Pronouns in the System of Parts of Speech

Rakhim Zakievich Muryasov

Department of Romance and Germanic Philology, Bashkir State University, Ufa, Russia

Email address:
Rakhimmuryasov@yandex.ru

Abstract: There are no school and university grammars on Indo-European (I-E) and Turkic languages, as well as no studies on the theory of parts of speech, in which the problem of pronouns is regarded from various perspectives. This class of words does not have a general semantic feature that is characteristic of all its categories, as is the case in other auto semantic parts of speech – nouns and verbs. It is not possible to specify syntactic functions that are common to all pronouns. Their morphological and paradigmatic characteristics are also heterogeneous. For example, personal pronouns have a declension paradigm that is not represented in other parts of speech. Their distinctive feature is suppletion within the case paradigm. The analysis of grammatical studies shows that there are significant differences in the definition of the quantitative composition and nomenclature of pronouns both within the same language of different authors, and in different languages in typological terms. Significant quantitative differences are revealed between different categories of this part of speech in all the languages under analysis – from 1 to 77. There are no clear boundaries between pronouns proper and the so-called pronominal words. The article presents a typological description of the types of morphological structure of all categories of pronouns in different languages. The classifications of the categories of pronouns are contradictory. Thus, the status of the so-called reflexives is defined differently: some linguists consider them as amplifying forms of personal pronouns, while others grant them the status of an independent category. In typological terms the indefinite pronoun they in English, man in German, on in French and their grammatical equivalent in Russian – the form of the 3rd person plural are of great interest. The paper also reveals the inverse relationship between the morphological structure and the one or multi-meaning of pronouns, namely: the simpler the morphological structure of a unit, the more multifunctional it is, and, vice versa, the more complex the morphological structure is, the poorer this unit is in functional and semantic terms.

Keywords: Level Structure, Morphological Structure, Pronoun Categories

1. Introduction

The field structure is an inherent property of the system of parts of speech, in which classes of words are distinguished. They correspond to all three criteria developed in linguistic science: 1) the presence of a general semantic feature, 2) the commonality of morphological categories, and 3) identical syntactic functions in the sentence. However, not all classes of words defined as parts of speech in traditional grammar have these characteristics.

All of the above-mentioned features are inherent in two parts of speech that form the core of the system of parts of speech, that is, the noun and the verb, around which other parts of speech are grouped. The peripheral zone of the system includes those groupings of words that are characterized by either an incomplete set of the above features, or they are not inherent in any of them. For example, within the far peripheral zone of the system of parts of speech, namely, interjections and onomatopes (onomatopoeic words), none of the criteria can be applied [1, 2].

Between the core and the peripheral zone of the parts of speech, the intermediate zone is formed by such classes of words, in the distinction of which the entire set of features cannot be used. The adjectives closest to the core are those which categorical semantic feature is quality. There is also a grammatical category inherent in this part of speech – the category of degree of comparison. However, in morphological terms, this part of speech is completely dependent on the paradigmatics of the noun being defined.

The purpose of this article is to determine the relevance or/and irrelevance of the above-mentioned principles of

classification of parts of speech in relation to different categories of pronouns as well as their quantitative and qualitative characteristics in different languages. The comparative method is applied in the analysis of both morphological structure and functional-semantic potential of the classes of pronouns based on the data from university grammars and partly from lexicographic sources. The observation method is also applied regarding the functioning of this part of speech in authentic (original) and translated texts.

2. Research

Pronouns are the most heterogeneous and contradictory part of speech in terms of morphology and semantics. The name of this part of speech itself goes back in the Germanic and Romance languages to the Latin grammatical term "*pronomen*"(pro "instead of, for" and nomen "name"), and in Russian "mestoimeniye" is a morphonologically modified calque of the Latin term (cf. the pronoun, French: le pronom, German: das Pronomen).

From the point of view of its internal form (morphological structure), this term does not reflect the functions that this part of speech performs in the language. Pronouns act not only as substitutes (sunstituents) for the name, but also for almost all significant parts of speech, on the one hand, and some categories of pronouns serve as substitutes for syntactic structures of varying complexity: phrases, sentences, and contexts that describe entire situations. The fact that a compressed pronoun can indicate both antecedent and postcedent structures of various complexity has led to criticism of this term and the introduction of such terms as pro-form, pro-verb, pro-predicate in English [3], Pro-Form, Pro-Wort, Fürwort in German [4, 5], proforme in French [6].

The term almashlyk "substitute," used in Turkology to refer to this part of speech seems to be a good one [7]. Since it does not relate to any particular part of speech or language unit, but is universal in nature.

In quantitative terms, pronouns form a relatively closed class of words. Some linguists believe that, for example, in German, their number does not exceed 70 [8]. Duden-Grammar has 75 pronouns [5]. N. Shvedova has distinguished more than 200 of them in Russian [9]. Despite this fact, pronouns are characterized by high frequency in the text. In some passages of the text, they are more frequent even than such significant parts of speech as the noun and verb, not to mention adjectives and adverbs, cf.:

Russian: Berlioz tosklivo oglyanulsya, ne ponimaya, *chto yego* napugalo. *On* poblednel, vyter lob platkom, podumal: "*Chto eto so mnoy*? *Etogo nikogda* ne bylo… serdse shalit. *Ya* pereutomilsya…pozhaluy pora brosit *vsyo* k chyortu i v Kislovodsk" [10];

English: Berlioz gazed miserably about *him*, unable to say *what* had frightened *him*. *He* went pale, wiped *his* forehead with *his* handkerchief and thought: "*What*'s the matter with *me*? *This* has never happened before. Heart playing tricks… *I*'m overstrained… *I* think *it*'s time to chuck *everything* up

and go and take the waters at Kislovodsk…[11];

