposition in modern English and investigate the peculiarities of the use of prepositions in the modern English language.

To achieve the goal, it was necessary to solve the following tasks:

- trace the evolution of the understanding of the meaning of a preposition and approaches to determining the semantic essence of prepositions as a category of words;
- analyze lexicographical sources and establish the criteria that are the basis of the description of all the meanings of the same preposition, identify the common semantic element of different descriptions of the meanings of the preposition in the dictionaries;
- to reveal the semantic essence of each of the selected prepositions and to reveal the main regularities of their functioning in language and speech to express the relevant relations between physical objects in space and abstract concepts in time;
- identify and describe the generalized types of relative objects that affect the definition of the meaning of the entire three-component prepositional combination;
- to determine the share of each type of meaning of the prepositional phrase (hereinafter PSS) within a continuous sample of the text.

Object of the research - prepositions in Modern English.

Subject of the study - peculiarities of the use of prepositions in the modern English language, paradigmatic lexical-semantic and functional relations of prepositions between them.

The following research methods are used in the work: the method of semantic oppositions - to highlight the invariant meaning of a word as an intralingual semantic differential, which is the basis of semantic opposition; the method of extracting and transforming the syntactic core of a sentence - to isolate structurally important components of the PSS (G.G. Pocheptsov), the method of transformations - to determine and distinguish the number and quality of different types of meanings of the PSS.

CHAPTER 1. Theoretical part

1.1. Definition of the concept of "preposition"

Elements of a complex, intelligently organized language system are prepositions. O. Kolodyazhny aptly called them "building material of a special kind" of the vocabulary of the language, which "seems to cement individual words, helping the grammarian to organize them into sentences, to give a verbally expressed thought a meaningful character" (13, p. 18). It is precisely the wide range of research aspects of this issue that determined the relevance of our chosen topic, which complements the theory of research on the meaning of words and prepositions in particular.

The concept of official words in general and the preposition in particular changed over time, deepened from understanding them as unchanging words to the modern interpretation as grammatical synsematic words and morphemes.

The views of linguists on the semantics of prepositions have changed radically over time. At first they denied the existence of a specific individual meaning for each preposition, and later they recognized it. The first researchers adhered to the ancient concept characteristic of classical languages: prepositions are indicators of only the grammatical connection between words at the syntagmatic level. Another, later, view is based on the fact that prepositions also perform a nominative function, because they denote extralingual objects'objects are relations between objects, and therefore each has its own individual meaning. Sharing this view, we are of the opinion that prepositions make up a lexical-grammatical class of words that denote the corresponding relations between objects'objects in real reality, and therefore are the same full-meaning words as nouns that name relative objects (18, p. 72).

Denoting the relationship between the objects expressed by nouns, they thus perform an important syntactic function of the connection between these words in a word combination and a sentence.

U. Chaif expressed an interesting opinion about determining the status of prepositions. The researcher considers prepositions as "locative verb roots", with the help of which a verb, which is not locative in its meaning, can optionally acquire a spatial tone, for example: a) Tom is sitting. – Tom is sitting (now); b) Tom is sitting on the table. – Tom is (now) sitting on the table, where the verb of state to sit (option a) acquires a locative meaning thanks to the locative *он – на* (option b) (30, p. 186-187).

1.2. Classification of prepositions according to functional characteristics

The name "preposition" comes from the Latin word *prepositio*, which consists of two morphemes - *pre* (before) and *positus* (placed). Prepositions are words that express important grammatical relations that persist over a number of eras, therefore, compared to words with a purely lexical meaning, prepositions have greater historical stability. Prepositions became especially important in the early Old English period, when the function of transmitting grammatical relations passed from the case system, which was dying out, to a new one - the system of prepositional inflections (1, p. 48).

Depending on the nature of the grammatical function and frequency of use, all prepositions developed differently. At first, prepositions were used to define relations of place and movement, later - time and cause. Prepositions conveying a wide variety of relations have developed their lexical structure, but in some cases their meaning has become less expressive or has been completely lost. On the basis of this, prepositions acquired the ability to convey basic case relations.

Some prepositions, in particular *of* and *to*, due to the multiplicity and abstractness of the relations they conveyed, as well as due to their frequent use in the language, have undergone de-semanticization. At the same time, their grammatical role has grown significantly. However, some weakening of the lexical meaning of prepositions led to their gradual replacement by semantically "fresh

prepositions", that is, those whose meaning was clearer and did not mix with the meaning of other prepositions (14, p. 8)).

Later, the same relations could be conveyed by different prepositions. Yes, in the modern language, we can observe this using the following example: the preposition *in* has acquired some meanings adjacent to the meaning of instrumentality (*written in pencil*) and entered the sphere of use of (*a rise in production*). The preposition *from* is used with words meaning origin, separation, separation, but a small number of words with these meanings are still constructed with the preposition *of*. As for the preposition *into*, it arose in the 9th century thanks to the combination of the prepositions *in* and *to*. At that time, the preposition *in* served as an indicator of the direction of movement, and the preposition *to* only specified the direction. Since these prepositions expressed concepts close in meaning, they began to be written together (29, p. 92).

