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Курс лекций по теоретической грамматике английского языка содержит 18 лекций, посвященных актуальным вопросам морфологии и синтаксиса английского языка. Главная цель курса теоретической грамматики заключается в изучении основных грамматических теорий по всем основополагающим проблемам грамматики английского языка, актуальных исследований последних лет для формирования необходимой лингвистической эрудиции будущих бакалавров и специалистов. Тематически и содержательно лекции построены с учетом достижений лингвистической науки за последние десятилетия и предполагают сопоставление различных грамматических явлений с фактами такого же порядка в русском языке.
Lecture 1

Fundamentals of grammar


1. Grammatical category. Grammatical meaning. Grammatical form

The general notions of grammar which determine the structure of language and find their expression in inflection and other devices are generally called grammatical categories. As is known, a grammatical category is generally represented by at least two grammatical forms, otherwise it cannot exist. A simple case of oppositions in pairs of grammatical forms will be found, for instance, between the Singular and the Plural in nouns, or between Active and Passive in verbs. A grammatical category is a unit of grammar based on a morphological opposition of grammatical meanings presented in grammatical forms.

It is more or less universally recognised that word-meaning is not homogeneous but is made up of various components the combination and the interrelation of which determine to a great extent the inner facet of the word. These components are usually described as types of meaning. The two main types of meaning that are readily observed are the grammatical and the lexical meanings to be found in words and word-forms.

The most general meanings rendered by language and expressed by systemic correlations of word-forms are interpreted in linguistics as grammatical meanings.

Grammatical meanings are very abstract, very general. Therefore the grammatical form is not confined to an individual word, but unites a whole class of words, so that each word of the class expresses the corresponding grammatical meaning together with its individual, concrete semantics. Grammatical meanings ranged in oppositions and presented in grammatical forms build grammatical categories.
Grammatical forms can be morphemes, synthetic forms, and grammatical word combinations, which are analytical forms. Synthetic forms unite both lexical and grammatical meanings in one word. In analytical forms there two or more words in which at least one element is an auxiliary. The auxiliary is a constant element of an analytical structure, which is devoid of lexical meaning (it renders grammatical meanings and is a purely grammatical element). Analytical structures must be differentiated from free syntactical word combinations. In free syntactical word combinations all the elements possess both lexical and grammatical meanings.

Cf. waiter and waitress

The distinctions of gender in Russian are universal. They refer to all the vocabulary of the language. In English this distinction is not a grammatical phenomenon. The grammatical category of gender is lost. What we have now is some gender distinctions existing as the remnant of history. The distinction “waiter vs. waitress” is not universal enough to build up a grammatical category. It does not possess the level of grammatical abstraction characterized by an unlimited range of occurrence.

Cf. book and books

-s is a form-building morpheme that builds a grammatical form because it is characterized by the level of grammatical abstraction realized in an unlimited range of occurrence.

Types of word-form derivation

These fall under two main headings:

(a) those limited to changes in the body of the word, without having recourse to auxiliary words (synthetic types),

(b) those implying the use of auxiliary words (analytical types).

Besides, there are a few special cases of different forms of a word being derived from altogether different stems.
Synthetic Types

The number of morphemes used for deriving word-forms in Modern English is very small (much smaller than either in German or in Russian, for instance.

There is the ending *-s* (*-es*), with three variants of pronunciation and the endings *-en* and *-ren*, in one or two words each, viz. *oxen, brethren* (poet.), *children*.

There is the ending *-'s*, with the same three variants of pronunciation as for the plural ending, used to form what is generally termed the genitive case of nouns.

For adjectives, there are the endings *-er* and *-est* for the degrees of comparison.

For verbs, there is the ending *-s* (*-es*) for the third person singular present indicative, with the same three variants of pronunciation noted above for nouns, the ending *-d* (*-ed*) for the past tense of certain verbs (with three variants of pronunciation, again), the ending *-d* (*ed*) for the second participle of certain verbs, the ending *-n* (*-en*) for the second participle of certain other verbs, and the ending *-ing* for the first participle and also for the gerund.

Thus the total number of morphemes used to derive forms of words is eleven or twelve, which is much less than the number found in languages of a mainly synthetical structure.

It should also be noted that most of these endings are mono-semantic, in the sense that they denote only one grammatical category and not two or three (or more) at a time, as is the case in synthetic languages. For example, the plural *-s* (or *-es*) denotes only the category of plural number, and has nothing to do with any other grammatical category, such as case.

Sound Alternations

Sound alternations are a way of expressing grammatical categories which consists in changing a sound inside the root. This method appears in Modern
English, for example, in nouns, as when the root vowel [au] of *mouse* is changed into [aɪ] in *mice*, etc.

This method is much more extensively used in verbs, such as *write* — *wrote* — *written*, *sing* — *sang* — *sung*, *meet* — *met* — *met*, etc. On the whole, vowel alternation does play some part among the means of expressing grammatical categories, though its part in Modern English has been much reduced as compared to Old English.

**Analytical Types**

These consist in using a word (devoid of any lexical meaning of its own) to express some grammatical category of another word.

There can be no doubt in Modern English about the analytical character of such formations as, e. g., *has invited* or *is invited*, or *is inviting*, or *does not invite*. The verbs *have*, *be*, and *do* have no lexical meaning of their own in these cases. The lexical meaning of the formation resides in the participle or infinitive following the verb *have*, *be* or *do*. Some doubt has been expressed about the formations *shall invite* and *will invite*. There is a view that *shall* and *will* have a lexical meaning.

While the existence of analytical forms of the English verb cannot be disputed, the existence of such forms in adjectives and adverbs is not nowadays universally recognised. The question whether such formations as *more vivid*, *the most vivid*, or, again, *more vividly* and *most vividly* are or are not analytical forms of degrees of comparison of *vivid* and *vividly*, is controversial. We can only say here that if these formations are recognised as analytical forms of degrees of comparison, the words *more* and *most* have to be numbered among the analytical means of morphology.

**Suppletive Formations**

Besides the synthetical and analytical means of building word forms in Modern English, there is yet another way of building them which stands quite apart and is found in a very limited number of cases only. By a suppletive formation we mean building a form of a word from an altogether different
stem. Examples in point are, the verb *go*, with its past tense *went*; the personal pronoun *I*, with its objective case form *me*, the adjective *good* with its comparative degree form *better*, and a few more. In the morphological system of Modern English suppletive formations are a very insignificant element, but they concern a few very widely used words among adjectives, pronouns, and verbs.

2. Theory of oppositions. Types of oppositions. Oppositions in morphology

In discussing grammatical categories, we shall often have to mention oppositions, that is, pairs of grammatical forms opposed to each other in some way. The **opposition** may be defined as a generalized correlation of lingual forms by means of which a certain function is expressed. The correlated elements (members) of the opposition must possess two types of features: common features and differential features. Common features serve as the basis of contrast, while differential features immediately express the function in question.

The oppositional theory was originally formulated as a phonological theory. Three main qualitative types of oppositions were established in phonology: privative, gradual, and equipollent. By the number of members contrasted, oppositions were divided into binary and more than binary (ternary, quaternary, etc.).

The most important type of oppositions is the binary privative opposition; the other types of oppositions are reducible to the binary privative opposition.

The **binary privative opposition** is formed by a contrastive pair of members in which one member is characterized by the presence of a certain differential feature (strong, marked, positive), while the other member is characterized by the absence of the feature (weak, unmarked, negative). Eg. voiced vs. devoiced consonants

The **gradual opposition** is formed by a contrastive group of members which are distinguished not by the presence or absence of a feature, but by the degree of it.
(Eg. [iː - i – e - ae] form a quaternary opposition by the degree of their openness)

The **equipollent opposition** is formed by a contrastive pair or group in which the members are distinguished by different positive features. (eg. [m] – [b], both bilabial consonants, form an equipollent opposition, [m] being sonorous nasalized, [b] being plosive.)

Any opposition can be reformulated in privative terms. Any positive feature distinguishing an oppositionally characterized element is absent in the oppositionally correlated element, so that considered from the point of view of this feature alone, the opposition, by definition, becomes privative.

The most important type of opposition in morphology is the binary privative opposition. The **privative morphological opposition** is based on a morphological differential feature which is present in its strong member and absent in its weak member (eg. present – past).

Speaking about morphological oppositions we need to keep in mind the fact that members of morphological oppositions unlike those of phonological oppositions possess both the plane of expression and the plane of content (eg. cat – cats). The meaning of the weak member is more general and abstract as compared with the meaning of the strong member, which is more particular and specific. Due to this difference in meaning, the unmarked member is used in a wider range of contexts than the marked member. For example, the present tense form of the verb, as different from the past tense, is used to render meanings much broader than those directly implied by the corresponding time-plane.

Equipollent oppositions in the system of English morphology constitute a minor type and are mostly confined to formal relations only (eg. am – are – is).

Gradual oppositions in morphology are not generally recognized. They can be identified as a minor type at the semantic level only (eg. strong – stronger – strongest).
In various contextual positions one member of an opposition can be used in the position of the other. This phenomenon can be referred to as reduction of oppositions.

eg. *US soldier goes to Iraq.*

*The conference opens next week.*

(The weak member replaces the strong one.)

This oppositional reduction is stylistically indifferent. Use of the unmarked member does not transgress the expressive conventions of ordinary speech. This kind of oppositional reduction is called neutralization. Another type of oppositional reduction is called transposition. It is defined as contrastive use of the counter-member of the opposition (the strong one, as a rule).

eg. *She is always finding faults with me.*

3. **Morpheme. Derivation morphemes and inflection morphemes**

Most word-forming morphemes are ambiguous, that is, they do not with certainty point to any definite part of speech but leave some choice which has to be decided by other criteria. The morpheme is one of the central notions of grammatical theory, without which no serious attempt at grammatical study can be made. Definition of a morpheme is not an easy matter, and it has been attempted many times by different scholars. Without going into particulars of the discussions that have taken place, we may briefly define the morphemes as the smallest meaningful units into which a word form may be divided.

For instance, if we take the form *writers,* it can be divided into three morphemes: (1) *writ,* expressing the basic lexical meaning of the word, (2) *-er-,* expressing the idea of agent performing the action indicated by the root of the verb, (3) *-s,* indicating number, that is, showing that more than one person of the type indicated is meant. Similarly the form *advantageously* can be divided into three morphemes: *advantage + ous + ly,* each with a special meaning of its own.
Two additional remarks are necessary here: (1) Two or more morphemes may sound the same but be basically different, that is, they may be homonyms. Thus the -er morpheme indicating the doer of an action as in *writer* has a homonym — the morpheme -er denoting the comparative degree of adjectives and adverbs, as in *longer*. Which of the two homonymous morphemes is actually there in a given case can of course only be determined by examining the other morphemes in the word. Thus, the morpheme -er in our first example, *writer*, cannot possibly be the morpheme of the comparative degree, as the morpheme *write* to which it is joined on is not the stem of an adjective or adverb, and so no comparative degree is to be thought of here.

(2) There may be zero morphemes, that is, the absence of a morpheme may indicate a certain meaning. Thus, if we compare the forms *book* and *books*, both derived from the stem *book-*, we may say that while *books* is characterised by the -*s*-morpheme as being a plural form, *book* is characterised by the zero morpheme as being a singular form.

In grammar, we are of course concerned with the grammatical, or structural, meaning of morphemes: we do not here study the meanings of root morphemes, which are necessarily lexical, and as to derivation morphemes, i.e. those which serve to build words, we are only interested in them in so far as they are grammatically relevant, and that is the case if they show that the word belongs to a certain part of speech, and if they serve to distinguish one part of speech from another. This grammatical significance of derivation morphemes, if it is there at all, is always combined with their lexical meaning. For instance, if we take this pair of words: *write* v. and *writer* n., the derivative morpheme -er has a grammatical significance, as it serves to distinguish a noun from a verb, and it has its lexical meaning, as the lexical meaning of the noun *writer* is different from that of the verb *write*.

**Inflection morphemes** have no lexical meaning or function. There is not the slightest difference in the way of lexical meaning between *live* and *lived*, or
between house and houses. However, an inflection morpheme can acquire a lexical meaning in some special cases, for instance if the plural form of a noun develops a meaning which the singular form has not; thus, the plural form colours has a meaning, 'flag', which the singular form colour has not. These are cases of lexicalisation.