German: Wehmütig schaute *er* hinter *sich* und begriff nicht, was*ihn* ängstigte. *Er* erblaßte, wischte *sich* mit dem Taschentuch die Stirn und dachte: *Was* hab *ich* bloß? *So was* kenne *ich* doch gar nicht. Das Herz macht Dummheiten… *Ich* bin überarbeitet. Vielleicht sollte *ich alles* stehen – und liegenlassen und nach Kislovodsk abhauen…[12];

French: Très peiné, Berlioz promena *ses* yeux alentour, ne comprenant pas *ce qui* avait pu l'effrayer ainsi. *Il* pâlit, s'épongea le front de *son* mouchoiz et pensa: "Mais *qu'*ai-*je* donc? *C'*est *la* premiere fois que pareille chose m'arrive. *Ce* doit être *mon* cœur *qui me* joue des tours... le surmenade... *il* faudrait peut-être que j'envoice *tout* au diable, et que j'aille faire une cure à Kislovodsk..." [13].

Personal pronouns are particularly high-frequency in dialogic texts, cf.:

Russian: - Nu-s, *chemyavam* mogu byt polezen? (Bulgakov)

English: - Well sir, and *what* can *I* do for *you*;

German: - Nun, womit kann *ich Ihnen* dienen?

French:- Eh, bien, en *quoi* puis-*jevous*être utile

There are also sentences, all the members of which, except for the predicate, are expressed by pronouns.

Russian: *Etonikogo* iz *vas* ne kasayetsya;

English: *It* doesn't concern *anybody* of *you*;

German: Das geht *niemanden* von *euch etwas* an;

French: *Cela* ne regarde *aucun* de *vous*.

Despite the above-mentioned frequency of pronouns in the text and discourse, their status as a part of speech is controversial. In this regard, we can point out three viewpoints.

1. Denial of the status of pronouns as a part of speech

2. Partial recognition or denial of their categorical status.

3. Distinguishing of pronouns as a special part of speech.

The first approach is most clearly presented in Russian Grammar (RG), in which pronouns were included in other parts of speech as their lexical and grammatical categories. Thus, the RG distinguishes categories of words with a bicategorical, hybrid name "pronoun-noun", defined as a class of words that indicate the subject and express "the meaning of the indication in the morphological categories of case (successively), number and gender (unsuccessfully)" [14]. A Part of the pronouns in the cited grammar is included in the class of adjectives of the pronominal declension (nash, moy, tvoy, svoy, etot, chei, tot, ves, sam etc.), i.e. possessive, demonstrative, etc. Pronouns in traditional classifications [14].

A particularily contradictory position of pronouns in the parts of speech system of Russian is reflected in the work of V. V. Vinogradov, in which the chapter devoted to this part of speech bears the unusual title "Grammatical remnants of Pronouns as a special part of speech in the modern Russian language" [15].

In recent decades, Russian linguistic science has emphasized the special status of pronouns in the language system. T. M. Nikolaeva states in this regard: "If for many decades pronouns were the "stepson" in the system of parts of speech, then in recent decades there have been works in which pronouns are

essentially declared the center of the language system" [16]. In this concept, pronouns form a sui generis hyperparadigm in the system of parts of speech. N. Yu. Shvedova states: "The system of pronouns covers the most general concepts, which then receive various, hierarchically organized names in the vocabulary, (they) are formalized in grammar and morphemics and designated by words that connect and qualify" [9]. Further, N. Yu. Shvedova emphasizes: "The class of pronouns is an arsenal of semantic abstractions contained in the language as a whole" [ibid.].

The semantic and grammatical heterogeneity of different categories of pronouns has led to the presence of multilayer, categorically hybrid designations also in other languages, cf. In English: possessive pronouns-adjectives, possessive pronouns - nouns [17], pronominal adjectives (adjectiva pronominalia), pronominal nouns (substantia pronominalia) in Latin [18], substantive pronouns (substantivische Pronomen), adjectival pronouns (adjektivische Pronomen) and article pronouns (artikelartige Pronomen) in German [19].

Despite the fact that in the Tatar language pronouns are considered an autonomous part of speech, all their categories have categorically hybrid designations: pronouns-nouns (min "I", ty "you", ul "he", bez "we" etc.), pronouns-adjectives (bu "this", shundiy "such", caysy "which" etc.), pronouns-adverbs (cayda "where", caychan "when" etc"), pronouns-numerals (cypme" how many", bernich " some "etc.), pronouns-verbs (itü, nitü" do"), pronouns-conjunctions (shunysy" that, what"), pronouns-particles (bary" only") [7].

The authors of the largest study on the grammar of modern English refer pronouns, along with the article, to functional words, and not to significant parts of speech: "Pronouns are used instead of full noun phrases in two situations: (1) when the entities referred to are identifiable through the speech situations or the surrounding text; (2) when the reference is unknown or general" [3].

The authors of the cited English grammar point out the need to distinguish between the terms pronoun and pro-form. They refer to a fairly wide range of units as substitute words: "The pro-form *so*, which replaces clauses or verb complements:" Do you think they're going to attack? "" I expect so <so=that they're going to attack> " [3]. In this grammar, predicate and adverbial units are also referred to as pro-forms: pro-predicates do and do so; now, then, therefore, thus, here, there, hence: "Health workers cannot use the proper techniques unless they are trained to do so <do so=use the proper techniques>" [ibid.].

Despite the semantic and morphological heterogeneity of the categories of pronouns in school and university grammars, they are considered as an integral part of speech.

In LED, pronouns are assigned to significant parts of speech: "A pronoun is a lexical and semantic class of significant words, the meaning of which includes either a reference to a speech act (to its participants, a speech situation, or to the utterance itself), or an indication of the type of speech correlation of a word with a non-linguistic reality (its denotative status)" [20].