From the research of written monuments of the past, it is clear that the main number of prepositions was formed from adverbs, nouns, adjectives and adverbs and therefore, by origin, they are, respectively, adverbial, nominative and adverbial. Adverbial prepositions are divided into simple, which were formed in ancient times from adverbs of place (*in, on, for, to*), and complex, consisting of two or more adverbs and prepositions (*into, out of, etc.*). Verbal prepositions arose as a result of compression of subordinate clauses, as a result of which the predicate became a verb, from which the preposition arose. These prepositions are the youngest in origin, they usually convey abstract concepts and constitute a small group.

It should be borne in mind that in addition to simple, compound and active prepositions, there is a large category (about two hundred and eighty) of so-called compound prepositions of the type *by means of, in spite of, on account of*. They were formed from various prepositional phrases. Their full meaning part (noun) has largely lost its real meaning. Compound prepositions generally play a secondary role compared to simple, compound and active prepositions. They have become most widespread in scientific and technical literature (2, p. 104).

All simple prepositions and some complex ones belong to the vocabulary of the Old English period. In particular, the prepositions *by, at, for, from, in, of, off, on, through, to*, which denoted spatial relations, come from elements that were used as adverbs, prepositions and relatively independent verb prefixes even in the languages of the Indo-European family . They are related to the simple prepositions of other Germanic languages, as well as Indo-European languages - Latin, Ancient Greek, Russian, etc. This is confirmed by literary monuments of the VII-X centuries. The prepositions of this period include *about, before, after, along, amidst, at, before, beneath, between, but, by, for, from, in, into, near, of, off, on, out, over, through, till , to, towards, under, underneath, with, without*. Except for the prepositions *before, amidst* and *underneath*, all the above-mentioned prepositions are widely used in modern English (26, p. 122).

So, after analyzing the development of prepositions, we can conclude that although the lexical composition of the English language is constantly changing, most prepositions, starting from 700 p., remained in common use, although they underwent certain phonetic and orthographic changes. The meanings of prepositions developed in different ways. Thus, the prepositions *to, beside, between, beneath, at* were not affected by new phenomena and retained their original meaning, others (*with, of, for*) could convey several relationships and became multi-meaning. The sphere of use of some prepositions could also overlap (*in* and *of*), and we observe the acquisition by one preposition of the meaning of another in the modern language (28, p. 102).

Thus, after reviewing various approaches to the definition of the preposition, its functions in the language in the early and modern works of Slavic and Western linguists, we can conclude that views on the nature of the preposition are constantly changing in connection with the development of new meanings.

1.3. The syntactic role of prepositions in the sentence

Prepositions are one of the most used parts of speech in the English language. They are used to express the dependence between other parts of speech in a sentence and have different syntactic roles.

The main syntactic roles of prepositions in the English language:

Part of a compound predicate - a preposition can be included in compound predicates consisting of a verb and a preposition, for example: "She looks after her little sister".

Direct complement - a preposition can serve as a direct complement to a verb or another part of speech, for example: "We are going to the beach".

Indirect adjunct - a preposition can serve as an indirect adjunct to a verb that indicates the object or person to whom the action is directed, for example: "I sent a letter to my friend."

Application - a preposition can indicate time, place or direction, for example: "She lives in Paris".

Definition - a preposition can be used to define features that refer to another part of speech in a sentence, for example: "He is good at playing football".

Circumstance - a preposition can act as a circumstance indicating a time, place or method of action, for example: "We met in the park".

In general, the syntactic roles of prepositions in the English language are quite diverse and depend on the context of use.

CHAPTER 2. Empirical part

2.1. Analysis of the functioning of prepositions in Modern English

The problem of the status of a preposition is closely related to the question of its semantics. Giving a preposition the status of a word (official or independent) means giving it not only a grammatical, but also a full-fledged lexical meaning, since the unity of lexical and grammatical meanings is inherent in the word itself. Accordingly, the main meanings of prepositions should be distinguished. The main meanings of the preposition include: categorical, grammatical and lexical.

The categorical meaning of a preposition means the meaning of the semantic-syntactic relationship of the noun component, which is essentially an adverbialized noun, to other full-valued components in the phrase, sentence. Grammatical meaning in general ("formal" according to O.O. Potebny) is a meaning that is inherent in all words of a morphological class and is expressed not by a word as such, but by additional means (changing words, the ability to combine with other words, etc.). The grammatical meaning of the preposition consists in expressing a syntactic subjunctive relationship (12, p. 133).

Actually, the lexical meaning of the preposition, according to O.M. Selyverstova, there is an indication of this or that relationship. Some fairly general concepts, such as space, time, cause, and others, correspond to this meaning. The lexical meaning of a preposition is often able to convey individual characteristics of these general concepts, for example, it indicates a type of space or a way of implementing an action in time. Thus, the preposition can introduce additional elements of the situation, and this once again confirms its lexical meaning. It determines the difference between prepositions that perform the same grammatical functions (17, p. 28).