4. Distributional analysis. Morphemic analysis. IC-analysis

By the term distribution we understand the occurrence of a lexical unit relative to other lexical units of the same level (words relative to words / morphemes relative to morphemes, etc.). In other words by this term we understand the position which lexical units occupy or may occupy in the text or in the flow of speech. The distribution of a unit is the sum total of all its environments. The environment of a unit may be either “right” or “left”. It is readily observed that a certain component of the word-meaning is described when the word is identified distributionally.

The distributional analysis is used to fix and study the units of language in relation to their contextual environments, i.e. adjoining elements in the text. In the distributional analysis at the morphemic level, phonemic distribution of morphemes and morphemic distribution of morphemes are discriminated. The study is conducted in two stages. At the first stage, the analyzed text is divided into recurrent segments consisting of phonemes. These segments are called “morphs”. At the second stage, the environmental features of the morphs are established and the corresponding identifications are effected.

Three main types of distribution are discriminated: contrastive, non-contrastive and complementary. Contrastive and non-contrastive distribution concern identical environments of different morphs. The morphs are said to be in contrastive distribution if their meanings are different. Such morphs constitute different morphemes (eg. played, playing). The morphs are said to be in non-contrastive distribution if their meaning is the same. Such morphs constitute “free alternants”, or “free variants” of the same morpheme (eg. burned, burnt).
Complementary distribution concerns different environments of formally different morphs which are united by the same meaning. If two or more morphs have the same meaning and the difference in their form is explained by different environments, these morphs are said to be in complementary distribution and considered the allomorphs of the same morpheme (e.g. desks, girls, glasses).

The morphemic analysis (sometimes also called morphological) is one of possible methods of analyzing word structure along with the word-building analysis. The morphemic analysis is a process of singling out morphs in a word and stating their meaning. To state the borders between morphemes correctly, it is necessary to study the word in a row of words which are structurally similar (words with the same root and suffixes).

The procedure of the morphemic analysis states the morphemic structure of the word. The procedure consists of two operations:

1) the stem is separated from the inflection by means of comparing word-forms of the word;

2) relations between morphemes in the stem are stated by means of comparing cognate words.

The morphemic analysis based on the distributional analysis gave rise to such notions as morph, allomorph, morpheme, etc.

The theory of Immediate Constituents (IC) was originally elaborated as an attempt to determine the ways in which lexical units are relevantly related to one another. It was discovered that combinations of such units are usually structured into hierarchically arranged sets of binary constructions. For example in the word-group a black dress in severe style we do not relate a to black, black to dress, dress to in, etc. but set up a structure which may be represented as a black dress / in severe style. Thus the fundamental aim of IC analysis is to segment a set of lexical units into two maximally independent sequences or ICs thus revealing the hierarchical structure of this set. Successive segmentation results in Ultimate Constituents (UC), i.e. two-facet units that cannot be segmented into smaller units having both sound-form and meaning. The Ultimate Constituents of the word-
group analysed above are: a | black | dress | in | severe | style. The meaning of the sentence, word-group, etc. and the IC binary segmentation are interdependent. For example, fat major’s wife may mean that either ‘the major is fat’ or ‘his wife is fat’. The former semantic interpretation presupposes the IC analysis into fat major’s | wife, whereas the latter reflects a different segmentation into IC’s and namely fat | major’s wife.
The Parts of Speech Problem. Grammatical Classes of Words

The parts of speech are classes of words, all the members of these classes having certain characteristics in common which distinguish them from the members of other classes. The problem of word classification into parts of speech still remains one of the most controversial problems in modern linguistics. The attitude of grammarians with regard to parts of speech and the basis of their classification varied a good deal at different times. Only in English grammarians have been vacillating between 3 and 13 parts of speech. There are four approaches to the problem:

1. Classical, or logical-inflectional, worked out by prescriptivists
2. Functional, worked out by descriptivists
3. Distributional, worked out by structuralists
4. Complex

The Principles of Classification as Used by Prescriptive Grammarians

Prescriptive grammarians, who treated Latin as an ideal language, described English in terms of Latin forms and Latin grammatical constraints. Similar to Latin, words in English were divided into declinables (nouns, adjectives, pronouns, verbs, participles) and indeclinables (adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, articles). The number of parts of speech varied from author to author: in early grammars nouns and adjectives formed one part of speech; later they came to be treated as two different parts of speech. The same applies to participles, which were either a separate part of speech or part of the verb. The article was first classed with the adjective. Later it was given the status of a part of speech and toward the end of the 19th century the article was integrated into the adjective. The underlying principle of classification was form, which, as can be seen from their treatment of the English noun, was not only morphologic but also syntactic, i.e. if it was form in Latin, it had to be form in English.
The Principles of Classification as Used by Non-Structural Descriptive Grammarians

Non-structural descriptive grammarians adopted the system of parts of speech worked out by prescriptivists and elaborated it further. Henry Sweet (1892), similar to his predecessors, divided words into declinable and indeclinable. To declinables he attributed noun-words (noun, noun-pronoun, noun-numeral, infinitive, gerund), adjective-words (adjective, adjective-pronoun, adjective-numeral, participle), verb (finite verb), verbals (infinitive, gerund, participle) and to indeclinables (particles), adverb, preposition, conjunction, interjection. Henry Sweet speaks of three principles of classification: form, meaning, and function. However, the results of his classification reveal a considerable divergence between theory and practice: the division of the parts of speech into declinable and indeclinable is a division based on form. Only within the class can we see the operation of the principle of function.

Otto Jespersen, another noted descriptivist, also speaks of three principles of classification: “In my opinion everything should be kept in view, form, function and meaning...” (O Jespersen, 1935:91). On the basis of the three criteria, the scholar distinguishes the following parts of speech: substantives, adjectives, pronouns, verbs, and particles (adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections). Otto Jespersen’s system is a further elaboration of Henry Sweet’s system. Unlike Henry Sweet, Otto Jespersen separates nouns (which he calls substantives) from noun-words, a class of words distinguished on the basis of function – a noun word is a word that can function as a noun; he also distinguishes pronouns as a separate part of speech, thus isolating them from Henry Sweet’s noun-words and adjective-words. Both scholars treat the verb alike: to Henry Sweet the verb includes primarily finite forms: he doubts as to the inclusion of non-finites in the verb. Although the scholar speaks of form, function and meaning, in practice he gives preference to form.
The Principles of Classification as Used by Structural Descriptive Grammarians

The traditional classification of words into parts of speech was rejected by structural grammarians who bitterly criticized it from two points. First, in their opinion, traditional grammar relies heavily on the most subjective element in language, meaning. The other is that it uses different criteria of classification: it distinguishes the noun, the verb and the interjection on the basis of meaning; the adjective, the adverb, the pronoun, and the conjunction, on the basis of function, and the preposition, partly on function and partly on form.

One of the noted representatives of American structuralism, Charles Fries (1956), rejected the traditional principle of classification of words into parts of speech replacing it with the methods of distributional analysis and substitution. Words that exhibit the same distribution (which is the set of contexts, i.e. immediate linguistic environments, in which a word can appear) belong to the same class. Roughly speaking, the distribution of a word is the position of a word in the sentence. To classify the words of English, Charles Fries used three sentences called substitution frames. He thought that the positions, or the slots, in the sentences were sufficient for the purpose of the classification of all the words of the English language.

Frame A
The concert was good.

Frame B
The clerk remembered the tax.

Frame C
The team went there.

The position discussed first is that of the word concert. Words that can substitute for concert (e.g. food, coffee, taste, etc.) are Class 1 words. The same holds good for words that can substitute for clerk, tax and team – these are typical positions of Class 1 words. The next important position is that of was, remembered and went; words that can substitute for them are called Class 2 words. The next
position is that of *good*. Words that can substitute for good are Class 3 words. The last position is that of *there*; words that can fill this position are called Class 4 words. According to the scholar, these four parts of speech contain about 67 per cent of the total instances of the vocabulary. He also distinguishes 15 groups of function words set up by the same process of substitution but on different patterns. These function words (numbering 154 in all) make up a third of the recorded material. Charles Fries does not use the traditional terminology. To understand his function words better, we shall use, where possible, their traditional names: Group A words (determiners); Group B (modal verbs); Group C (the negative particle “not”); Group D (adverbs of degree); Group E (coordinating conjunctions); Group F (prepositions); Group G (the auxiliary verb “to”); Group H (the introductory “there”); Group I (interrogative pronouns and adverbs); Group J (subordinating conjunctions); Group K (interjections); Group L (the words “yes” and “no”); Group M (the so-called attention-giving signals: look, say, listen); Group N (the word “please”); Group O (the forms “let us”, “lets” in request sentences).

It is obvious that in classifying words into word-classes Charles Fries in fact used the principle of function, or combinability (the position of a word in the sentence is the syntactic function of word). Being a structuralist, he would not speak of function: function is meaning while position is not. His classification is not beyond criticism. First, not all relevant positions were tested. Class 3 words are said to be used in the position of *good* (Frame A). But the most typical position of these words is before Class 1 words. If this position had been used by the scholar, such words as *woolen*, *wooden*, *golden*, etc. (i.e. relative adjectives) would have found their place in the classification. But if he had done it, the classification would have collapsed, for their position can be filled by other word-classes: nouns, numerals, pronouns. Second, his functional classes are very much ‘splintered’, i.e. broken into small groups. This is good for practice but bad for theory, for theoretical grammar is more interested in uniting linguistic facts than in separating them. Third, being deprived of meaning, his word-classes are “faceless”, i.e. they
have no character. No wonder, other structuralists deemed it necessary to return to traditional terminology and to use the criterion of form and, additionally, position.

The Classification of Words in Post-Structural Traditional Grammar

In modern linguistics, parts of speech are discriminated according to three criteria: semantic, formal and functional. This approach may be defined as complex. The semantic criterion presupposes the grammatical meaning of the whole class of words (general grammatical meaning). The formal criterion reveals paradigmatic properties: relevant grammatical categories, the form of the words, their specific inflectional and derivational features. The functional criterion concerns the syntactic function of words in the sentence and their combinability. Thus, when characterizing any part of speech we are to describe: a) its semantics; b) its morphological features; c) its syntactic peculiarities.

The lexemes of a part of speech are united by their meaning. This meaning is a category-forming one. Therefore, it is referred to as categorical meaning. Lexemes that have the meaning of substance or thingness are nouns, those having the meaning of property are adjectives; those having the meaning of process are verbs; those having the meaning of circumstantial property are adverbs. As categorical meaning is derived from lexemes, it is often called lexico-grammatical meaning. In the surface, lexico-grammatical meaning finds outward expression. For instance, the meaning of substance, or thingness, is realized by the following lexico-grammatical morphemes: -er, -ist, -ness, -ship, -ment. It is also realized by specific grammatical forms constituting the grammatical categories of number and case. These outward features are a formal criterion of classification. The functional criterion concerns the syntactic role of a word in the sentence.

In accordance with the said criteria, we can classify the words of the English language into notional and functional. To the notional parts of speech belong the noun, the adjective, the numeral, the verb, and the adverb. To the functional parts of speech belong the article, the pronoun, the preposition, the conjunction, the particle, the modal words, and the interjection. The notional parts of speech present open classes while the functional parts of speech present closed classes, i.e. the
number of items constituting the notional word-classes is not limited while the number of items constituting the functional word-classes is limited and can be given by the list.

The division of language units into notion and function words reveals the interrelation of lexical and grammatical types of meaning. In notional words the lexical meaning is predominant. In function words the grammatical meaning dominates over the lexical one. However, in actual speech the border line between notional and function words is not always clear cut. Some notional words develop the meanings peculiar to function words - e.g. semi-notional words – to turn, to get, etc.

Notional words constitute the bulk of the existing word stock while function words constitute a smaller group of words. Although the number of function words is limited (there are only about 50 of them in Modern English), they are the most frequently used units.