In the linguistic literature, there are different approaches to determining the place of pronouns in the system of parts of speech. In some studies on the grammar of English and German, all parts of speech are divided into two blocks. Pronouns appear along with prepositions, conjunctions, and articles in a group of word classes called "functional words" (German: Funktionswörter) [3, 21, 5].

Contradictory approaches to determining the status of pronouns create certain difficulties for the theory of language as a whole. Thus, functionally correlative units in different languages are interpreted differently, i.e. they relate to different parts of speech. German linguist Eisenberg states: "Die grammatischen Kategorien der Wortarten sind nach Auffassung fast aller Grammatiker in zwei Gruppen zu unterteilen, nämlich die lexikalischen oder offenen Kategorien Substantiv, Verb, Adjektiv und Adverb und die Funktionswörter oder abgeschlossenen Kategorien Präposition, Partikel, Konjunktion, Artikel und Pronomen" [22, 34].

However, often the same unit in different languages refers to different parts of speech, cf.: when: adverb, conjunction, pronoun [23], *German*: wann: Adverb [24], *French*: mȇme: pronom, adjectiv indéfinit, adverb [25], *Russian*: kogda: adverb, conjunction [26].

Thus, the peculiairty of pronouns in the language system is that they do not have all the features that are characteristic of other significant parts of speech. First of all, this refers to the absence of its own generalized semantic feature. Their reference to a particular person, object or phenomenon is of a referential nature and is contextually determined.

3. Structural Types of Pronouns

The structure of pronouns in different languages has its own specific features. Usually, in the same language, different types of bases have different specific weight in different lexical and grammatical categories. Often, within the same category simple, complex and composite structures are distinguished. In all languages, indefinite pronouns (pronomina indefinite) have a particularly rich set of structures.

Russian: Ryadom s Margaritoy *nikogo* ne bylo, no nemnogo podalshe za kustamy slyshalis vsplesky i fyrkanye, tam tozhe *kto-to* kupalsya [10];

German: In ihrer Nähe war *niemand*, aber in einiger Entfernung hörte *sie* hinter den Büschen ein Plätschern und Prusten – dort badete auch *wer* (≈ *jemand irgendwer, irgendjemand*) [12];

French: Près de Marguerite, *il* n'*y* avait personne, mais plus loin, derrière les baisson, *il* devait y avoir *un autre* baigneur, car, *on* enlenotent *quelqu'ons'*ébrouer et éclabousser [13].

In English, German structures with the indefinite pronoun *man* are rendered in two ways: 1) by the pronoun *they* and 2) by passive verb construction:

Russian: –*Govoryat,* chto on … dengi budto by poluchil … [10];

English: *They* say… that he is supposed to have been paid… [11];

German: *Man* sagt… er habe Geld dafür bekommen…[12];

– *On* dit… qu'il aurait touché de l'argent... [13].
Cf. Russian.
Russian: - Mne *govorili*, chto moy otets byl siriyets [10];
English: - I *was told* that my father was a Syrien… [11];
German: - *Man* hat mir gesagt, mein Vater sei ein Syrer gewesen [12];
French: *On* m'a dit que mon p re était syrien... [13].

The Latin language is dominated by simple and complex pronominal stems [8]: simple: personal (ego "I", tu "you", nos "we"), possessive (meus "my", tuus "your", etc., demonstrative (hic "this", is "that, he", idem "that, the same, etc.), interrogative (quis, "who", quid "what", qui "who, which, which, what for", etc.).), some indefinite pronouns (quis "somebody, somebody", nemo "nobody", nihil "nothing»); complex: relative (qui-cunque "whoever, whatever, whoever, whatever", quis-quis "whoever" quid-quid "whatever"), indefinite: aliquis, alique, aliquam "anybody, anyone", quidam, quedam, quiddam, quoddam, quispiam, quisque, quaque, quique "someone, anyone), unisquisque, unaquaque, unumquidque, unumquodque, quilibet, quidlibet, quodlibet, quivis "each, each", uterque "each of the two, both", neuter "none of the two, neither ".

The Russian language is also characterized by simple and complex structures of pronominal stems: simple: personal (ya, ty, on, my), possessive (moi, tvoi, yego, nash, vash, ikh), interrogative (kto? chto? chei? kotoriy?), relative, coinciding with interrogative, determinative (ves, vsyakiy, kazhdiy, liuboi, inoi, sam etc.); complex: some indicative (tot-to, takoi-to), negative (nikto, nekogo, nichto, nechego), indefinite (kto-nibud, kto-to, kto-libo, koye-kto, nekto, chto-to, chto-nibud, chto-libo, koye-chto).

English pronouns are also dominated by simple and complex structures [3, 18]; only in certain cases there are composite stems: simple: personal (I, me, you, we, they), possessive (my, his, her, its, our); demonstrative (this, that, it, one), interrogative and relative (who, whose, what, which); impersonal *it*, some indefinite (some, all, any, none, much, many, little, few, both, either, each, other, one); complex: reflexive (myself, yourself, himself, ourselves, themselves, oneself); indefinite (anybody, somebody, everybody); compound: reciprocal (each other / one another).

In German, there are two types of pronominal stems [4, 5]: simple: personal, possessive ich-mein, du-dein, wir-unser, etc.), part of demonstrative pronouns (der "this", es "this", dieser "this", jener "that", solcher "such, similar", selber "himself", selbst "himself", beide "that, and the other, both"), interrogative (wer "who", was "what", welcher "who", wer "who", was "what"), reflexive (sich / mich / dich / uns / euch); some vaguely personal (man, ein, einer, someone, someone, someone", jeder "everyone", jemand "someone, someone", etwas "something, some, some, some, someone, something"), negative (niemand "nobody", nichts "nothing", kein "not"), complex: part of the demonstratives (derjenige "that", derselbe "the same, the same"). Mutual pronoun einander "each other", compound interrogative pronoun: was für ein? "which", indefinite (so etwas "something like").