The meaning of the preposition in the broadest sense is reduced to the expression of a certain type of relationship between the subject and the object of the prepositional statement. It should not be confused with the concept of syntactic

relation as a form of connection of words in a sentence and word combination. Prepositions convey the semantics of relations between different syntactic units (word, phrase, sentence). The ability to express the relationship is embedded in the words themselves and syntactic constructions, while analytical syntactic morphemes realize these abilities. The concept of a relation arises as a result of abstractions from specific connections between things based on the comparison of two objects according to the selected type of comparison. Thus, at the basis of temporal relations is a comparison by the time of action, at the basis of causal relations - a comparison of an action and its source, spatial relations express the localization of an object, actions in a certain fragment of reality, that is, in the state of affairs (24, p. 13).

This meaning does not change with each use of the same preposition and cannot be "weakened" because there are no "weakened" types of relations. A preposition as a word denoting certain objective relations between physical objects in space and phenomena in time ensures the independence of the explanation of its definition from word usage, because its independent meaning is unique to it and independent of the meanings of other, full-meaning words. Nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs have their own categorical meanings and express concepts of substance, properties, processes, etc. The concretization of relations occurs by marking them with various prepositions.

The specific individual meaning of the preposition consists in the designation of one certain abstraction - the generalized type of relations corresponding to it (8, p. 238).

We consider the natural property of the preposition from the point of view of paradigmatics. The concept of "object" by itself implies a relationship carried out by the subject-object in dynamics, movement, action, and among the relationships (during temporary, simultaneous, future action) there are causal, meaningful, relationships method of action, etc. The relations "at" are determined not by the formula $S(O)VR$, but by SRO , where the relations between two objects are distinguished by a preposition (respectively, S/O is subject/object, and R is a

preposition), i.e. not He works at, a He (works) at the factory. It is implied that the relations "R" can only be determined by the relations between S(O)/O, not "V". Other types of relations only indirectly regulate the meanings of relations at the syntagmatic level, and the identification of the very type of relations "R", that is, the meaning of the preposition itself, occurs at the intralingual level, that is, in paradigmatics (10, p. 29).

The relation category was included in the grammatical, conceptual, logical, and philosophical categories (R.O. Budagov), which is motivated by the status of the language itself, which, reflecting the phenomena of objective reality, realizes in itself the thinking and cognitive intentions of individuals, society and nation.

In terms of content, the category of relation in language becomes conceptual. Based on the views of I.I. Meshchaninov and O.V. Bondark about conceptual categories and functional-semantic fields based on them on the basis of the commonality of functions, we can talk about the existence of a functional-semantic field of relations, which covers different language means, including prepositions specializing in expressing the relationship between objects. The thesis of H.P. Nemts that "the relation in language is always one of the links of the chain that creates the concept of "meaning", which is perceived by us as a reflection of the object of reality (phenomenon, relation, quality, process) in consciousness" (H. P. Nemets), allows us to assert that the category of relation as conceptual at the linguistic level is connected with the lexical and grammatical meaning of the word (according to A.P. Zagnitko) (11, p. 144).

You can sit in front of the desk (or in front of the desk). The professor can sit on the desk (when he's being informal) or behind the desk, and then his feet are under the desk or beneath the desk. He can stand beside the desk (meaning next to the desk), before the desk, between the desk and you, or even on the desk (if he's really strange). If he's clumsy, he can bump into the desk or try to walk through the desk (and stuff would fall off the desk). Passing his hands over the desk or resting his elbows on the desk, he often looks across the desk and speaks of the desk or concerning the desk as if there were nothing else like the desk. Because he thinks

of nothing except the desk, sometimes you wonder about the desk, what's in the desk, what he paid for the desk, and if he could live without the desk. You can walk towards the desk, to the desk, around the desk, by the desk, and even past the desk while he sits at the desk or leans against the desk. All of this happens, of course, in time: during the class, before the class, until the class, throughout the class, after the class, etc. And the professor can sit there in a bad mood.

2.2. Studying the peculiarities of the use of prepositions in different contexts

The preposition, of course, does not denote a place, time, or state, but it causes the meaning of the PSS with the corresponding words. This gave rise to the conclusion that the meaning of the preposition cannot be dependent on adjacent words, which determine a certain semantic content of the entire PSS, and not the preposition itself. The value remains invariant – expressing position or location (OSD, at 1) – with extrapolation of relations in space to relations in time: used with something seen as a point in space (LDE, at 1); used with a point in time (ib., 2). The type of relations at remains invariant, its various meanings - local, temporal, causative, etc., characteristic of the other preposition by, are determined by the context, and are paradigmatically opposed to other types of relations (cf. at and by 10 o'clock) (9, p. 12).

The traditional non-distinction of the two multifaceted components of the word's content - a stable intralingual invariant meaning and a variable extralingual marked concept - leads to the erroneous unification of them into one monolithic whole - a one-dimensional "meaning" that changes with each other marked concept.