It will be obvious that the system of English parts of speech as presented here is not the only one possible. All depends on which feature we want to base our classification. So, for instance, if the classifying criterion is the variability of a form, we shall have to unite prepositions, conjunctions, interjections and particles into one class (cf. H. Sweet’s and O. Jespersen’s classifications). If we classify words in accordance with the criterion of meaning, we shall distinguish only four word-classes: nouns, adjectives, verbs and adverbs. Besides, linguists do not agree on the number of features needed to distinguish a part of speech. So, for instance, besides the traditional parts of speech, some linguists distinguish the stative and response words.

**The System of Parts of Speech**

1. Noun

**Meaning:** thingness.

**Form.** Nouns have the category of number (singular and plural), though some individual nouns may lack either a singular or a plural form. They also, in the accepted view, have the category of case (common and genitive).
Function. (a) Combining with words to form phrases. A noun combines with a preceding adjective (big house), or occasionally with a following adjective (secrets unrevealed), with a preceding noun in either the common case (chocolate bar) or the genitive case (mother's face), with a verb following it (children play) or preceding it (play games). Occasionally a noun may combine with a following or a preceding adverb (the guy outside; the then president). It also combines with prepositions (in a house; house of rest). It is typical of a noun to be preceded by the definite or indefinite article (the room, a room). (b) Function in the sentence. A noun may be the subject or the predicative of a sentence, or an object, an attribute, and an adverbial modifier. It can also make part of each of these when preceded by a preposition.

2. Adjective

Meaning. The adjective expresses property.

Form. Adjectives in Modern English are invariable. Some adjectives form degrees of comparison (long, longer, longest).

Function. (a) Adjectives combine with nouns both preceding and (occasionally) following them (large room, times immemorial). They also combine with a preceding adverb (very large). Adjectives can be followed by the phrase "preposition + noun" (free from danger). Occasionally they combine with a preceding verb (died young). (b) In the sentence, an adjective can be either an attribute (large room) or a predicative (is large). It can also be an objective predicative (painted the door green).

3. Pronoun

(1) The meaning of the pronoun as a separate part of speech is somewhat difficult to define. In fact, some pronouns share essential peculiarities of nouns (e.g. he), while others have much in common with adjectives (e.g. which). This made some scholars think that pronouns were not a separate part of speech at all and should be distributed between nouns and adjectives. However, this view proved untenable and entailed insurmountable difficulties. Hence it has proved necessary to find a definition of the specific meaning of pronouns, distinguishing
them from both nouns and adjectives. From this angle the meaning of pronouns as a part of speech can be stated as follows: pronouns point to the things and properties without naming them.

**Form.** As far as form goes pronouns fall into different types. Some of them have the category of number (singular and plural), e. g. *this*, while others have no such category, e. g. *somebody*. Again, some pronouns have the category of case (*he*—*him*, *somebody*—*somebody's*), while others have none (*something*).

**Function.** (a) Some pronouns combine with verbs (he speaks, find him), while others can also combine with a following noun (*this room*). (b) In the sentence, some pronouns may be the subject (*he*, *what*) or the object, while others are the attribute (*my*). Pronouns can be predicatives.

### 4. Numeral

The treatment of numerals presents some difficulties, too. The so-called cardinal numerals (*one*, *two*) are somewhat different from the so-called ordinal numerals (*first*, *second*).

**Meaning.** Numerals denote either number or place in a series.

**Form.** Numerals are invariable.

**Function.** (a) As far as phrases go, both cardinal and ordinal numerals combine with a following noun (*three rooms*, *third room*); occasionally a numeral follows a noun (*soldiers three*, *George the Third*). (b) In a sentence, a numeral most usually is an attribute (*three rooms*, *the third room*), but it can also be subject, predicative, and object: *Three of them came in time*; "*We Are Seven*" (the title of a poem by Wordsworth); *I found only four*.

### 5. The verb

**Meaning.** The verb as a part of speech expresses a process.

**Form.** The verb is characterized by an elaborate system of morphological categories, some of which are, however, controversial. These are: tense, aspect, mood, voice, person, and number.

**Function.** (a) Verbs are connected with a preceding noun (*children play*) and with a following noun (*play games*). They are also connected with adverbs (*write*...
Occasionally a verb may combine with an adjective (married young). In a sentence a verb (in its finite forms) is always the predicate or part of it (link verb). The functions of the verbals (infinitive, participle, and gerund) must be dealt with separately.

7. The adverb

The meaning of the adverb as a part of speech is hard to define. Indeed, some adverbs indicate time or place of an action (yesterday, here), while others indicate its property (quickly) and others again the degree of a property (very). As, however, we should look for one central meaning characterising the part of speech as a whole, it seems best to formulate the meaning of the adverb as "property of an action or of a property".

Form. Adverbs are invariable. Some of them, however, have degrees of comparison (fast, faster, fastest).

Function. (a) An adverb combines with a verb (run quickly), with an adjective (very long), occasionally with a noun (the then president) and with a phrase (so out of things). (b) An adverb can sometimes follow a preposition (from there). (c) In a sentence an adverb is almost always an adverbial modifier, or part of it (from there), but it may occasionally be an attribute.

8. Prepositions

Meaning. The meaning of prepositions is obviously that of relations between things and phenomena.

Form. Prepositions are invariable.

Function. (a) Prepositions enter into phrases in which they are preceded by a noun, adjective, numeral, stative, verb or adverb, and followed by a noun, adjective, numeral or pronoun. (b) In a sentence a preposition never is a separate part of it. It goes together with the following word to form an object, adverbial modifier, predicative or attribute, and in extremely rare cases a subject (There were about a hundred people in the hall).

9. Conjunctions

Meaning. Conjunctions express connections between things and phenomena.
Form. Conjunctions are invariable.

Function. (a) They connect any two words, phrases or clauses. (b) In a sentence, conjunctions are never a special part of it. They either connect homogeneous parts of a sentence or homogeneous clauses (the so-called co-ordinating conjunctions), or they join a subordinate clause to its head clause (the so-called subordinating conjunctions).

10. Particles

Meaning. The meaning of particles is very hard to define. We might say, approximately, that they denote subjective shades of meaning introduced by the speaker or writer and serving to emphasise or limit some point in what he says.

Form. Particles are invariable.

Function. (a) Particles may combine with practically every part of speech, more usually preceding it (only three), but occasionally following it (for advanced students only). (b) Particles never are a separate part of a sentence. They enter the part of the sentence formed by the word (or phrase) to which they refer. (It might also be argued that particles do not belong to any part of a sentence.)

11. Interjections

Meaning. Interjections express feelings (ah, alas). They are not names of feelings but the immediate expression of them. Some interjections represent noises, etc., with a strong emotional colouring (bang!).

Form. Interjections are invariable.

Function. (a) Interjections usually do not enter into phrases. Only in a few cases do they combine with a preposition and noun or pronoun, e.g. alas for him! (b) In a sentence an interjection forms a kind of parenthesis. An interjection may also be a sentence in itself, e.g. Alas! as an answer to a question.

Generally speaking, the problem of words’ classification into parts of speech is far from being solved. Some words cannot find their proper place. The most striking example here is the class of adverbs. Some language analysts call it a ragbag, a dustbin (Frank Palmer), Russian academician V.V.Vinogradov defined
the class of adverbs in the Russian language as мусорная куча. It can be explained by the fact that to the class of adverbs belong those words that cannot find their place anywhere else. At the same time, there are no grounds for grouping them together either. Compare: perfectly (She speaks English perfectly) and again (He is here again). Examples are numerous (all temporals). There are some words that do not belong anywhere - e.g. after all. Speaking about after all it should be mentioned that this unit is quite often used by native speakers, and practically never by our students. Some more striking examples: anyway, actually, in fact. The problem is that if these words belong nowhere, there is no place for them in the system of words, then how can we use them correctly? What makes things worse is the fact that these words are devoid of nominative power, and they have no direct equivalents in Russian. Meanwhile, native speakers use these words subconsciously, without realizing how they work.
Lecture 3

Noun and Its Categories

1. General characteristics.
2. The category of number.
3. The category of case.
4. The problem of gender.
5. The category of determination.

1. General characteristics

The noun is the central lexical unit of language. It is the main nominative unit of speech. As any other part of speech, the noun can be characterised by three criteria: semantic (the meaning), morphological (the form and grammatical categories) and syntactical (functions, distribution).

Semantic features of the noun. The noun possesses the grammatical meaning of thingness, substantiality. According to different principles of classification, nouns fall into several subclasses:

1. According to the type of nomination they may be proper and common;
2. According to the form of existence they may be animate and inanimate. Animate nouns in their turn fall into human and non-human.
3. According to their quantitative structure nouns can be countable and uncountable.

This set of subclasses cannot be put together into one table because of the different principles of classification.

Morphological features of the noun. In accordance with the morphological structure of the stems all nouns can be classified into: simple, derived (stem + affix, affix + stem – thingness); compound (stem+ stem – armchair ) and composite (the Hague). The noun has morphological categories of number and case. Some scholars admit the existence of the category of gender.

Syntactic features of the noun. The noun can be used in the sentence in all syntactic functions but predicate. Speaking about noun combinability, we can say
that it can go into right-hand and left-hand connections with practically all parts of speech. That is why practically all parts of speech but the verb can act as noun determiners. However, the most common noun determiners are considered to be articles, pronouns, numerals, adjectives and nouns themselves in the common and genitive case.

2. The category of number

The grammatical category of number is the linguistic representation of the objective category of quantity. The number category is realized through the opposition of two form-classes: the plural form :: the singular form.

There are different approaches to defining the category of number. Thus, some scholars believe that the category of number in English is restricted in its realization because of the dependent implicit grammatical meaning of countableness/uncountableness. The category of number is realized only within subclass of countable nouns, i.e. nouns having numeric (discrete) structure. Uncountable nouns have no category of number, for they have quantitative (indiscrete) structure. Two classes of uncountables can be distinguished: singulæra tantum (only singular) and pluralia tantum (only plural). M. Blokh, however, does not exclude the singularia tantum subclass from the category of number. He calls such forms absolute singular forms comparable to the ‘common’ singular of countable nouns.

In Indo-European languages there are lots of nouns that don’t fit into the traditional definition of the category based on the notion of quantity. A word can denote one object, but it has the plural form. Or a noun can denote more than one thing, but its form is singular. There is a definition of the category of number that overcomes this inconsistency. It was worked out by prof. Isachenko. According to him, the category of number denotes marked and unmarked discreteness (not quantity). A word in a singular form denotes unmarked discreteness whether it is a book, or a sheep, or sheep. If an object is perceived as a discrete thing, it has the form of the plural number. Thus, trousers and books are perceived as discrete object whereas a flock of sheep is seen as a whole. This definition is powerful
because it covers nearly all nouns while the traditional definition excludes many words.

The grammatical meaning of number may not coincide with the notional quantity: the noun in the singular does not necessarily denote one object while the plural form may be used to denote one object consisting of several parts. The singular form may denote:

a) oneness (individual separate object – \textit{a cat});

b) generalization (the meaning of the whole class – \textit{The cat is a domestic animal});

c) indiscreteness (нерасчлененность or uncountableness - \textit{money, milk}).

The plural form may denote:

a) the existence of several objects (\textit{cats});

b) the inner discreteness (внутренняя расчлененность, pluralia tantum, \textit{jeans}).

To sum it up, all nouns may be subdivided into three groups:

1. The nouns in which the opposition of explicit discreteness/indiscreteness is expressed: \textit{cat::cats};

2. The nouns in which this opposition is not expressed explicitly but is revealed by syntactical and lexical correlation in the context. There are two groups here:

A. Singulaira tantum. It covers different groups of nouns: proper names, abstract nouns, material nouns, collective nouns;

B. Pluralia tantum. It covers the names of objects consisting of several parts (\textit{jeans}), names of sciences (mathematics), names of diseases, games, etc.

3. The nouns with homogenous number forms. The number opposition here is not expressed formally but is revealed only lexically and syntactically in the context: e.g. \textit{Look! A sheep is eating grass. Look! The sheep are eating grass}. 
3. The category of case

In present-day linguistics case is used in two senses: 1) semantic, or logic, and 2) syntactic.