The most complex picture is revealed when analyzing the structure of pronouns in the French language [27]. It is dominated by complex and composite types of stems: simple: prepositional and autonomous personal pronouns (tu, il1, elle, nous, vous; moi, toi, lui, soi, etc.), indicative ("this, that"), some interrogative qui "who", que "what", quoi "what"), a few relative (qui "which", que "which, which, which", don't "which, which, which"), impersonal pronoun (il: il pleut "it's raining", il est trois heures "it is three o'clock»); negative (nul "nobody", personne "nobody", rien "nothing"); indefinite (un "one", tout "all", certains "some", etc.), (un autre "some other", autre chose "something else", qui que "whoever", quoi que "whatever"; complex interrogatives (lequel "which", laquelle "which", lesquelles "which", etc.), relative (aucun"nobody, no one"), composite (de laquelle" which", à laquelle " which»); indefinite (l'autre quelqu'on "someone, somebody", d'autres "some others", quelques "someone, somebody, d'autres "some others", quelques-uns "some", quiconque "anyone who"; indicative (celui-la "that", celle-ci "this" celle-la "that", (le même "the same", la même "the same"); compound: possessive (le mien "my", la mienne "my", le tien "your", la tienne "your", les nôtres "our", les vôtres "your", les leurs "their").

In French, whole phrases function as pronouns, cf. qui est-ce qui? "who?", qu'est-ce qui?, qu'est-ce que? "what?"

The peculiarities of the French language also include the use of paired negative pronouns: ne... personne, pas... rien, ne... rien, ne... pas: As-tu un stylo? – Non, je n'en ai pas. Ça ne vous regarde en rien.

In Russian, two negative pronouns can also be used in the same sentence: On *nikogda nikogo* ne videt In English and German, as a rule, one negative pronoun is used: He doesn't see *anyone*; It doesn't concern you; it. Er sieht *niemanden*. Das geht Sie *nichts* an.

In the Turkic languages, for example, in Tatar, the structure of pronouns has a number of features that are not inherent in the I.-E. languages. Common with the I.-E. languages is the presence of a non-derivative structure of personal pronouns: min, sin, ul, bez, sez, alar.

Possessive pronouns have received somewhat different interpretation in the Tatar language. In the grammar of the Tatar language, it is noted that possession is expressed by the forms of the genitive of personal pronouns (minem "my", sineng "your", bezneng "our", sezneng "your", etc.) and by attaching the affixes-nyky / -neke to personal pronouns, cf. minem kitap" my book "and kitap mineke" my book " [7]; demonstrative pronouns. In the Tatar language, three types of indefinite pronouns are structurally distinguished: derivatives with the help of affixes-yr/ -er, -dyr/-der, which have variants in composite structures (kemder /ællæ kem "someone", nærsæder/ ællæ nærsæ /nider /ællæ ni "something; complex (kaiber "some", bernichæ / berkadæp / bernikadæp "several", etc.). A single structural feature has the pronoun fælæn "some, so-and-so".

Based on a comparative analysis of the structural types of pronouns in different languages, two of the most significant conclusions can be drawn. First, the structural types are unevenly distributed among the different categories of

pronouns. The richest set of structural types is typical for pronouns in French, and the smallest set of structural types of pronouns is represented in Russian. Secondly, different structural types have different specific weight in different languages. Thus, complex and composite structures are also characteristic of pronouns in French and of indefinite pronouns in English, Russian, and Tatar. The greatest number of units in all languages is represented by indefinite pronouns. Thus, N. Shvedova distinguishes more than 77 indefinite pronouns [9].

There is a certain relationship between the volume of the structure and the polyfunctionality of pronouns, namely: the simpler the morphological structure of a pronoun, the richer its semantic structure, and the more complex the morphological structure of a pronoun, the poorer its semantics, i.e., the more monofunctional it is.

Monosyllabic pronouns, on the one hand, and complex and compound pronouns form functionally opposite poles – the former are always polyfunctional, the latter tend to be monofunctional, cf. *es, English it and French il, ce*: 1) personal pronoun: das Buch-es, the / a book – it, le livre-il, ce; 2) when describing natural phenomena: es regnet / schneit, it is raining / it is snowing; il pleut / il neige; 3) empty subject [3, 21]: German. es ist acht Uhr, es ist höchste Zeit; Eng. it's eight o'clock, it's time; Fr. Il est huit heure. Il est temps; 4) preparatory subject: It's pleasant to see you here. Es ist angenehm dich hier zu sehen; Fr. C'est un grand plaisir de vous voir ici; 5) preparatory object or formal object: Eng. I thought it my duty to warn you, German. Ich hielt es für meine Pflicht, Sie zu warnen [23].

Analysis of pronouns such as German. *es*, Eng. *it*, Fr. *il, ce* leads us to the idea that we are dealing with two different

pronouns – personal and impersonal.

In Russian, there is also a pronoun of the 3rd person singular of the neuter gender*оно*, which vaguely resembles impersonal pronouns in other languages, but is rarely used. This pronoun indicates some unexpected situation, cf. Vot ved *ono* inogda tak byvayet! "Sometimes occur things like that".

The differences in semantic structure are especially prominent when comparing simple and complex pronouns formed from them, cf. it and itself, what and whatever, who and whoever; it. ein and irgendein, was and irgendwas; Fr. quelque and quelqu'un / quelque / chose [27].