The invariant meaning of a preposition is distinguished using the "meaning - meaning" method, which assumes the presence of a generalized abstracted invariant meaning of a word as communicatively relevant semantic differential features (hereinafter - SDO) - an element of the language system - and its actualization in the syntagmatic plan as a certain unambiguous meaning caused by

a change the basis of semantic opposition for unchanged meaning. The relation of the same word to several different objects and vice versa is explained by the fact that the word does not denote one specific object, but only differentiates it from another element of the same system by its invariant meaning - communicatively relevant SDO (19, p. 39).

This technique is based on the main provisions of the theory of phonological opposition (M.S. Trubetskoi), which puts forward categorical requirements to contrast only identical objects according to their differential features. In addition, it is based on the provisions of "system and structure", which boils down to the fact that the identical features of the structural organization of the elements of one system are easily recognized in another, are generalized, abstracted from this system of elements and constitute the invariant meaning of the word as SDO for differentiating the concepts of a variable base semantic opposition.

In the case of replacement of system elements (identical concepts as the basis of semantic opposition), essential communicative relevant SDOs of the structural organization of the elements of the previous system remain unchanged, thereby ensuring the understanding of the use of the word in a new sense due to the provision of already known structural features to the new element of another system.

Therefore, the naming of a new object (an element of another system) occurs according to the features characteristic of its structure - thanks to the correlation with other elements of the same system, and the interpretation of the meaning of the use of the same word - according to the features of the essence of the object itself: different in essence about Objects are different meanings of the word. That is, completely different objects named by the same word, which in themselves have nothing in common (except for the structure), are usually its "different meanings" (8, c. 239).

For example, train and train of thoughts. Here train - a train, train of thought, train (dress), etc. - are different meanings of the use of the same word (train) with its invariant meaning of the SDO, actualized in different quantitative and

qualitative combinations and in different units of time and space. Dictionaries only list different traditional meanings, not meanings.

Extending the general provisions of the invariant meaning of a word to a preposition, it should be noted that its meaning is based on abstraction, unlike a noun (table), an adjective (new, long), etc. But, as O.I.Smyrnytsky rightly observes, in the process of speech, opinions are expressed not only about individual objects, phenomena and qualities, but also about the relations in which the corresponding objects and phenomena appear (16, p. 83).

So, the objective relations between objects of real/mental reality, recognized, generalized by thinking and fixed in the minds of people with the help of words, underlie the objective meanings of these words - a category of prepositions, as objective as objects: table , window, etc. with the difference, however, that relations do not exist without correlative objects (only in dictionaries these relations are indicated by appropriate words).

Numerous relationships between objects are summarized by us into separate types, and each of them is denoted by a separate word: at, by, with, for, etc. So, each preposition already denotes a kind of invariant – a type of relationship between objects in the language system. The type of relations between objects is determined by the main cardinal object, which is specified in speech, and a relative object that specifies the type, for example, before the cardinal, under it, above it, after it (5, p. 54).

The meanings of prepositions are based on relations between objects, which are reduced to individual points. Thus, relations at are generalized to static point-likeness: *The car was at the house*, (actual point-like relations); *Don't throw the ball at her* (resultative point relations). The relations by are generalized to dynamic punctuation (a sequence of points): *Not came by the night train*; *She ran by the river*. Compatibility relations are neutral with respect to statics or dynamics: *He did not stand with his friend*; *He came with his friend*.

Prepositions *at*, *by*, *with* are united by a common sign of relations of indefinite proximity (in contrast to other prepositions with certain types of

relations, such as in - "inside", out - "outside", over - "on the other side", as in horizontally, as well as vertically, i.e. "over, floor"). The first (*at, by, with*) really mean a relationship of undefined proximity, but the distance in space (closeness/distance) in the relationship is, in fact, irrelevant, it is neutralized in the further process of generalization of related concepts, in particular, during the extrapolation of relationships in space times, cf.: at my house = a point in space; at ten o'clock = an exact point in time (ib.) (11, p. 145).

Therefore, the proper invariant meaning of a preposition is determined by a single generalized type of relations, which stands out against the background of other prepositions in the paradigmatic plan of the lexical-semantic system in comparison and contrast with other prepositions or in contrast with the same, and not different relative objects in the syntagmatic plan, namely: the invariant value of the preposition *at* is a differential feature of the generalized type of static point relations; the invariant value of the preposition *by* is a differential feature of the generalized type of dynamic point relations; the invariant value of the preposition *with* is a differential feature of the generalized type of relations of compatible point.

CHAPTER 3. Practical part

3.1. Use of prepositions in different types of speech: oral and written

Numerous various relative concepts undergo generalization and are reduced to a limited number of generalized types of such concepts: physical objects in space, events in time, various states of the subject / object, and so on. The classification of concepts according to generalized types is carried out using the method of transformation of semantic cores of PSS into corresponding structural and semantic models - generalized types (И play, stay with my friend (UED, with, 2, 3). *I play with my friend* ↔ *My friend plays with me* (=compatibility and simultaneity of action of both subjects) *And stay with my friend* —/→ *My friend stays with me* (= object of action, only compatibility, but not simultaneity of action).