**The semantic case concept** was developed by C. J. Fillmore in the late 1960s. Ch. Fillmore introduced syntactic-semantic classification of cases. They show relations in the so-called deep structure of the sentence. According to him, verbs may stand to different relations to nouns. There are 6 cases:

1. Agentive Case (A) *John opened the door*;
2. Instrumental case (I) *The key opened the door*; John used the key to open the door;
3. Dative Case (D) *John believed that he would win* (the case of the animate being affected by the state of action identified by the verb);
4. Factitive Case (F) *The key was damaged* (the result of the action or state identified by the verb);
5. Locative Case (L) *Chicago is windy*;
6. Objective case (O) *John stole the book*.

**The syntactic case concept** dates back to the grammars of Ancient Greece and Ancient Rome. It is a case whose main role is to indicate a relationship between constituents. To put it otherwise, its role is to indicate a construction in syntax. Thus genitive is a case which marks one noun as dependent on another, e.g. John’s car. The conception of case as a marker of a syntactic relation or a construction can be found in prescriptive, non-structural descriptive and structural descriptive grammars. Prescriptivists spoke of the nominative, the dative, the genitive, the accusative, and the ablative.

**H. Sweet**’s views (1925) rest on the syntactic conception of case: case to him is a syntactic relation that can be realized syntactically or morphologically. He speaks of inflected and non-inflected cases (the genitive vs. the common case). Non-inflected cases, according to the scholar, are equivalent to the nominative, vocative, accusative, and dative of inflected languages.
O. Jespersen (1933) speaks of the genitive and the common case. Some grammarians (R. W. Pence (1947), H. Whitehall (1965), H. Shaw (1952)) give three cases in English - nominative, genitive (possessive) and accusative (objective). This three-case system, based on the analogy of the form of pronouns, remained extremely popular in the grammars of the 20th century, including some structural grammars (H. Whitehall). H. Whitehall, however, does not reflect the general situation in the school of structural grammar: structuralists at large recognize the existence of two cases - the genitive and the common.

Case expresses the relation of a word to another word in the word-group or sentence (my sister’s coat). The category of case correlates with the objective category of possession. The case category in English is realized through the opposition: The Common Case :: The Possessive Case (sister :: sister’s). However, in modern linguistics the term “genitive case” is used instead of the “possessive case” because the meanings rendered by the “‘s” sign are not only those of possession. The scope of meanings rendered by the Genitive Case is the following:

1. Possessive Genitive : Mary’s father – Mary has a father,
2. Subjective Genitive: The doctor’s arrival – The doctor has arrived,
3. Objective Genitive : The man’s release – The man was released,
4. Genitive of origin: the boy’s story – the boy told the story,
5. Descriptive Genitive: children’s books – books for children
6. Genitive of measure and partitive genitive: a mile’s distance, a day’s trip

To avoid confusion with the plural, the marker of the genitive case is represented in written form with an apostrophe. This fact makes possible disengagement of –’s form from the noun to which it properly belongs. E.g.: The man I saw yesterday’s son, where -’s is appended to the whole group (the so-called group genitive). It may even follow a word which normally does not possess such a formant, as in somebody else’s book.

There is no universal point of view as to the case system in English. Different scholars stick to a different number of cases.
1. There are two cases. (limited case theory) The Common one and The Genitive;

2. There are no cases at all, the form ‘s is optional because the same relations may be expressed by the ‘of-phrase’: the doctor’s arrival – the arrival of the doctor;

3. There are three cases: the Nominative, the Genitive, the Objective due to the existence of objective pronouns me, him, whom;

4. The theory of positional cases.

5. The theory of prepositional cases.

We adhere to the view that English does possess the category of case, which is represented by the opposition of the two forms - the genitive vs. the non-genitive, or the common. The marked member of the opposition is the genitive and the unmarked the common: both members express a relation - the genitive expresses a specific relation (the relation of possession in the wide meaning of the word) while the common case expresses a wide range of relations including the relation of possession, e.g. Kennedy’s house vs. the Kennedy house. While recognizing the existence of the genitive case, we must say that the English genitive is not a classical case. Its peculiarities are:

1) the inflection -‘s is but loosely connected with the noun (e.g. the Queen of England’s daughter; the man I met yesterday’s son);

2) genitive constructions are paralleled by corresponding prepositional constructions (e.g. Shakespeare’s works vs. the works of Shakespeare);

3) the use of the genitive is mainly limited to nouns denoting living beings;

4) the inflection -‘s is used both in the singular and in the plural (e.g. a boy’s bicycle vs. the boys’ bicycles), which is not typical of case inflexions.

4. The Problem of Gender in English

In Indo-European languages the category of gender is presented with flexions. It is not based on sex distinction, but it is purely grammatical.
According to some language analysts (B. Ilyish, F. Palmer, and E. Morokhovskaya), nouns have no category of gender in Modern English. Prof. Ilyish states that not a single word in Modern English shows any peculiarities in its morphology due to its denoting male or female being. Thus, the words husband and wife do not show any difference in their forms due to peculiarities of their lexical meaning. The difference between such nouns as actor and actress is a purely lexical one. In other words, the category of sex should not be confused with the category of gender, because sex is an objective biological category. It correlates with gender only when sex differences of living beings are manifested in the language grammatically (e.g. tiger – tigress).

Gender distinctions in English are marked for a limited number of nouns. In present-day English there are some morphemes which present differences between masculine and feminine (waiter – waitress, widow – widower). This distinction is not grammatically universal. It is not characterized by a wide range of occurrences and by a grammatical level of abstraction. Only a limited number of words are marked as belonging to masculine, feminine or neuter. The morpheme on which the distinction between masculine and feminine is based in English is a word-building morpheme, not form-building.

Still, other scholars (M. Blokh, John Lyons) admit the existence of the category of gender. Prof. Blokh states that the existence of the category of gender in Modern English can be proved by the correlation of nouns with personal pronouns of the third person (he, she, it). Accordingly, there are three genders in English: the neuter (non-person) gender, the masculine gender, the feminine gender.

5. The Category of Determination

The linguistic status of the article

The question is whether the article is a separate part of speech (i.e. a word) or a word-morpheme. If we treat the article as a word, we shall have to admit that English has only two articles - the and a/an. But if we treat the article as a word-morpheme, we shall have three articles - the, a/an, ø.
B.Ilyish (1971:57) thinks that the choice between the two alternatives remains a matter of opinion. The scholar gives a slight preference to the view that the article is a word, but argues that “we cannot for the time being at least prove that it is the only correct view of the English article”. M.Blokh (op. cit., 85) regards the article as a special type of grammatical auxiliary. Linguists are only agreed on the function of the article: the article is a determiner, or a restricter. The linguistic status of the article reminds us of the status of shall/will in I shall/will go. Both of the structures are still felt to be semantically related to their ‘parent’ structures: the numeral one and the demonstrative that (O.E. se) and the modals shall and will, respectively.

The articles, according to some linguists, do not form a grammatical category. The articles, they argue, do not belong to the same lexeme, and they do not have meaning common to them: a/an has the meaning of oneness, not found in the, which has a demonstrative meaning.

If we treat the article as a morpheme, then we shall have to set up a grammatical category in the noun, the category of determination. This category will have to have all the characteristic features of a grammatical category: common meaning + distinctive meaning. So what is common to a room and the room? Both nouns are restricted in meaning, i.e. they refer to an individual member of the class ‘room’. What makes them distinct is that a room has the feature [-Definite], while the room has the feature [+Definite]. In this opposition the definite article is the strong member and the indefinite article is the weak member.

The same analysis can be extended to abstract and concrete countable nouns, e.g. courage: a courage vs. the courage.

Consider: He has a courage equaled by few of his contemporaries.

vs. She would never have the courage to defy him.

In contrast to countables, restricted uncountables are used with two indefinite articles: a/an and zero. The role of the indefinite article is to individuate a subamount of the entity which is presented here as an aspect (type, sort) of the entity.
Consider also: Jim has a good knowledge of Greek, where $a$ denotes a subamount of knowledge,

Jim’s knowledge of Greek.

A certain difficulty arises when we analyze such sentences as *The horse is an animal* and *I see a horse*. Do these nouns also form the opposemes of the category of determination? We think that they do not: the horse is a subclass of the animal class; a horse is also restricted - it denotes an individual member of the horse subclass.

Cf. The horse is an animal. vs. A horse is an animal.

Unlike the nouns in the above examples, the nouns here exhibit determination at the same level: both the horse and a horse express a subclass of the animal class.
Lecture 4

The Verb: General.

The Categories of Person, Number, Tense, Aspect and Temporal Correlation

1. A general outline of the verb as a part of speech.
2. Classification of verbs.
3. The category of person.
4. The category of number.
5. The category of tense.
6. The category of aspect.
7. The category of temporal correlation.

1. A General Outline of the Verb as a Part of Speech

The verb is the most complex part of speech. This is due to the central role it performs in realizing predication - connection between the situation given in the utterance and reality. That is why the verb is of primary informative significance in the utterance. Besides, the verb possesses a lot of grammatical categories. Furthermore, within the class of verbs various subclass divisions based on different principles of classification can be found.

Semantic features of the verb. The verb possesses the grammatical meaning of verbiality - the ability to denote a process developing in time. This meaning is inherent not only in the verbs denoting processes, but also in those denoting states, forms of existence, evaluations, etc.

Morphological features of the verb. The verb possesses the following grammatical categories: tense, aspect, voice, mood, person, number, finitude and temporal correlation. The common categories for finite and non-finite forms are voice, aspect, temporal correlation and finitude. The grammatical categories of the English verb find their expression in both synthetical and analytical forms.

Syntactic features. The most universal syntactic feature of verbs is their ability to be modified by adverbs. The second important syntactic criterion is the ability of the verb to perform the syntactic function of the predicate. However, this
criterion is not absolute because only finite forms can perform this function while non-finite forms can be used in any function but predicate.

2. Classification of Verbs

**Morphological classifications**

1. **According to their stem-types** all verbs fall into: *simple* (to play), *sound-replacive* (food - to feed, blood - to bleed), *stress-replacive* (‘insult - to in’sult, ‘record - to re’cord), *expanded* - built with the help of suffixes and prefixes (oversleep, undergo), *composite* - correspond to composite nouns (to blackmail), *phrasal* (to have a smoke, to take a look).

2. **According to the way of forming past tenses and Participle II** verbs can be *regular* and *irregular*.

**Lexical-morphological classification** is based on the implicit grammatical meanings of the verb.

According to the implicit grammatical *meaning of transitivity/intransitivity* verbs fall into *transitive* and *intransitive*.

According to the implicit grammatical *meaning of stativeness/non-stativeness* verbs fall into *stative* and *dynamic*.

**Dynamic** verbs include:
1) activity verbs: beg, call, drink;
2) process verbs: grow, widen, narrow;
3) verbs of bodily sensations: hurt, itch;
4) transitional event verbs: die, fall;
5) momentary: hit, kick, nod.

**Stative** verbs include:
1) verbs of inert perception and cognition: adore, hate, love;
2) relational verbs: consist, cost, have, owe.

According to the implicit grammatical *meaning of terminativeness/non-terminativeness* verbs fall into *terminative* and *durative*. This classification is closely connected with the categories of aspect and temporal correlation.
Syntactic classifications

According to the nature of predication (primary and secondary) all verbs fall into finite and non-finite.

Functional classification

According to their functional significance verbs can be notional (with the full lexical meaning), semi-notional (modal verbs, link-verbs), auxiliaries. Auxiliaries are used in the strict order: modal, perfective, progressive, passive.

3. The Category of Person

As it can be seen, in Russian person is fully grammaticalized in the present tense; grammatically, the personal pronouns are redundant: they merely reduplicate the person information contained in the verb form.

In English, only the third person present tense singular form expresses person grammatically; therefore, the verb forms are obligatorily associated with personal pronouns. Special mention should be made of the modal verbs and the verb be. Modal verbs, with the exception of shall/should and will/would, do not show person grammatically.

The verb be is more grammaticalized in this respect: it takes an exception to the other verbs. As can be seen, it has two grammaticalized persons in the singular – first and third person – and no grammaticalized persons in the plural. In the past tense, the verb be does not distinguish person – without a personal pronoun we cannot say which person the form expresses.

To sum up, the category of person is represented in English by the two-member opposition: third person singular vs. non-third person singular. The marked member of the opposition is third person; the unmarked member is non-third person (it includes the remaining forms – first person, second person forms – singular and plural). The opposition is privative both in the plane of content and in the plane of expression.
4. The Category of Number

The category of number shows whether the process is associated with one doer or with more than one doer, e.g. *He eats three times a day*. The sentence indicates a single eater; the verb is in the singular despite the fact than more than one process is meant.