4. Categories of Pronouns and Their Paradigmatic Features

In linguistic publications, two approaches to the classification of pronouns are known: 1. in relation to other parts of speech and 2. internal classification, i.e. by category. On the basis of the first feature, three groups of pronouns are distinguished: 1. substantive, 2. adjective, and 3. bicategorical (substantive and adjective). These groups were pointed out by O. Espersen [28]. In some grammars, adverbial and verbal pronouns are also indicated [3, 7].

The internal classification of pronouns seems to be very complex and contradictory. There is no consensus in the linguistic texts also on the number and nomenclature of the categories of pronouns. They do not coincide even within the same language for different authors. See the table of categories in English.

Table 1. The Types of Pronouns in English in Different Grammars.

Categories of pronouns	[29]	[30]	[31]	[32]	[3]	[21]	[33]	[34]
1. Personal	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
2. Possessive	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
3. Reflexive	–	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
4. Reciprocal	–	+	–	+	+	–	+	–
5. Demonstrative	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
6. Interrogative		+	+	+	+	–	–	+
7. Interrogative-relative	+	+	–	+	+		+	
8. Relative	–	+	+	+	+			+
9. Indefinite	+	+	–		+	+	+	+
10. Negative	+	+	–		+	+	+	+
11. Indefinite-personal			+			+		+
12. Impersonal					+	+		
13. Integrity	–	–	–	–	–	–	+	–
Total	5	10	7	8	10	8	9	9

Table 2. The List of Types of Pronouns in Different Languages.

Categories of pronouns	Russian	English	German	French	Tatar
1. Personal	+	+	+	+	+
2. Possessive	+	+	+	+	+
3. Reflexive	+	+	+	+	+
4. Reciprocal	+	+	+	+	–
5. Demonstrative	+	+	+	+	+
6. Interrogative	+	+	+	+	+
7. Interrogative-relative	+	+	+	+	–
8. Relative	+	+	+	+	+
9. Indefinite	+	+	+	+	+
10. Negative	+	+	+	+	+

Categories of pronouns	Russian	English	German	French	Tatar
11. Indefinite-personal	–	+	+	–	+
12. Impersonal	–	+	+	+	–
13. Integrity	–	–	+	+	–
14. Identification and exceptionality	–	–	+	+	–
15. Duality	–	–	+	–	–
Total	10	12	15	14	9

Note: Quantitative data for each language compiled on the basis of a number of grammars by different authors

The internal classification of pronouns is not without contradictions. The most controversial issues are as follows: 1) the number of units belonging to a particular category; 2) the definition of the category status of a particular pronoun, as well as their part-of-speech characteristics. Many units are polyfunctional at the level of parts of speech, cf. Fr. un, - e: 1) indefinite article, 2) adjective, 3) pronoun; Eng. one: 1) numeral, 2) adjective, 3) indefinite pronoun, etc.

Many pronouns are polyfunctional in the sense that the same unit is included in two or more lexical and grammatical categories. The status of interrogative and relative pronouns, between which there are no differences in terms of expression, is unstable. For this reason, some linguists combine them into one category called "interrogative-relative" pronouns [33]. There is also no single point of view about the status of the so-called reflexives. For example, in German, some grammatical studies treat *sich* as a personal pronoun [35, 5], in others - as an amplifying form of personal pronouns [36]; in a number of grammars as an independent category-reflexive: Russian. sebya, sebe, soboi; Eng. oneself, myself, himself etc., Fr. m me, me, te, se etc. In the Tatar language, this pronoun is absent and the reflexive is expressed by a special affix that is part of the structure of the verb stem.

Reflexive in the typological aspect has linguistic-specific features.

In the English language, the reflexive is expressed by attaching the component *self: myself, yourself, ourselves* etc. to the stems of the possessive pronouns: I introduce myself to your parents. We introduce ourselves to your parents.

In French, reflexivity is expressed by the repetition of personal pronouns in the forms of the object case: Je mé présent à tes parents. Nous nous présentons à tes parents etc.

In German, the reflexive *sich* has forms of different indirect cases, depending on the forms of the personal pronoun-subject: Ich stelle mich deinen Eltern vor. Wir stellen uns deinen Eltern vor. The reflexive *sich* in German has the forms of dative and accusative: Stelle dir vor. Stellen wir uns vor.

The peculiarity of the Russian language is that the reflexive does not correlate with personal pronouns and in all personal forms of the verb singular and plural, the same pronoun *sebya* is used in different case forms: ya chuvstvuiy / ty chuvstvuiesh / my chuvstvuiem / oni chuvstvuiut *sebya* artistami. But: English: I feel myself to be an artist / He (she) feels himself (herself) to be an artist / We feel ourselves to be an artist etc. German: Ich fühle mich als Künstler; Fr. Je me sens comme acteur / Nous nous sentons comme acteur etc.

Some verbs with *sich* in German and their equivalents in other languages without this component do not exist and, therefore, they are not reflexive, cf.: German: sich verspäten, French: se mettre en retard. Such verbs rarely coincide in their structure in different languages, cf. to be late; cf. further: Russian: usmekhnutisia, English: to smirk, to grin; German: grinsen; French: ricaner; Rus.: oslushatsia, Eng.: to disobey, Germ.: nicht gehorchen, French: désobéir. The German *sich* and its equivalents in other languages are not a reflexive pronoun in passive constructions with a modal meaning, cf.: French: Ce vin se boit au dessert [37], German. Dieser Wein trinkt sich gut, but: English: the vine is pleasant to drink [38].

As for the quantitative composition of the categories of pronouns, there is an asymmetry between different categories both within the same language and in the contrastive-typological aspect. Some categories of pronouns are represented by one or two lexical units, while others consist of a number of units. Thus, the category of reciprocal pronouns in Russian and German consists of one unit (einander, each other), in English-of two units (each other, drug druga). The most numerous number in the languages under analysis is represented by the category of indefinite pronouns. So, in Russian, N. Shvedova distinguishes 77 indefinite pronouns [9]. On the other hand, the author considers the pronoun *samiy*as a separate category in the Russian language, "meaning exclusivity, never functioning independently and introducing the meaning of concentration and exclusive givenness, withdrawn from the set" [9].