In this way, the most important generalized types of relational concepts that underlie the corresponding types of meanings of each PSS are determined, the share of each type in the sample, as well as relations in space and time within the same type of relations in the sample and the dependence of the type of relations, as well as the distribution, are determined the main types of meanings from the specificity of the sample and the functional style of the language (22, p. 148).

For ease of understanding, we present a list of the main types of meanings of PSS with the prepositions at, by, and in the form of tables and brief conclusions to them (tables 2.1, 2.2, 2.3).

Table 2.1 Use of the preposition *at* in the main types of meanings, %

Relationship between objects	Space	Time
		38
1. Factual relationships: Orsini sat at a rough wooden table (Forsyth). The band played at the hotel (Stevenson).	18.4	
2. Resultant relations: Quinn glanced at the moon (Forsyth). The lawyer looked at his watch (Stevenson).	19.6	

3. Between the point of existence/activity of the subject in time and the marked point of time: Train arrives at two twenty six (Christie). We'd arranged to meet later at dinner (Spark).	35
4. Between the subject and his state: You yourself remain here at some risk (Stevenson). Mrs. H. would be... quite happy and at peace (Christie).	3
5. Between the subject in a certain state and the concept that causes his state: Mor was glad at her joy (Murdoch). People get annoyed at being sent to a place (Christie).	15
6. Between a subject of a certain quality and a concept that is a complement to its quality: She was a tiger-woman at heart (Spark). She was clever (good) at her job (Spark)	5
7. Between the subject/object of the action and the units of measure of its activity/value: Miss Carter approached (in a car) at a walking pace (Murdoch). She might draw caricatures at sixpence (Huxley).	4

Therefore, the distribution of the preposition *at* in the sample significantly prevails in relations between concepts in time (62%) compared to relations between objects in space (38%). This is explained by the more frequent need to indicate the relationship between the points of activity (existence) of the subject and the marked point on the time axis. In fiction, where the life and activity of a person as the subject of action are in the center of attention of the work, the need to indicate the time of his activity (35%) and the cause of his condition (15%) is quite natural.

Due to the same reasons, i.e. the ratio of given relations between concepts in time and relations between objects in space, the distribution of this preposition in the remaining types of relative objects decreased accordingly: between the subject in a certain quality and the complement of its quality (5%) and units of measure of its activity/value (4%), between the subject and its condition (3%). Of course, such relative types of objects are significantly inferior to all other previous ones (10, p. 31).

The components of the PSS, although mandatory for the constructive completion of the PSS, are not equivalent in the formation of the meaning of the PSS, among them there is necessarily the main, meaning-determining component, and precisely, in the actual relations between objects in space (given the static nature verb components) the main noun component N1 is simultaneously decisive and meaning-determining. In potential productive relations, the verb component is meaningful, because it is it that determines the final productive relative point in

space by its dynamism. In PSS with relations between states in time, the decisive component is N2, because it denotes the point or duration of time of the subject's action for all other possible identical components.

The definition of the leading meaning-making component in the PSS with the relationship between the subject in a certain state and the concept as the cause of his state is complicated by the lack of a close unequivocal connection between the causative component N2 and a certain state of the subject: the concepts answer, memory, thought can evoke as joyful, and the sad state or mood of a person depending on the circumstances. Still, the causative component is decisive in such cases, because it determines the fact of the appearance of a certain state as a predicative sign, as opposed to the static presence of such a sign.

In the rest of the generalized types of relational objects, the meaning-making components are defined easily and unambiguously as quite clear.

Table 2.2 Use of the preposition *by* in the main types of meanings, %

Relationship between objects	Space	Time
	12	88
1. Relationship between point static/dynamic objects:		
a) point static: Clara stood by him (Stevenson). Poirot wilted by my side (Christie).	6	
b) dynamic and static: He was surprised to see a gentleman go by at so unusually slow a pace (Stevenson). The bucket seats swung silently by him (Forsyth).	3	
c) dynamic and static elongated: He decided to walk back by the main road (Murdoch). The lane was bordered on either hand by garden walls (Stevenson).	1	
d) dynamic points: I always travel by Tube never by bus (Huxley). Some things that cannot be sent by telegram (Christie).	2	
2. Between the point of existence/activity of the subject in time and the marked point of time: The man was by then three streets away (Forsyth). By the spring of 1910 another two million copies had been sold (Mustard).		8
3. Between the object of the action and its executor: (The) anecdote related by the author (Twain). A head covered by a velvet skull-cap (Shaw).		62
4. Between the subject of the action and the concept that defines/characterizes his activity/state: He was known by everyone by his red hair (Mustard). An Italian by birth (Christie).		12