The category of number is a two-member opposition: singular and plural. An interesting feature of this category is the fact that it is blended with person: number and person make use of the same morpheme. As person is a feature of the present tense, number is also restricted to the present tense.

Some verbs – modals – do not distinguish number at all. Still others are only used in the plural because the meaning of ‘oneness’ is hardly compatible with their lexical:

*The boys crowded round him.* vs.

*The boy crowded round him.*

*The soldiers regrouped and opened fire.* vs.

*The soldier regrouped and opened fire.*

The analysis of the examples demonstrates the weakness of the English verb as concerns the expression of person and number and its heavy reliance on the subject: it is the subject that is generally responsible for the expression of person and number in English.

The forms of the type *livest, takest, livedst, tookest* stand outside the grammatical system. They are associated with the personal pronoun *thou* and are only used in religious and occasionally in poetical texts and among Quakers. With these forms the category of number appears within the category of the 2nd person and the whole system of person and number (including the past tense) must be presented in a different shape.
5. The category of tense

Time is an unlimited duration in which things are considered as happening in the past, present or future. Time stands for a concept with which all mankind is familiar. Time is independent of language. Tense stands for a verb form used to express a time relation. Time is the same to all mankind while tenses vary in different languages. Time can be expressed in language in two basic ways: 1) lexically; 2) grammatically.

The category of tense is considered to be an immanent grammatical category which means that the finite verb form always expresses time distinctions. The category of tense finds different interpretations with different scholars.

According to one view, there are only two tenses in English: past and present. Most British scholars do not recognize the existence of future. It is considered to be a combination of the modal verb and an infinitive used to refer to future actions. The modal verbs “shall” and “will” preserve their lexical meaning of “wish, volition”. In that case combinations of the modal verbs with notional verbs should be regarded as free syntactical constructions, not as analytical structures. However, there are some examples in which the notion of volition cannot be implied:

eg. He will die in a week.
I shall be twenty next Friday.

Provided that the situation is realistic, in these contexts lexical meanings of “shall” and “will” are not present. These elements render only grammatical meanings, therefore they serve as auxiliaries and such combinations must be regarded as analytical structures. So we have to recognize the existence of pure futurity in English.

In traditional linguistics grammatical time is often represented as a three-form category consisting of the “linear” past, present and future forms. The meaning of the category of tense is the relation of the action expressed by a finite verb to the moment of speaking. Present denotes coincidence, past denotes a prior action, future denotes a posterior action which follows the moment of speaking.
The future-in-the-past does not find its place in the scheme based on the linear principle since it does not show any relation to the moment of speaking, hence this system is considered to be deficient, not covering all lingual data. Those who deny the existence of simple future in English consider future-in-the-past one of the mood forms. Those who recognize the existence of simple future argue that it is used in the same situation when simple future is used, in subordinate clauses when the principal clause contains a past form. So, this form is different only in one respect – it is dependent on the syntactic structure.

According to the concept worked out by Prof. Blokh, there exist two tense categories in English. The first one – the category of primary time – expresses a direct retrospective evaluation of the time of the process denoted. It is based upon the opposition of past vs. present, the past tense being its strong member. The second one – the category of “prospective time” – is based on the opposition of “after-action” and “non-after-action”, the marked member being the future tense.

6. The category of aspect

The category of aspect is a linguistic representation of the objective category of manner of action. It is realized through the opposition Continuous::Non-Continuous (Progressive::Non-Progressive). The opposition is privative both in the plane of content and in the plane of expression. It is easily neutralized, i.e. non-continuous forms substitute continuous forms when the notion of duration is expressed by other means (eg. lexical).

The realization of the category of aspect is closely connected with the lexical meaning of verbs. There are some verbs in English that do not normally occur with progressive aspect, even in those contexts in which the majority of verbs necessarily take the progressive form. Among the so-called ‘non-progressive’ verbs are think, understand, know, hate, love, see, taste, feel, possess, own, etc. The most striking characteristic that they have in common is the fact that they are ‘stative’ - they refer to a state of affairs, rather than to an action, event or process. It should be observed, however, that all the ‘non-progressive' verbs take the
progressive aspect under particular circumstances. As the result of internal transposition verbs of non-progressive nature can be found in the Continuous form: *Now I'm knowing you.* Generally speaking the Continuous form has at least two semantic features - duration (the action is always in progress) and definiteness (the action is always limited to a definite point or period of time). In other words, the purpose of the Continuous form is to serve as a frame which makes the process of the action more concrete and isolated.

A distinction should be made between grammatical aspect and semantic aspectuality. English has an aspect system marked by the presence or absence of the auxiliary *be* contrasting progressive and non-progressive. The major aspectuality contrast is between perfective and imperfective. With perfective aspectuality the situation described in a clause is presented in its totality, as a whole, viewed, as it were, from the outside. With imperfective aspectuality the situation is not presented in its totality, but viewed from within, with focus on the internal temporal structure or on some subinterval of time within the whole. The main use of progressive forms is to express a particular subtype of imperfective aspectuality.

As for the Russian verb, it has two aspects, the perfective and the imperfective. It is obvious at once that there is no direct correspondence between English and Russian aspects; for instance, the English continuous aspect is not identical with the Russian imperfective. The relation between the two systems is not so simple as all that. On the one hand, the English common aspect may correspond not only to the Russian perfective but also to the Russian imperfective aspect; thus, he wrote may correspond both to написал and to писал. On the other hand, the Russian imperfective aspect may correspond not only to the continuous but also to the common aspect in English; thus, писал may correspond both to was writing and to wrote.

7. The category of temporal correlation
The Modern English perfect forms have been the subject of a lengthy discussion which has not so far brought about a definite result.

The position of the perfect forms in the system of the English verb is a problem which has been treated in many different ways and has raised much controversy. There are three major approaches to defining the essence of perfective forms in English:

The category of perfect is a peculiar tense category, i. e. a category which should be classed in the same list as the categories "present" and "past". This view was held, for example, by O. Jespersen.

The category of perfect is a peculiar aspect category, i. e. one which should be given a place in the list comprising "common aspect" and "continuous aspect". This view was held by a number of scholars, including Prof. G. Vorontsova. Those who hold this view have expressed different opinions about the particular aspect constituting the essence of the perfect forms. It has been variously defined as "retrospective", "resultative", "successive", etc.

The category of perfect is neither one of tense, nor one of aspect but a specific category different from both. It should be designated by a special term and its relations to the categories of aspect and tense should be investigated. This view was expressed by Prof. A. Smirnitsky. He took the perfect to be a means of expressing the category of "time relation" (временная отнесенность).

The category denotes correlation of the action expressed by the finite verb to some moment in the past, present or future.

This category is based on the opposition “perfect vs. non-perfect”. The opposition is privative in the plane of expression, however, it is not so easily neutralized in the plane of content. Since the opposition is not easily neutralized in the present tense, it is equipollent, but it can easily be neutralized in the past. Therefore, it should be considered privative-equipollent.

Perfect forms denote priority to the moment in the past, present or future. Non-perfect forms denote simultaneity with a moment in the past, present of future.
In Slavonic languages perfective and non-perfective aspects are differentiated. They should not be confused with perfect and non-perfect forms in Germanic languages.

There are tendencies to define the English aspect as based on the notion of limit.
Lecture 5

The Verb: the Categories of Voice and Mood.

Oppositional Reduction of Verbal Categories

1. The category of voice.
2. The category of mood.
3. Mood and modality.
4. Oppositional reduction of verbal categories.

1. The category of voice

The form of the verb may show whether the agent expressed by the subject is the doer of the action or the recipient of the action (*John broke the vase - the vase was broken*). The objective relations between the action and the subject or object of the action find their expression in language as the grammatical category of voice. Therefore, the category of voice reflects the objective relations between the action itself and the subject or object of the action:

The category of voice is realized through the opposition Active voice::Passive voice. The passive is marked both in meaning and in form and the active as unmarked both in meaning and in form.

The realization of the voice category is restricted because of the implicit grammatical meaning of transitivity/intransitivity. In accordance with this meaning, all English verbs should fall into transitive and intransitive. However, the classification turns out to be more complex and comprises 6 groups:

1. Verbs used only transitively: *to mark, to raise*;
2. Verbs with the main transitive meaning: *to see, to make, to build*;
3. Verbs of intransitive meaning and secondary transitive meaning. A lot of intransitive verbs may develop a secondary transitive meaning: *They laughed me into agreement; He danced the girl out of the room*;
4. Verbs of a double nature, neither of the meanings are the leading one, the verbs can be used both transitively and intransitively: *to drive home - to drive a car*;
5. Verbs that are never used in the Passive Voice: *to seem, to become*;
6. Verbs that realize their passive meaning only in special contexts: *to live, to sleep, to sit, to walk, to jump.*

**Three types of passive** constructions can be differentiated: 1) **direct primary passive;** 2) **indirect secondary passive;** 3) **prepositional tertiary passive.**

Some English verbs can admit only one object – the direct one: *e.g. Mary saw him.*

When such an object becomes the subject of a passive construction, the latter is called direct primary passive: *e.g. He was seen by Mary.*

There are many verbs in English that take two objects in the active construction (direct and indirect): *e.g. I gave him a book. She told the story to her sister.*

These verbs admit of two passive constructions:

a) *A book was given to him. The story was told to her sister.* (the direct primary passive)

b) *He was given a book. Her sister was told the story.* (the indirect secondary passive)

The indirect (secondary) passive is not infrequent in verb-phrases with the verb *to give,* such as: *to give credit, to give command, to give a chance, to give a choice, to give an explanation, to give an opportunity, to give orders, to give shelter,* and the like.

*e.g. He was given a good to chance to argue.*

*She is given an opportunity to go to the south in summer.*

*Suppose, you are given a choice. What would you prefer?*

However, many verbs in English may take a direct and an indirect object in the active construction but admit only one passive construction — the direct passive, *e.g.: to bring, to do, to play, to telegraph* and many others. The list could be extended.

Next come constructions with the so-called prepositional or tertiary passive. The subject of the passive construction corresponds to the prepositional object of the active construction. This “detached” preposition retains its place after the verb.
e.g. Everything was taken care of.

She could not bear being read to any longer.

He was constantly being laughed at.

It should be noted that some scholars admit the existence of Middle, Reflexive and Reciprocal voices.

"Middle Voice" - the verbs primarily transitive may develop an intransitive middle meaning: That adds a lot; The door opened; The book sells easily; The dress washes well.

"Reflexive Voice": He dressed; He washed - the subject is both the agent and the recipient of the action at the same time. It is always possible to use a reflexive pronoun in this case: He washed himself.

"Reciprocal voice": They met; They kissed - it is always possible to use a reciprocal pronoun here: They kissed each other.

We cannot, however, speak of different voices, because all these meanings are not expressed morphologically.

2. The Category of Mood

A great divergence of opinions on the category of mood is caused by the fact that identical mood forms can express different meanings and different forms can express similar meanings.

The category of mood expresses the relation of nominative content of the sentence towards reality. Hence there are two moods – one presenting the action as real and the other presenting the action as unreal. Real actions are expressed by the indicative mood and unreal are expressed by the oblique mood.

I go to university. vs. He suggests I (should) go to university.

I am a student again. vs. I wish I were a student again.

As for the imperative mood, traditionally it has been referred to as a separate mood. However, Prof. Blokh thinks that the imperative is a variety of the subjunctive. This can be shown by means of equivalent transformations:

Be off! _ I demand that you (should) be off.
Do be careful with the papers. _ My request is that you (should) be careful with the papers.

Do as I ask you! _ I insist that you (should) do as I ask you.

As it can be seen, the meaning of the imperative does not much differ from the meaning of the subjunctive. It expresses a directive which may or may not be translated into a fact. Thus if we agree with M. Blokh, we shall have only two moods – the indicative and the non-indicative, or optative.

Speaking of the system of oblique moods, linguists distinguish various semantic varieties: Subjunctive I, Subjunctive II, Conditional, Suppositional.

- **Subjunctive I**
  
  So be it. Long live the Queen.