We should note the complex nature of possessive pronouns in different languages. Thus, in English and German, the indirect forms of some pronouns are interpreted in two ways: in English, his "as a possessive determiner... (followed by a noun: He gave me his address) and "as a possessive pronoun (without a following noun):... I deal with *my* problems and he deals with *his*" [23].

In German, the pronouns mein, sein, dein, etc. are interpreted in two ways: as possessive pronoun and as possessive case of personal pronouns ich, dich er etc. [24]: gedunk mein, vergiß mein nicht (remember me, don't forget me), erbarme dich mich or meiner (have pity on me).

In all languages, possessives are used as a predicate, i.e. without connection with any noun: English: Whose book is that? - It's mine; German: Wessen Buch ist das? – Das ist meins.

In French equivalents of the English, German and Russian possessive pronouns are defined as adjectives (adjective possessive), the possessive pronouns are only analytical forms with the definite article le / la: le mien "my" (masc.), la mienne "my" (fem.), les miens / les miennes (pl.) cf.

Russian: – Imya? – *Moyo*? – toroplivo otozvalsya

arestovanniy. – *Moyo* imya izvestno… *Tvoyo* [10].

English: "Name?" – "*Mine*? inquired the prisoner hurriedly… "I know *my* own name… "*your* name" [11].

German: - Name? – *Mein* Name? fragte der Gefangene eilig…*Meiner* ist mir bekannt, sagte der Prokurator leise… Den *deinen* will ich wissen [12].

French: – Nom?– Le *mien*? repondit hâtivement le détenu… Le procurateur dit à mi-voux:

– Pas le *mien*, je le connais. Le *tien*, oui [13].

Something similar is observed in the Turkic languages. So, in the Tatar language, to express belonging, on the one hand, the form of the genitive (possessive) case of a personal pronoun is used, which performs an attributive function before a noun (minem kitab "my book"), on the other hand, belonging to something, to someone can be expressed by a possessive pronoun formed from stems of personal pronouns using the suffixes-yky / -ike, in independent use as a predicate: bu kitab mineke (the book is mine).

Some categories of pronouns are represented only in one or two languages. For example, attributive pronouns are distinguished in the Russian and Tatar languages: Rus.: vsyakiy, vsyacheskiy, kazhdiy, liuboi, ves, tseloye etc.; Tat.: boeten "whole" hærkem" everybody", hærnærsə "everything", etc., the equivalents of which in other languages are referred to as indefinite pronouns.

Only in French there is an independent category of universal pronouns (les pronoms de la totalité): tout "any, all", chacun, "each", toutes "every". In the French language, pronouns with the meaning of identification and differentiation (les pronoms d'identification et de distinction) are treated as an independent category: mȇme chose "the same" [27].

In the German grammar of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, collective distributives (Kollektiv-und Distributivpronomenon: alle "all", jeder "everyone", irgendjemand "somebody") and Dualis (beide "both") are given as special categories [19].

The paradigmatic features of the categories of pronouns determined, first of all, by what part of speech they are replaced. Thus, possessive, demonstrative, and relative pronouns in attributive use take an adjectival paradigm. Substantive pronouns are characterized by a great variety of their paradigmatics. In this group, a special place is occupied by personal pronouns, which have grammatical features peculiar only to them.

1. A specific case paradigm that does not coincide with that of other nominal parts of speech.

2. The case paradigm includes the suppletive forms that go back to Latin in the opposition "imenitelniy (nominative) case: object cases" in Russian and German and "direct case: object cases" in English and French, cf. Lat. ego "ya": mei "u menya", mihi "mne"; me "menya"; de me "obo mne", mecum "so mnoyu", English: I, me, French: je: moi, Russian: ya, menya, German: ich: mir, mich, etc.

3. Grammatical opposition on the basis of the generic feature in the 3rd person singular in Russian, German and French, and the absence of such an opposition in English.

4. The presence in the English language of the opposition of pronouns of the 3rd person singular on the basis of "animateness-inanimateness" (he/she: it) and within the animateness of the opposition "male person: female person" (he: she).

5. Complete suppletion of the forms of opposition "singular: plural" (Latin: ego: nos, tu: vos; Russian: ya, my, ty, vy; English: I: we, he/ she/ it: they; German: ich: wir, du: ihr, er / sie/ es: sie; French: je: nous, tu: vous. The 3rd person singular and plural in Russian and French are formed from a common stem: Rus.: on / ona / ono: oni; Fr.: il / elle: ils / elles.

6. If in Russian, English and German the generic differences of the 3rd person pronouns in the plural are neutralized, then in French the gender opposition is preserved, cf. il "he": ils "they" and elle "she": elles "they".

7. Personal pronouns have a special communicative potential: outside context, they are not characterized by denotative correlation and they represent discursively conditioned communicative-variable units of the language.

The cognitive differences between the plural forms of nouns and pronouns should also be noted. If plural form of nouns can be represented as the formula "student 1 +student 2 + student 3 + student n=students", then this formula does not apply to personal pronouns * "I 1 + I 2 + I 3 + I 4 + I n=we". For example, the plural form of the pronoun *we* can have the formulas "I + you=we", "I + you + he / she + you + they=we", etc. Personal pronouns plural can express an indefinite number of people, that can be defined in contexts.

Individual languages have their own paradigmatic features of personal pronouns. For example, in the Russian language, a six-part structure is retained in the case paradigm of personal pronouns as well as in the substantive paradigm. In the English language, the case system of personal pronouns is represented by a two-part structure: he – him, she – her, etc., in the German language, the four-part case paradigm is preserved: ich – mein, meiner (obsolete) - mir-mich.