5. Between the subject of the action and the units of measure of its action: They are moving step by step (Michener). Window by window we tried different supporters (Stevenson).		4
6. Between the subject of the action and the concept that is the circumstance of the action: Tim worked there usually by neon light (Murdoch). The lean, silent figure moved through the street by its dim illumination (Forsyth).		2

In the distribution of the preposition *by*, there is a sharp disproportion in the relations between objects in space (12%) and phenomena in time (88%) compared to the preposition *at* (38 and 62%, respectively). The relative disproportion is explained by the dynamic essence of the *by* relationship compared to the static essence of the *at* relationship: with the same type of relative objects – the point of existence/activity of the subject on the time axis and the marked time point, the *by* ratio is 8%, and the *at* ratio is 35%. This shows the accuracy, static time (Train arrives at two twenty six) and the formation of time/dynamism: *by then, by the spring of 1910*. In addition, the vast majority (62%) of the distribution falls on the dynamism/process of relations between the object action and its active subject; in the case of the subject's state, the transformation of the structure into activation is usually not observed.

The difference between the types of relations *at* and *by*, given the equality of distributions in both (4%) and the equality of the types of relative objects - the subject of action and the units of measure of its action - turns out to be that the relations *by* are indicated by the location of the absolute units of measurement one near (*by*) one, i.e. *by repeating step by step, page by page*, and the relation *at* – *by relative units: the entire distance to the units of distance measurement, such as: She approached (in a car) at a walking pace; She might draw caricatures at sixpence*.

The units of measure of the subject's activity, in particular, and especially the units of measure of time tend to be reinterpreted to indicate the method of action, for example, in the following expressions: *little by little, step by step, by and by* - allow for a double interpretation, as can be seen from the example *Steer by step Commander W. had checked out the story* (23, p. 93).

Table 2.3 Use of the preposition *with* in the main types of meanings, %

Relationship between objects	Space	Time
		56
1. Between the subject and the "active" object: She went with him (Forsyth). She always agreed with him (Spark).	22	
2. Between the subject and the "passive" object: I don't want to leave baby with anyone else (Spark). He...renewed relations with his friends (Michener).	20	
3. Between the subject and the object as a tool of his action: He polished his spectacles with his handkerchief (Twain). He was filled with great tenderness (Murdoch).	14	
4. Between the subject and the concept that causes its corresponding state/action: I was pale with rage (Twain). Her face was still twisted with fear (Murdoch). She blushed with bitterness (Saroyan).		3.5
5. Between the subject and the concept as its specific feature: Said Mrs. Parker with her demon's smile (Murdoch); Men with culture and breeding (Mustard); An old lady with a certain amount of spirit (Christie).		19
6. Between the subject and the concept as a circumstance of action: (a) signs of the action itself: The shift was made with ease (Michener); (b) signs that accompany the action: His aunt might, with due care, live for many years (Christie); (c) signs of the subject during its action: and with a smile Mrs. Merrowdene poured boiling water on the tea (Christie).		21.5

The specificity of the relations of compatibility (*with*) is that the related objects are perceived compatible and simultaneously; this explains the fact that the compatibility of objects in space is 56%, the compatibility of phenomena in time is 44%, and the compatibility of the state of the subject and the reasons for its state in time is only 3.5%. Violation of the principle of mandatory compatibility and simultaneity of the actions of the subjects leads to a distortion of the meaning of the PSS, in particular, the incompatibility of actions in time (*I stay with my friend —/ My friend stays with me*) and the incompatibility of actions in space (*I rise with the lark — The lark rises with me*).

The joint performance of the same action (play cricket) or a similar one (walk, run) by two subjects extends to the performance of different actions, and one of them is the main one, the other is secondary with various logical connections to it, without violating the principle of simultaneity and compatibility.

Thus, with the help of semantic and syntactic analysis, a number of differential seven prepositions at, by, with, united by the sign of relations of

indefinite proximity, and nouns and verbal nouns denoting the subject/object, i.e. their generalized type – structural-semantic models. It was found that the prepositions *at*, *by*, *with* are characterized by 24 structural-semantic models, which are the result of syntactic variation of the invariant structure N1RN2 – PCC with the prepositions *at*, *by*, *with*. The investigated prepositions are distinguished by their share in the sample (*at* – 44%, *with* – 38%, *by* – 18%), on the one hand, and by the distribution of the designation of relations between objects in space and phenomena in time (*at* – 38 - 62%, *by* – 12 - 88%, *with* – 56 - 44%) – on the other hand. The advantage of relations with in space is explained by the specificity of these relations, namely, the visual compatibility of relative concrete objects. Approximately the same number of main types of meanings of prepositions differ in their quality, as well as the share (the meaning of "circumstances of action" in *by* - 2%, in *with* - 21.5%, which is explained by the essence of the type of relations and the specificity of the sample) of the relation *by* between the subject and object of action in our sample – 62%, in scientific and technical literature – up to 92%.