- **Subjunctive II**
  
  If I had / had had time

- **Conditional**
  
  I would go / would have gone there

- **Suppositional**
  
  I demand that he should be present

These moods are distinguished on the basis of meaning which is coloured by the linguistic environment of the forms, i.e. these are ‘modal’ varieties of the subjunctive mood.

Subjunctive II and Conditional are used in a conditional period. They have two forms – either homonymous to Past Indefinite and Future-in-the-Past, or to Past Perfect and Future-Perfect-in-the-Past.

Prof. Khlebnikova analyzed the morphological system of the English verb on the basis of oppositions. She paid proper attention to the fact that all these forms are united by one meaning – that of unreality. Since the meaning is one, but forms are different, she made the conclusion that there is only one oblique mood presented by two subtypes.

Subjunctive II and Conditional are more important than the other two because they are indispensable and sufficient in the system, that is, one cannot do without them, but can easily do without the other two. Subjunctive II and Conditional express the same meaning and don’t exist independently, so they can be united into one mood. Prof. Khlebnikova called this mood Conjunctive.
Subjunctive I and Suppositional are on the periphery of the system. The former is a remnant of history. It has fallen out of the system and is used in restricted contexts, such as religious hymns, slogans, etc. The latter is a new formation that has not entered into the system yet. It is used in specific syntactic structures, eg., after verbs ‘demand’, ‘suggest’, etc. Another indication that Subjunctive I and Suppositional are on the periphery of the system is that they are synonymous and interchangeable in the structure.

To sum up, the category of mood is represented by two oppositions: the indicative mood and the spective mood. The indicative mood is the basic mood of the verb. Morphologically it is the most developed system. Semantically, it is a fact mood; it is the least subjective of all the moods. The spective mood, which includes the traditional imperative and the subjunctive mood, represents a process as a non-fact, i.e. as something imaginary, desirable, problematic, contrary to reality. The imperative variety of the spective mood is morphologically the least developed mood: it is only expressed by the bare infinitive form.

3. Mood and Modality

A distinction should be made between grammatical mood and semantic modality. Mood is a matter of grammatical form, modality a matter of meaning. The main markers of modality in English are the modal auxiliaries can, may, must, will, shall, together with a few less central ones.

When considering modality it is useful to distinguish between two parts:
the dictum: what is said
the modus: how it is said (that is, the speaker's cognitive, emotive, and/or volitive attitude about what is said)

For example, a sentence could have the following dictum: It is hot outside. This dictum could be paired with various of modi, such as the following:
I hope that it is hot outside.
I doubt that it is hot outside.
It must be hot outside.
It has to be hot outside.
It might be hot outside.
It could be hot outside.
It needn't be hot outside.
It shouldn't be hot outside.
It is probably hot outside.
Perhaps it is hot outside.
It is possible that it is hot outside.
It is certain that it is hot outside.
It is probable that it is hot outside.
It is likely that it is hot outside.

Three main kinds of modal meaning are distinguished:

- deontic,
- epistemic,
- dynamic.

Deontic modality is concerned with “influencing actions, states, or events” and typically has to do with such notions as obligation and permission, or – in combination with negation – prohibition. Deontic modal meaning also deals with threats, promises (commissive deontic modality), requests, commands, instructions (directive), desires, wishes and fears (volitive):

e.g. You must come in immediately (obligation).
You can have one more turn. (permission)
You can’t have any more. (prohibition)
May he lose the race. (wish)

Epistemic modality is concerned with the speaker’s judgement of the truth of the proposition embedded in the statement.

e.g. It was a mistake represents an unqualified assertion.
It must have been a mistake suggests that I am drawing a conclusion from evidence rather than asserting something of whose truth I have direct knowledge.
You may be right merely acknowledges the possibility that “You are right” is true.

Dynamic modality has nothing to do with the speaker, it is subject-oriented and generally concerns the properties and dispositions of persons, etc., referred to in the clause.

e.g. Liz can drive better than you. I asked Ed to go but he won’t.

In these examples the speaker is concerned with Liz’s driving ability and Ed’s willingness to go.

All three kinds of modality are commonly expressed by other means than by modal auxiliaries: lexical verbs (You are obliged to do that), adjectives (You are likely to be fined), adverbs (Perhaps you are right), nouns (You have my permission to leave early).

4. Oppositional reduction of verbal categories

In various contextual conditions, one member of an opposition can be used in the position of the other, counter-member. This phenomenon is usually referred to as “oppositional reduction” (some authors use the term “oppositional substitution”). Two major types of oppositional reduction are differentiated: neutralization and transposition.

Neutralization as a linguistic concept by which we mean suspension of otherwise functioning oppositions. The position of neutralization is, as a rule, filled in by the weak member of the opposition due to its more general semantics. Neutralization is stylistically indifferent, the use of the unmarked member of the opposition in the position of the marked member does not transgress the expressive conventions of ordinary speech.

e.g. The exhibition opens next week.

The example presents a case of neutralization of the opposition “present vs. future”. The present form “opens”, which is the weak member of the opposition, is used in the position of the strong member and denotes a future action.
Neutralization is possible due to the presence of the adverbial modifier of time ("next week"), which plays the role of the neutralizer in this case.

The other type of oppositional reduction called transposition takes place when one of the members of the opposition is placed in contextual conditions uncommon for it, that is, the use of the form is stylistically marked. Transposition is based on the contrast between the members of the opposition, it may be defined as a contrastive use of the counter-member of the opposition. As a rule, it is the marked member of the opposition that is employed transpositionally, but not always so.

e.g. He is always borrowing my pen.

The present continuous form in the example stands in sharp contradiction with its regular grammatical meaning “action in progress at the present time”. There is no doubt that the contradiction is purposeful: by exaggeration, it intensifies the implied disapproval of the person’s behavior.

The verbal categories of tense, aspect and temporal correlation are all subject to oppositional reduction. Let us consider the following examples:

**Category of tense:**

eg. The big Christmas sale starts next Monday.

Your order will be sent to you immediately after we get a copy of your receipt.

The two examples present cases of neutralization of the opposition “present vs. future”. Present forms “starts” and “get” refer to future actions. In the first case neutralization is optional since the paradigmatically required form “will start” can be used here. (Using a non-future temporal form to express a future action which is to take place according to some plan or arrangement is one of typical cases of neutralization.) In the second case neutralization is strictly obligatory. This type of neutralization is syntactically conditioned: It occurs in clauses of time and condition whose verb-predicate expresses a future action. (This is another typical case of neutralization of the analyzed oppositional).

Example of transposition:
eg. I walked for a couple more minutes and then suddenly I see a fox running in my direction.

In this example the present form “see” substitutes the past form “saw”. Present is used in the position of transposition of the opposition “present vs. past”. The stylistic purpose of this phenomenon known as “the historic present” is to create a vivid picture of the event reflected in the utterance. The peculiarity of this case of transposition is that the weak member stands in the position of the strong member, which is not typical of transposition.

Category of aspect

There are several typical cases of oppositional reduction of the category of aspect. One is related to the division of verbs into limitive and unlimitive.

e.g. The sun shone brightly.

The example presents a case of neutralization of the opposition “continuous vs. non-continuous” (a process is implied). Neutralization is optional since the paradigmatically required form “was shining” can still be used. The neutralizer is the lexical meaning of the verb.

As for transposition, continuous forms can be used transpositionally to denote habitual, recurrent actions in emphatic collocations. (e.g. He is always borrowing my pen).

Category of temporal correlation

As we have already mentioned, the category of temporal correlation is based on the privative-equipollent opposition of “perfect vs. non-perfect”, which is not easily neutralized in the present but can be neutralized in the past with ease.

e.g. The court issued an arrest warrant after the police detained a suspect.

The non-perfect form “detained” substitutes the paradigmatically required form “had detained”. The use of the weak member of the opposition in the position of the strong member is possible because the meaning of “a prior action” is expressed by the temporal conjunction “after” and by the other action.
Lecture 6
Non-Finite Forms of the Verb

1. The infinitive and its properties. The categories of the infinitive.
2. The gerund and its properties. The categories of gerund. The notion of half-gerund.
3. The present participle, the past participle, and their properties.

Introductory

Verb forms make up two distinct classes: finites and non-finites, also called verbals, verbids. Finites serve to express a primary predication, i.e. they ‘tie’ the situation described by a proposition to the context. Non-finites serve to express a secondary predication.

The non-finite forms of the verb combine the characteristics of the verb with the characteristics of other parts of speech. Their mixed features are revealed in their semantics, morphemic structural marking, combinability, and syntactic functions.

The strict division of functions clearly shows that the opposition between the finite and non-finite forms of the verb creates a special grammatical category. The differential feature of the opposition is constituted by the expression of verbal time and mood: the non-finite forms have no immediate means of expressing time-mood categorial semantics and therefore present the weak member of the opposition. The category expressed by this opposition is called the category of finitude. The syntactic content of the category of finitude is the expression of predication (more precisely, the expression of verbal predication).

In other words, the opposition of the finite verbs and the verbids is based on the expression of the functions of full predication and semi-predication. While the finite verbs express predication in its genuine and complete form, the function of the verbids is to express semi-predication, building up semi-predicative complexes within different sentence constructions.

The English verbids include four forms: the infinitive, the gerund, the present participle and the past participle.
The Infinitive

Historically, the infinitive is a verbal noun. Hence its double nature: it combines the features of the verb with those of the noun. It is the form of the verb which expresses a process in general, i.e. a process that is not restricted (i.e. concretized) by person, number, tense, and mood. Because of its general process meaning, the infinitive is treated as the head-form of the whole paradigm of the verb.

The infinitive has two presentation forms: marked and unmarked. The marked infinitive is distinguished by the grammatical word-morpheme to, historically a preposition. Similar to other grammatical word morphemes, to can be used to represent the corresponding construction as a whole (e.g. You can read any of the books if you want to). It can also be separated from its notional part by a word or phrase, usually of adverbial nature, forming the so-called split infinitive (e.g. We need your participation, to thoroughly investigate the issue.) The marked infinitive is an analytic grammatical form.

The other form of the infinitive is unmarked; it is traditionally called the bare infinitive. It is used in various analytic forms (non-modal and modal), with verbs of physical perception, with the verbs let, bid, make, help (optionally), with a few modal phrases (had better, would rather, would have, etc.), with the relative why.

The infinitive combines the properties of the verb with those of the noun, as a result it serves as the verbal name of a process. It has the grammatical categories of voice, aspect and temporal correlation. Consequently, the categorial paradigm of the infinitive includes eight forms: the indefinite active, the continuous active, the perfect active, the perfect continuous active; the indefinite passive, the continuous passive, the perfect passive, the perfect continuous passive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Form</th>
<th>Passive Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to take</td>
<td>to be taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to have taken</td>
<td>to have been taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be taken</td>
<td>to be being taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to have been taken</td>
<td>to have been being taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The continuous and perfect continuous passive can only be used occasionally, with a strong stylistic colouring. It is the indefinite infinitive that constitutes the head-form of the verbal paradigm.

The verbal features of the infinitive. Like the finite form of verb, the infinitive distinguishes the categories of aspect, voice, and temporal correlation.

The paradigm of the infinitive is determined by the semantico-syntactic properties of the process. If the process is intransitive, we cannot derive voice forms

e.g. to walk – to be walking vs. *to be being walked
to have walked – to have been walking vs. *to have been being walked

The nounal features of the infinitive. Semantically and morphologically, the infinitive is much more similar to the verb than to the noun: its verbal features outweigh its nounal features. Similar to the noun, the infinitive can be used as the subject or part of the subject, the predicative, and the attribute.

The Gerund

The gerund is originally a verbal noun in –ing. Similar to the infinitive, the gerund is the name of a process, but its substantive meaning is more strongly pronounced than that of the infinitive: unlike the infinitive, the gerund can be modified by a noun in the genitive case or by the possessive pronoun and used with prepositions.

The general combinability of the gerund, like that of the infinitive, is dual, sharing some features with the verb, and some features with the noun.