There is no morphological category of case in French. However, the forms of personal pronouns are opposed to each other on two grounds: 1. the verbal (dependent) use of personal pronouns (je travail "I work", j'écris "I write») and the autonomous (independent) use in the sentence (qui est là "who is there?" - C'est moi "this is me"), 2. There are also some differences in their use as a direct and indirect complement.

Unlike other I.-E. languages, in which there is no opposition of the 3rd person pronouns in the plural on the basis a generic feature, in French there are differences between the forms of masculine and feminine genders, depending on whether the pronoun is used, firstly, in the subject or object function, and, secondly, whether this pronoun is a prepositional or an autonomous one. There are certain communicative differences in the use of prepositional (dependent) and autonomous forms of personal pronouns.

The autonomous personal pronouns *moi, toi, lui, soi, nous, vous, eux, and elles* are used when the subject is logically distinguished.:

Russian: -Byvayut sredi nikh magi … i ubiytsy, govoril monotonno prokuror – a popadayutsya lguny. *Ty*, naprimer, lgun (Bulgakov).

French: - Parmi eux, il y a des mages... Et il y a aussi des menteurs. *Toi*, par exemple, tu es un menteur.

English: - There are also liars. *You*, for instance, are a liar" [11].

If a grammatical category is understood as one or another generalized semantic feature represented in a language by a system of morphological means that form a word-changing paradigm consisting of at least two forms of the same word opposed to each other, then the personal forms of the verb are characterized in different languages by an unequal degree of consistent expression. The comparative study of the I.-E. and the Turkic languages leads to the identification of the following pattern: the use of personal pronouns and personal forms of the verb are interrelated; the more clearly the inflections of word forms are opposed, the more optional the use of verbs in combination with personal pronouns, and, vice versa, the more homonymous links in the paradigm, the more obligatory the use of personal pronouns [39]. The ideal inflectional paradigm in the verb conjugation system is characteristic of Latin, presentational forms of Russian, as well as personal forms for verbs in the Turkic languages, cf. orno "I adorn" - ornas "you adorn" - ornat "he adorns"; Latin is characterized by the absence of homonymy of personal verb forms in all tenses of the indicative and conjunctive (preterit: ornabam – ornabas – ornabat – ornabamus – ornabatis – ornabant; perfect: ornavi – ornavis – ornavit – ornavimus, etc.; plusquamperfect: ornaveram – ornaveras – ornaverat – ornaveramus, etc.; si tacuisses, "if you were silent"). The use of personal pronouns in Latin occurs when they are logically opposed, cf. Paene ille timore, ego risu corrui. He almost fell from fear, I from laughter (Cic.). Usually, the personal forms of the verb are not accompanied by pronouns, cf. Cogito, ergo sum; Veni, vidi, vici. Russian past tense does not indicate the person performing this or that action: я/ ты / он читал, мы / вы / они читали; in the future tense, the Russian verb has a inflectional paradigm, the members of which are consistently opposed to each other, as in the present paradigm: prochitayu – prochitayesh – prochtayet etc., budu chitat – budesh chitat – budet chitat etc.

In German, morphological oppositions in verbal paradigmatics are generally consistent. However, some homonymous links appear in it, cf. ich mache-du machst-er macht; wir machen – ihr macht-sie machen.

The homonymy of personal verb forms is even more common in English than in Russian and German. The present form of the verb is represented in it by only one explicit marker, and the other four forms are homonymous: I / you / we / they write: he / she / it writes, and in the preterital form (past simple) we have a complete homonymy of all personal forms, i.e. there is not a single morphological marker of the person and number, the personal forms of the verb are represented by a "bare" stem: I / you / he / she / it / we / they wrote. A similar phenomenon is also observed in the forms of the future tense.

The French language stands out in this respect, in which the verb forms in the singular are graphically opposed only partially, namely, the 1st and 2nd person singular are homographs that are graphically opposed to the 3rd person of the singular: j'écris "I write" - tu écris "you write", but: il / elle écrit. All three forms are pronounced identically, i.e. they are homophones. In the plural, the forms of all three persons are opposed to each other both graphically and phonetically: nous écrivons – vous écrivez – ils / elles écrivent. Homophony is characteristic of the singular forms and also used in the formation of the imperfect (imparfait) of the indicative and the present of the conditional mood (conditionnel): je parlais – tu parlais – il parlait; je parlerais – tu parlerais – il / elle parlerait.

Consequently, in English and French, the personal forms of the verb and personal pronouns form a variety of analytical forms. The same phenomenon is observed in the past tense paradigm of the Russian verb.

The verbal paradigmatics in the Tatar language are bluntly opposed to the paradigmatic series of Indo-European and, above all, Germanic languages. The verbal stems in the Tatar language are not changed, and vowels vary in accordance with the law of synharmonism peculiar to the Turkic languages.

The most significant distinguishing feature of the Tatar verb in terms of the structure of inflectional paradigms is the clear juxtaposition of units of the paradigmatic rows and the absence of homonymy between synthetic markers. In the personal paradigm of the present tense, there is not a single case of homonymy: min alam "I take", sin alasyng "you take", ul ala "he / she takes", bez alabyz "we take", sez alasyz "you take", alar alalar "they take". The same clear morphological differentiation of personal forms is observed in the forms of the past tense, cf. past definite: min aldym "I took", ul aldy "he / she took (took)", bez aldyk "we took", sez aldygyz "you took" etc.

Thus, the paradigmatic rows of verbs in Tatar, as in other Turkic languages, are characterized by a clear opposition in formal terms, which determines their relative independence from personal pronouns.