So, the results of the study prove that the distinct variable meanings of the PSS complement the general provisions of the theory of the invariance of the meaning of a word and a preposition in particular (on the example of the prepositions *at*, *by*, *with*), and other prepositions of the English language could be studied using this method.

3.2. Definition of the most frequently used prepositions and their contextual use

The most commonly used prepositions in the English language are parts of speech used to express various relationships between different parts of speech in a sentence. The main prepositions most commonly used in English include:

at - indicates the exact time ("*at 3 o'clock*"), place ("*at the bus stop*"), as well as conditions ("*at a discount*").

in - indicates a place in space ("*in the room*"), time ("*in the morning*"), as well as age, year, etc. ("*in my twenties*").

on - indicates the place ("*on the table*"), the time ("*on Monday*"), as well as the connection with the surface ("*on the wall*").

to - indicates the direction ("*to the store*"), as well as the interlocutor ("*talk to me*").

with - indicates the accomplice of the action ("*with my friend*"), as well as the object used to perform the action ("*cut with a knife*").

by - indicates that something is done with the help of another thing ("*by train*"), as well as means of action ("*write by hand*").

for - indicates the destination ("*this is for you*"), the time ("*for three days*"), as well as the reason ("*I'm sorry for being late*").

The contextual use of prepositions in English can depend on various factors, including the role they play in the sentence, the context, the size of the linguistic expression, etc. For example, "*at*" is used to indicate a specific time or place, and "*for*" is used to express the purpose of something or the reason for something. However, there are many cases where the same preposition can be used in different contexts, and depending on this, its meaning can change. Therefore, studying the contextual use of prepositions in the English language requires knowledge of their various meanings and connections with other parts of the language.

For example, the preposition "*to*" can be used as an infinitive participle ("*to go*"), or indicate the direction of action ("*to the store*"), or be used to express communication between people ("*talk to me*").

In addition, some prepositions can be used in different phrases or idioms that have specific meanings that differ from the literal meaning of the preposition. For example, the phrase "*come up with*" means "invent" and not just "*rise from the bottom up*", which corresponds to the literal meaning of the prepositions "*come*" and "*up*".

To learn the contextual use of prepositions in English, it is useful to read information about the most used prepositions and their meanings, as well as to

consider examples of their use in different contexts. It is also useful to learn idioms and idioms containing prepositions in order to understand their meaning and usage. The more you practice using prepositions in different situations, the easier it is to understand their meaning and contextual use.

CONCLUSION

So, the preposition in general and, in particular, its meaning, that is, the prototypical semantics and epigramatics of the word, is one of the most complex and debatable problems of linguistics. Without a thorough study of this question, it is impossible to solve all the others related to it, namely the incompleteness/fullness of the preposition, the changeability/constancy of its meaning under the influence of adjacent words in the phrase, the possibility/impossibility of its independent use in a sentence, etc.

In the studies of the preposition and its meaning, there is a natural development of the views of the researchers from the denial of the preposition's own meaning to its recognition.

During the research, it was established that in the lexocentric approach to the meaning of the lexeme, each preposition (as an element of the lexical-semantic system) has one and only one invariant meaning - a certain generalized type of relations. A preposition cannot denote two or more generalized types of relations and therefore cannot be polysemous. The illusory polysemy of the preposition, generated in the syntagmatic plane, disappears in the paradigmatic one, in which it itself is compared with other prepositions and contrasted with prepositions that denote the corresponding generalized types of relations. The abstract essence of relations of a certain type is recognized in the syntagmatic plan with the same, and not different relative objects (He is at the car, in the car, with the car, behind the car, etc.).

Given the constancy of the invariant meaning of the preposition, the unambiguous meaning of a structurally complete syntactic PSS is determined by the attributive and predicative properties of the relative objects.

Generalized type of relations – the invariant meaning of the preposition cannot be uniquely revealed in its individual arbitrary typical actualizations, it is generalized and used with a wide variety of relational objects, the generalization of which is reduced to a limited number of types. These types of objects themselves

determine the corresponding main types of different meanings of the entire PSS, and not the different meanings of the preposition itself.

Structurally significant nominal components of PSS are not equivalent in the formation of an unambiguous meaning. Among them there is always the main, meaning-determining component. In each of the studied types of relations, it is distinguished by specific properties of lexical units. The same meaning-making factors operate within the same type of relationship. The invariant meaning of the prepositions *at*, *by*, *with* are generalized types of relations of static pointiness, dynamic pointiness, compatible pointiness.

For the objective delimitation and separation of generalized types of related concepts, the method of transformation of semantic cores of PSS was useful, which makes it possible to identify the generalized type of component of PSS and its meaning-making significance. Arbitrary selection of non-generalized objects in certain respects causes differences in the number and quality of "different meanings" of prepositions, in the order of presentation of their interpretations in dictionaries and explanation of their content. One typical meaning is often divided into several, and different ones are combined into one, often with inappropriate interpretation of the content and illustrative examples.