The verbal features of the gerund. Like the verb, the gerund distinguishes the categories of voice and temporal correlation:

writing (non-passive, non-perfect) – being written (passive, non-perfect)
having written (non-passive, perfect) – having been written (passive, perfect)

It is obvious that gerunds derived from intransitive verbs have only two forms: non-perfect active and perfect active, e.g. walking vs. having walked.
The gerund has the following syntactic features of the verb: it can function as part of the verbal predicate (e.g. If he stops working, he will die); it can be followed by an object (e.g. I remember locking the door) and an adverbial modifier (e.g. He avoids driving fast).

**The nounal features of the gerund.** Similar to the noun, the gerund can be modified by a noun in the genitive case or in the common case, which, when pronominalized, turn into the possessive and objective forms, respectively:

*She did nothing to encourage John’s going abroad.*

*She did nothing to encourage John going abroad.* vs.  
*She did nothing to encourage his going abroad.*  
*She did nothing to encourage him going abroad.*

The standard form is the form with the noun in the genitive case or with the possessive pronoun. The other form is more common in spoken English. The gerund in the latter construction is traditionally called the half-gerund.

Unlike the noun, the gerund cannot be used in the plural; it cannot be preceded by the article (or its substitute); it cannot be determined by the adjective.

Like the noun, the gerund can be used as the subject, the object, the predicative, and the attribute.

**Participle**

The participle is a term applied to adjectival forms of verbs. There are two types of participle: the present participle and the past participle.

**Participle I**

The present participle is the non-finite form of the verb which combines the properties of the verb with those of the adjective and adverb, serving as the qualifying-processual name. In its outer form the present participle is wholly homonymous with the gerund, ending in the suffix *-ing* and distinguishing the same grammatical categories of temporal correlation and voice. Both forms denote a process – the present participle (or the past participle) denotes a qualifying process while the gerund denotes a substantival process.
The term *present participle* may be misleading since the participle does not express tense distinctions. It is a traditional term, originally applied to adjectival forms of verbs in Ancient Greece which were inflected for tense, aspect, and case. It was borrowed from Greek grammar through Latin grammar and uncritically applied to English verbal forms which had an adjective-like use. As to its temporal meaning, the present participle expresses a process simultaneous with or prior to the process of the finite verb: it may denote present, past, and future.

**Verbal features.** Both the present participle and the gerund distinguish the same grammatical categories of voice and temporal correlation:

- writing (non-perfect, non-passive) – being written (non-perfect, passive)
- having written (perfect, non-passive) – having been written (perfect, passive)
- walking (non-perfect, non-passive) – having walked (perfect, non-passive)

Like the verb, it combines with the object, the adverbial modifier; like the verb, it participates in the formation of the verbal predicate.

The present participle, similar to the infinitive, can build up semi-predicative complexes of objective and subjective types. The two groups of complexes, i.e. infinitival and present participial, may exist in parallel (e.g. when used with some verbs of physical perceptions), the difference between them lying in the aspective presentation of the process. Cf.:

- *Nobody noticed the scouts approach the enemy trench.* —
- *Nobody noticed the scouts approaching the enemy trench with slow, cautious, expertly calculated movements.*
- *Suddenly a telephone was heard to buzz, breaking the spell.* —
- *The telephone was heard vainly buzzing in the study.*

A peculiar use of the present participle is seen in the absolute participial constructions of various types, forming complexes of detached semi-predication. Cf.:

- *The message being written, I clicked “Send”.*
- *Jane was watching TV, the kids sleeping in the adjoining room.*
These complexes of descriptive and narrative stylistic nature seem to be gaining ground in present-day English.

**Adjectival properties.** Like the adjective, the present participle can be used as an attribute – generally as a postposed attribute, e.g. *The man talking to John is my boss.*

**Participle II**

The past participle is the non-finite form of the verb which combines the properties of the verb with those of the adjective, serving as the qualifying-processual name. Unlike the present participle, it has no paradigm of its own.

Its **verbal features** are participation in the structure of the verbal predicate (e.g. *The house was destroyed by a bomb*) and the use as secondary predicate (e.g. *Her spirit, though crushed, was not broken*).

Its **adjectival feature** is its attributive function, e.g. *She looked at the broken cup.*

Similar to the present participle, the past participle can be used in postposition or in preposition to the noun: *the broken cup vs. the cup broken.* But as compared to the present participle, the past participle occurs in preposition to the noun more frequently.

Like the present participle, the past participle is capable of making up semi-predicative constructions of complex object, complex subject, as well as of absolute complex.

The absolute past participial complex as a rule expresses priority in the correlation of two events. Cf.: *The preliminary talks completed, it became possible to concentrate on the central point of the agenda.*
Lectures 7 - 8

The Adjective. The Adverb

1. A general outline of the adjective.
2. Classification of adjectives.
3. The problem of the static.
4. The category of comparison.
5. A general outline of the adverb.
6. Classification of adverbs (semantic features).
7. Structural types of adverbs (morphological features).

1. **A general outline of the adjective**

   **Semantic features.** The adjective expresses the **property of an entity**. Typically, adjectives denote states, usually permanent states, although there are also adjectives which can denote temporary states. Adjectives are characteristically **static**, but many of them can be seen as **dynamic**. The static property of an entity is a property that cannot be conceived as a developing process, and the dynamic property of an entity is a property that is conceived as active, or as a developing process.

   eg. *John is very tall.* vs. *John is being very tall today*

   *John is very careful today* (unemphatic) vs. *John is being careful today* (emphatic).

   **Morphological features.** Derivationally, adjectives are related either to nouns or verbs. Suffixes changing nouns to adjectives are: - (i)al, -ar, -ary or -ery, -ed, -en, -esque, -ful, -ic(al), -ish, -istic, -less, -like, -ly, -ous, -ward, -wide, -y. Suffixes changing verbs to adjectives are: -able or -ible, -ent or -ant, -ed, -ing, -ive, -(at)ory.

   **Syntactic features.** In the sentence, the adjective performs the functions of an **attribute** (an adjunct) and a **predicative**. Of the two, the more typical function is that of an attribute since the function of a predicative can also be performed by other parts of speech.
Adjectives can sometimes be **postpositive**, that is, they can sometimes follow the item they modify.

Adjectives can often function as **heads of noun phrases**. As such, they do not inflect for number and for the genitive case and must take a definite determiner.

An adjective can function as a **verbless clause** (e.g., *Anxious, he dialed the number*).

### 2. Classification of adjectives

**Semantic classification**

All the adjectives are traditionally divided into two large subclasses: **qualitative** and **relative**. Relative adjectives express such properties of a substance as are determined by the direct relation of the substance to some other substance. *E.g.* mathematics — mathematical precision; history — a historical event.

Qualitative adjectives, as different from relative ones, denote various qualities of substances which admit of a quantitative estimation, i.e. of establishing their correlative quantitative measure. The measure of a quality can be estimated as high or low, adequate or inadequate, sufficient or insufficient, optimal or excessive. The ability of an adjective to form degrees of comparison is usually taken as a formal sign of its qualitative character, in opposition to a relative adjective which is understood as incapable of forming degrees of comparison by definition.

However, in actual speech the described principle of distinction is not strictly observed. Substances can possess qualities that are incompatible with the idea of degrees of comparison. So adjectives denoting these qualities and incapable of forming degrees of comparison still belong to the qualitative subclass (*extinct, immobile, deaf, final, fixed, etc.*). On the other hand, some relative adjectives can form degrees of comparison. *Cf.: a grammatical topic — a purely grammatical topic — the most grammatical of the suggested topics.*

Prof. Blokh suggests that distinction be based on the **evaluative function of adjectives**. According as they actually give some qualitative evaluation to the substance referent or only point out its corresponding native property, all the adjective functions may be grammatically divided into "evaluative" and
"specificative". One and the same adjective, irrespective of its being "relative" or "qualitative", can be used either in the evaluative function or in the specificative function. For instance, the adjective *good* is basically qualitative. On the other hand, when employed as a grading term in teaching, i.e. a term forming part of the marking scale together with the grading terms *bad, satisfactory, excellent*, it acquires the said specificative value; in other words, it becomes a specificative, not an evaluative unit in the grammatical sense. Conversely, the adjective *wooden* is basically relative, but when used in the broader meaning "expressionless" or "awkward" it acquires an evaluative force and, consequently, can presuppose a greater or lesser degree ("amount") of the denoted property in the corresponding referent.

Thus, the introduced distinction between the evaluative and specificative uses of adjectives, in the long run, emphasizes the fact that the morphological category of comparison (comparison degrees) is potentially represented in the whole class of adjectives and is constitutive for it.

Adjectives that characterize the referent of the noun directly are termed **inherent**, those that do not are termed **non-inherent**.

*eg. an old member of the club – the member of the club is old*

Most adjectives are inherent, and it is especially uncommon for dynamic adjectives to be other than inherent.

**Syntactic classification**

From a syntactic point of view, adjectives can be divided into three groups:

1) adjectives which can be used attributively and predicatively (*a healthy man – the man is healthy*);

2) adjectives which can be used attributively only (*a complete idiot – *the idiot is complete*);

3) adjectives which can be used predicatively only (*a loath man – the man is loath to agree with it*).

Attributive adjectives constitute two groups:

1) **intensifying**:
2) restrictive, or particularizing (limiter adjectives).

Intensifying adjectives constitute two groups:

1) emphasizers;

2) amplifiers.

Emphasizers have a heightening effect on the noun (clear, definite, outright, plain, pure, real, sheer, sure, true); amplifiers scale upwards from an assumed norm (complete, great, firm, absolute, close, perfect, extreme, entire, total, utter).

Restrictive adjectives restrict the noun to a particular member of the class (chief, exact, main, particular, precise, principal, sole, specific). They particularize the reference of the noun.

3. The problem of the category of state

There is a class of words in English with the following morphological, semantic and syntactic characteristics:

1) The words of this type denote “states” while adjectives denote “qualities”;

2) The words of this type may be characterized by the prefix a- (it derives from the Middle English preposition an ‘in, on’): alive, asleep, ajar, etc.;

3) The words of this type do not possess the category of the degrees of comparison;

4) The words of this type are used predicatively only, e.g. He is awake.

Because of the said features, these words are regarded by some grammarians as a separate part of speech which has been variously referred to as the category of state words, adlinks, and statives (B. Ilyish; B. S. Khaimovich and B. I. Rogovskaya). The number of such words does not exceed several dozen. The traditional view of the stative, which separates temporary adjectives from other adjectives, does not seem to be convincing: temporary adjectives are part and parcel of the adjective class as a whole. At the same time, we must admit that these adjectives have features (meaning, function) that allow us to assign them to a separate subclass of the adjective. But the features examined are not sufficient for the distinction of the category of state within the adjective.
4. The category of comparison

The category of comparison is constituted by the opposition of three forms of the adjective: the positive, the comparative, and the superlative.

Some grammarians have expressed the view that there are only two degrees of comparison. Otto Jespersen, for instance, argues that the positive degree cannot be regarded as a degree of comparison as it does not convey the idea of comparison.

According to A.I. Smirnitsky, the degrees of comparison include the positive degree and the relative degree which is subdivided into the comparative and the superlative degree.

There are three ways of forming degrees of comparison: synthetic, analytic, and suppletive. The synthetic way of forming degrees of comparison is by the inflections -er, -est; the analytic way, by placing more and most before the adjective. The synthetic way is generally used with monosyllabic adjectives and dissyllabic adjectives ending in -y, -ow, -er, -le and those which have the stress on the last syllable. However, in the dissyllabic group we can observe radical changes: adjectives formerly taking -er and -est are tending to go over to more and most, e.g. more common, most common; more cloudy, most cloudy; more fussy, most fussy; more cruel, most cruel; more quiet, most quiet; more clever, most clever; more profound, most profound; more simple, most simple; more pleasant, most pleasant – all these were normally compared with -er and -est before the WWII. All this goes to show that English comparison is getting more and more analytic.

The question that linguists have been grappling with is: what is the linguistic status of analytic forms? Are more and most adverbs of quantity (degree) or grammatical word-morphemes? The problem is similar to the problem of the future in English. At present linguists are divided on this question: some linguists (A. I. Smirnitskyj, B. Khaimovich and B. Rogovskaya, B. Blokh) treat degrees of comparison with more and most as analytic constructions proper while others (V. N. Zhigadlo, L. S. Barkhudarov, D. A. Shteling,) treat them as free combinations of adverbs and adjectives.
To analytic forms of comparison M. Blokh also attributes *less/least* combinations. He calls them *forms of reverse comparison*. By the way, the forms *less, least* are generally used as an argument against the treatment of *more* and *most* as grammatical word-morphemes. So, for instance, B. Ilyish argues that if *less* and *least* are not grammatical word morphemes, *more* and *most* are not grammatical word-morphemes either.