The absence of personal pronouns in Tatar and Latin in all the tenses of the verb and in the personal forms of the present tense in Russian does not create any communicative ambiguities and hindrances, while in English, German and French the absence of personal pronouns as subjects is rare.

5. Conclusion

Pronouns represent a heterogeneous and contradictory part of speech in morphological-paradigmatic, functional-semantic and syntactic relations. The term *pronomen* itself does not reflect the functional aspect of this part of speech. Personal pronouns of the 1st and the 2nd person singular and plural are devoid of antecedent or postcedent deictic function

in the discourse, since they are communicatively variable quantities. The forms of personal pronouns vary depending on their syntactic function. In the function of the subject, object, and predicate, the phenomenon of suppletion is observed. Eng.: I / we answered. It's me, us. Germ.: Wessen Wagen steht vor dem Haus? Das ist meiner, antwortete ich; Fr. Qui est la?C'est moi.

Different definitions of the categories of pronouns with identical meanings in different languages do not fit into the general theoretical concept. They often refer to different parts of speech. Thus, in French, the lexemes mon, ton, nôs, vôs, etc., used in the attributive function, are referred to as possessive adjectives (mon pére, ma mére), and the forms used as a predicate with the definite article le / la are defined as possessive pronouns (le mien / la mienne, le tien / la tienne).

The role of personal pronouns in the formation of verbal paradigms needs to be reviewed, namely, in different languages they should be considered as components of personal verb forms with different degrees of analytization: to a greater extent, in French, which has a wide range of homography and homophony in both indicative and subjunctive and conditional forms, quite numerous phenomena of homography and homophony are represented in personal verb forms in English; partially, namely, in the past tense of the Russian verb, there are no personal endings and the presence of personal pronouns is obligatory.

On the whole, the analysis of different categories of pronouns reveals a number of contradictions. These include, for example, the intersection of different categories. For example, the same units are assigned to different categories in different grammars. Especially fluid are the lines between indefinite negative, indefinite and definite pronouns, etc.

References

[1] Muryasov R Z., Savelyeva L. A. (2019) The periphery zone of the system of parts of speech (contrastive-typological research), Ufa.

[2] Muryasov R. Z. (2019) On the periphery of the parts of speech system // Xlinguae. European Scientific Language Journal. October 2019. Volume 12. Issue 4. P. 51-64.

[3] Longman. Grammar of Spoken and Written English (2000). London.

[4] Helbig G., Buscha J. (1996) German Grammar. Langenscheidt Verlag Enzyklopädie. Leipzig. Berlin. München. Wien. Zürich. New York.

[5] Duden. (2005) Bd. 4. The Grammar. Dudenverlag. Mannheim. Leipzig. Wien. Zürich.

[6] The Dictionary of Lnguistics (1973) Librairie Larousse. Paris.

[7] The Tatar Grammar (1997) T. II. Morphologia. Kazan.

[8] Glinz H. The Grammars in Comparison. German-French. English-Latin. Forms-Meaning-Understanding (1994) Max Niemeyer Verlag. Tübingen.

[9] Shvedova N. Yu. (2005) The Russian Language. Selected Works. Moscow.

[10] Bulgakow M. A. (1992) Master i Margarita. in Russian. Moscow.

[11] Bulgakov M. (1996) The Master and Margarita. The Harvill Press. London.

[12] Bulgakow M. (1983) Der Meister und Margarita. Aufbau-Verlag. Berlin and Weimar.

[13] Boulgakov M. (2005) Le Maître et Marguerite. Paris.

[14] The Russian Grammar (1980) Moscow.

[15] Vinogradov V. V. (2001) The Russian Language (Grammatical Study of the Word). Moscow.

[16] Nikolayeva T. M. (2008) Non-paradigmatic Linguistics (The History of Wandering Particles). Moscow.

[17] The New Comprehensive English-Russian Dictionary (2000) V 3. Moscow.

[18] Sobolevskiy S. I. (1998) The Grammar of the Latin Language. Theoretical Part. Morphology and Syntax. Saint-Petersburg.

[19] The Foundation of the German Grammar (1981) Akademie-Verlag. Berlin.

[20] Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary - LED (2002) Moscow.

[21] Alexander L. G. (1999) Longman English Grammar. London and New York.

[22] Eisenberg P. (1994) The Basic Features of the German Grammar. Stuttgart. Weimer.

[23] Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (2006) Pearson Education Limited Edenborough Gate. England.

[24] Wahrig G. (2006) German Dictionary. Guetersloh. München.

[25] The New Petit Robert (1994) Paris.

[26] The Comprehensive Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language (2000). Saint-Petersburg.

[27] Riegel Martin, Pellat Jean Christoph, Rioul Rene (2014) Methodical Grammar of French. Paris.

[28] Jespersen O. (1924) The Philosophy of Grammar. New York.

[29] Smirnitskiy A. I. (1959) The English Language Morphology. Moscow.

[30] Barkhudarov L. S., Shteling D. A (1973) The Grammar of the English Language. Moscow.

[31] Ivanova I. P., Burlakova V. V. Pocheptsov G. G. (1981) Theoretical Grammar of the Modern English Language. Moscow.

[32] Kachalova K. N., Izrailevich E. E. (1994) Practical Grammar of the English Language. Moscow.

[33] Kamyanova T. G. (2015) English Grammar. Moscow.

[34] Ilyish B. (1965) The Structure of Modern English. Moscow.

[35] Paul H. German Grammar (1958) Bd. 3. VEB. Halle (Saale).

[36] Lamprecht A. (1972) The Grammar of the English Language. Berlin.

[37] Le Petit Larousse. (2010) Paris.

[38] Oxford German Dictionary. German-English. English-German (2008) Oxford University Press.

[39] Muryasov R. Z. (2016) Verb Typology in Languages of Different Structures. Ufa.