The research confirmed: a) the statement about the important properties of the word as the main unit of language, its internal integrity and separation from adjacent speech expressions and their organic combination using the example of the prepositions *at*, *by*, *with*; b) the conclusion that there are two types of attributive syntagmatics - syntactic (composition of words) and lexical (a meaningful combination of elements), it is systematically and regularly carried out on two logically different bases; c/ invariance of structural-semantic models (on examples with prepositions *at*, *by*, *with*) - PSS as a basis for studying the invariant meaning of any preposition; d/ common and variable meanings of the generalized type of objects, characteristic of various relationships expressed by the prepositions *at*, *by*, *with*.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Aksenenko B. N. Prepositions of the English language. - M.: Izd-vo literatury na angliskim yazeki, 2016. - 320 p.
2. Antrushina G.B., Afanasyeva O.V., Morozova N.N. Lexicology of the English language. - M: Drofa, 2013. - 270 p.
3. Balla M.I. Use of prepositions in the English language. - K.: Soviet School, 2012. - 175 p.
4. Barkhudarov L.S. Steling D.A. English grammar. - M., 1993. - 485 p.
5. Belyavskaya E.G. Semantics of the word: Textbook. allowance for in-tov in. I'm from. - M.: Higher School, 2013. - 147 p.
6. Bloch M.Ya. Theoretical grammar of the English language. - M.: Higher School, 2015. - 383 p.
7. Verba L.G., Verba G.V. Grammar of the modern English language. Directory. - K.: "Logos", 2017. - 352 p.
8. Gulkevich S.P. Meaning and use of prepositions in modern English // Collection of materials dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the International Cooperative Alliance, 160th anniversary of the Academy / Lviv Commercial Academy. - Lviv, 2015. - P. 238-239.
9. Gulkevich S.P. The invariant meaning of the preposition by and typical meanings of prepositional phrases // Problems of text linguistics and linguistic methodology: abstracts of the reports of the international scientific and methodological conference of teachers of foreign languages of universities / Lviv State University named after I. Frank. - Lviv, 2014. - P. 12-14.
10. Gulkevich S.P. Explanation of the different meanings of the prepositional phrase // Materials of the All-Union Interuniversity Scientific and Practical Conference "Linguistic-methodical aspects of teaching foreign languages in a university". - Petrozavodsk, 2013. – P. 29-31.

11. Gurskyi S.O., Gupalo S.M., Gulkevich S.P. To the question about the study of prepositions // *Philological sciences and methods of their teaching.* - Zhytomyr, 2012. - Vol. 6. – P.142-145.
12. Espersen O. *Philosophy of grammar / Trans. With English* - M.: Inostr. Lit., 2015. - 404 p.
13. Kolodyazhnyi A.S. *Preposition.* - Kharkiv: Kharkiv University Publishing House, 2016. - 165 p.
14. Kolomiitseva V.V. Stratification of the semantics of prepositions in prepositional-noun constructions // *Problems of comparative semantics. Coll. of science articles Issue 5 / Resp. ed. M. P. Kochergan.* - K: KDLU, 2011. - 386 p.
15. Pocheptsov H.G. *Constructive analysis of the structure of the proposal.* - K.: Higher School, 2011. - 191 p.
16. Rayman E.A. *English prepositions. Values and functions.* - M.: Nauka, 2012. - 145 p.
17. Selyverstova O.N. Does the preposition have only grammatical meaning? // *Questions of philology.* – 2019. – No. 3. - pp. 26-34.
18. Seniv M.G. *Preposition in classical languages.* - Donetsk: Yugo-Vostok, 2015. - 272 p.
19. Seniv M.G. Spatial meanings in the lexical-semantic system of prepositions (on the material of classical languages) // *Typology of linguistic meanings in diachronic and comparative aspects: Collection. of science Ave. / V.D. Kaliushchenko (ed. coll.) and others.* – Donetsk: Don NU, 2013. – Issue 8. – P. 38-54.
20. Filipenko M.V. Problems of description of prepositions in modern linguistic theories // *Research on the semantics of prepositions: Collected articles.* - M.: Russian Dictionaries, 2012. - P. 12-54.
21. Dirven R., Verspoor M. *Cognitive Exploration of Language and Linguistics // Cognitive Linguistics in Practice,* - Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2015. - 281 p.

22. Fillmore CH Some Problems for Case Grammar // Georgetown University Monograph of Languages and Linguistics. - Washington: Georgetown University, 2011. - P. 1-24.
23. Fries Ch.C. The Structure of English. - NY, 2012. - 400
24. Ilush BA The structure of Modern English. - Ed. 2. - M.: Nauka, 2011. - 321 p.
25. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Grammar of Contemporary English. - London, 2012. - 365
26. Rayevska MN Modern English Grammar. - K., 2016. - 304 p.
27. Sandra D., Rice S. Network analysis of prepositional meaning: Mirroring whose mind – the linguist's or the language user's? // Cognitive Linguistics. - Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2015. - Vol. 6. - P. 89-130.
38. Taylor JR Cognitive Grammar. Further Readings on English Syntax. - London, 2012. - 380 p.