As already pointed out, the third way of forming degrees of comparison is by the use of suppletive forms: *good _ better, best; bad _ worse, worst; far _ farther/further, farthest/furthest; little _ less, least; much/many _ more, most.*

In discussing the category of comparison, linguists generally mention such constructions as *a most beautiful girl*. This combination is a common means of expressing *elative evaluations* of substance properties. The indefinite article has nothing to do with comparison; it points to another problem, viz. the lexicalization of superlative forms: *most* no longer marks the superlative degree; it has turned into an adverb of degree whose meaning is the same as that of *very*.

Cf. also the *best suit vs. a best suit; the best seller vs. a best-seller.*

### 5. The Adverb

**Semantic features.** The adverb is usually defined as a word expressing either property of an action, or property of another property, or circumstances in which an action occurs. However, this definition fails to demonstrate the difference between the adverb and the adjective. To overcome this drawback, we should define the adverb as *a notional word denoting a non-substantive property, that is, a property of a non-substantive referent.* This feature sets the adverb apart from the adjective which, as already known, denotes a substantive property.

Adverbs are commonly divided into *qualitative, quantitative* and *circumstantial*.

Qualitative adverbs express immediate, inherently non-graded qualities of actions and other qualities. The typical adverbs of this kind are qualitative adverbs in *-ly.*
Quantitative adverbs are specific lexical units of semi-functional nature expressing quality measure, or gradational evaluation of qualities. They may be subdivided into several sets:

1. Adverbs of high degree ("intensifiers"): very, quite, entirely, utterly, highly, greatly, perfectly, absolutely, strongly, considerably, pretty, much.

2. Adverbs of excessive degree (direct and reverse) also belonging to the broader subclass of intensifiers: too, awfully, tremendously, dreadfully, terrifically.

3. Adverbs of unexpected degree: surprisingly, astonishingly, amazingly.


5. Adverbs of low degree: slightly, a little, a bit.

6. Adverbs of approximate degree: almost, nearly.

7. Adverbs of optimal degree: enough, sufficiently, adequately.

8. Adverbs of inadequate degree: insufficiently, intolerably, unbearably, ridiculously.


Although the degree adverbs are traditionally described under the heading of "quantitative", in reality they occupy an intermediate position between qualitative and quantitative words and therefore can be referred to qualitative adverbs. Thus, the latter are subdivided into qualitative adverbs of full notional value and degree adverbs – specific functional words.

Circumstantial adverbs are also divided into notional and functional. The functional circumstantial adverbs are words of pronominal nature. They include numerical adverbs, adverbs of time, place, manner, cause, consequence. Many of them are used as syntactic connectives and question-forming words (now, here, when, where, so, thus, how, why, etc.)

Notional circumstantial adverbs include two basic sets: adverbs of time and adverbs of place: today, tomorrow, already, ever, never, shortly, recently, seldom, early, late; homeward, eastward, near, far, outside, ashore, etc.
Just like adjectives, adverbs can be divided into evaluative and specificative, connected with the categorial expression of comparison. Each adverb subject to evaluation grading by degree words expresses the category of comparison. Thus, not only qualitative adverbs are included into the categorial system of comparison.

**Morphological features.** As to their word-building structure adverbs may be non-derived, or simple (e.g. here, there, now, then, so, quick, why, how, where, when, very, rather) and derived (e.g. slowly, sideways, clockwise, homewards, away, ahead, apart, across). We can also distinguish composite forms and phrasal forms of the adverb: sometimes, nowhere, anyhow; at least, at most, at last, to and fro, upside down. A prolific source of adverbs is the adjective: many –ly adverbs are transformationally related to respective adjectives. The suffix –ly is a typical marker of the adverb. However, many adverbs related to adjectives may not be necessarily used with the suffix –ly, e.g. fast, late, hard, high, clean, clear, close, loud, tight, firm, quick, right, sharp, slow, wide, etc.

Special mention should be made of preposition-adverb like elements which form a semantic blend with verbs: to give up, to give in, to give out, to give away, to give over, etc; to set up, to set in, to set forth, to set down, etc.; to get on, to get off, to get through, to get about, etc. The verb-adverb combination goes by several names: two-part verbs, composite verbs, phrasal verbs. The verbs in such combinations are mostly one-syllable words; the most common adverbs are those denoting place, e.g. in, out, on, off; over, up, down, through, etc. Some of the adverbs may be separated by objective complements, e.g. Please hand in your papers. vs. Please hand your papers in. Others are non-separable, e.g. John called on me. vs. *John called me on.

In verb-adverb combinations the second element may:

a) retain its adverbial properties of showing direction (e.g. to go out, to go in, to go away);

b) change the aspect of the verb, i.e. mark the completeness of the process (e.g. to eat – to eat up; to stand – to stand up; to sit – to sit down; to lie – to lie down; to shave – to shave off; to speak – to speak out);
c) intensify the meaning of the process (e.g. to end – to end up; to finish – to finish up (off); to cut – to cut off; to talk – to talk away);

d) lose its lexical meaning and form an integral whole, a set expression (e.g. to fall out ‘to quarrel’; to give in ‘to surrender’; to come off ‘to take place’; to leave off ‘to stop’; to boil down ‘to be reduced in quantity’).

These combinations have been treated by different scholars in different ways. Some scholars have treated the second element as a variety of adverbs, as preposition-like adverbs (A. Smirnitsky, 1959, 376), as a special kind of adverb called adverbial postpositon (I. E. Anichkov, 1947), as postverbal particles (L. Kivationg et al., 1968: 35), as a special kind of form-word called postpositive (N. N. Amosova, 1963: 134), a postfix or postpositive affix (Y. Zhluktenko, 1954), a separate part of speech called postposition (B.A. Ilyish, 1948: 243 – 5). As for B. Ilyish, he later (1971:148) changed his view arguing that, since the second element does not indicate the circumstances in which the process takes place, the whole construction is a phraseological unit: the whole has a meaning different from the meanings of the components. According to M. Blokh, these elements form a special functional set of particles based on their functional character. He suggests the term “post-positives”.

The great variety of interpretations shows the complexity of the problem. Apparently, the problem requires further research.

**Syntactic features.** Adverbs are characterized by combinability with verbs, adjectives and words of adverbial nature. The adverb performs the function of an adverbial modifier.
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1. A General Outline of Functional Parts of Speech

According to the criteria of form, meaning and function, all words are divided into notional and functional, which reflects their division in the earlier grammatical tradition into changeable and unchangeable.

Functional words are characterized by incomplete nominative meaning, they are non-self-dependent and they perform mediatory functions in the sentence.

On the principle of "generalized form" only unchangeable words are traditionally treated under the heading of functional parts of speech. As for their individual forms as such, they are simply presented by the list, since the number of these words is limited, so that they don’t need to be identified on any general scheme.

To the basic functional series of words in English belong the article, the preposition, the conjunction, the particle, the modal word, the interjection.

2. The Preposition

It is common knowledge that prepositions are a most important element of the structure of many languages, particularly those which, like Modern English, have no developed case system in their nominal parts of speech. Prepositions in English are less closely connected with the word or phrase they introduce than, say, in Russian. This greater independence of English prepositions manifests itself in various ways.

Semantic features
The preposition is traditionally defined as a word expressing relations between words in the sentence. The weakness of the traditional definition is that it does not allow us to distinguish prepositions from subordinating conjunctions.

*Cf. She never saw him after the concert.* vs. *She never saw him after he left town.*

In traditional analysis, the preposition is used with the noun phrase, not with the verb phrase. Such being the case, *after* in the first sentence is a preposition, while *after* in the second sentence is a conjunction. In other words, the status of *after* is determined by the linguistic status of the following phrase. Accepting this approach, we shall have to treat the two uses of *after* as homonyms.

A new approach to prepositions and subordinating conjunctions is to treat the two traditional categories as prepositions (Geoffrey K. Pullum and Rodney Huddleston, 2002: 600). The said scholars include in the preposition category all of the subordinating conjunctions of traditional grammar with the exception of *whether* and *that*. Prepositions are taken as heads of phrases and are comparable to verbs, nouns, adjectives, and adverbs which also function as heads. This approach to prepositions makes it possible to combine prepositions and subordinating conjunctions into one class and thus solve the problem of the discrimination of prepositions and conjunctions.

Sometimes the boundary line between a preposition and another part of speech is not quite clear. Thus, with reference to the words like *near* there may be doubtful cases from this viewpoint. For instance, there certainly is the adjective *near*, used in such phrases as *the near future*. On the other hand, there is the preposition *near*, found in such sentences as *They live near me.*

Functionally, prepositions can be divided into grammatical, and non-grammatical (the latter are subdivided into spatial and non-spatial).

Grammatical prepositions have no identifiable meaning independent of the grammatical construction in which they occur. Consider:

1. He was interviewed by the police.
2. They were discussing the speech of the President.
3. She sent the letter to John.

In all these examples the prepositions have no identifiable meaning of their own: it is only in the co-text that we can say what meaning they express. In (1) by marks the element that is the Agent; in (2) of marks the possessive relationship between the speech and the president; in (3) to marks the Recipient.

In their grammatical functions, prepositions are similar to inflections in synthetic languages.

Cf. interviewed by the police: допрошены полицией;
the speech of the President: речь президента;
sent to John: отправила Джону.

As already indicated, non-grammatical prepositions can be divided into spatial and non-spatial, the term spatial including two types of space: non-temporal and temporal. Spatial non-temporal prepositions mark the position of entities with respect to each other: one entity is treated as a reference point (the deictic centre) with respect to which another is located.

Morphological features

Structurally, prepositions fall into two categories: simple, or one-word, prepositions (in, on, for, to, about, after, etc.) and composite, or two- or threeword, prepositions (ahead of, because of, according to; by means of, at the cost of, with reference to, etc.).

However, not all scholars recognize the existence of composite prepositions. According to Prof. Ilyish, we cannot term these groups prepositions, since a preposition is a word, not a word group, and it is essential to keep up the distinction between words and word groups. The term "compound preposition" is too vague and is not conducive to a clear and consistent grammatical theory.

Syntactic features

As far as phrases are concerned, the function of prepositions is to connect words with each other. On the sentence level: a preposition is never a part of a sentence by itself; it enters the part of sentence whose main centre is the following noun, or pronoun, or gerund. It won’t be correct to say that prepositions connect
parts of a sentence. They do not do that, as they stand within a part of the sentence, not between two parts.

3. The Conjunction

Semantic features

Every conjunction has its own meaning, expressing some connection or other existing between phenomena in extralinguistic reality.

When discussing prepositions, we noted that in a certain number of cases the use of a given preposition is predicted by the preceding word: thus the verb *depend* can only be followed by the preposition *on* (or *upon*), the adjective *characteristic* only by the preposition *of*, etc. In such cases the preposition has no meaning of its own. Conjunctions in this respect are entirely different. Their meaning is independent of preceding words.

Syntactic features

Two levels are distinguished — that of phrases and that of sentences.

On the phrase level it must be said that conjunctions connect words and phrases. It is the so-called co-ordinating conjunctions that are found here, and only very rarely subordinating ones.

On the sentence level it must be said that conjunctions connect clauses (of different kinds). Here we find both so-called co-ordinating and so-called subordinating conjunctions.

In comparing prepositions with co-ordinating and subordinating conjunctions we cannot fail to notice that while prepositions have nothing in common with co-ordinating conjunctions, some prepositions are very close in meaning to subordinating conjunctions, and in some cases a preposition and a subordinating conjunction sound exactly the same.

It should also be noted that the difference between prepositions and conjunctions is much less pronounced in Modern English than in Russian, where prepositions are closely connected with cases, while conjunctions have nothing
whatever to do with them. In English, with its almost complete absence of cases, this difference between prepositions and conjunctions is very much obliterated.

4. The Particle

Particles usually refer to the word (or, sometimes, phrase) immediately following and give special prominence to the notion expressed by this word (or phrase), or single it out in some other way, depending on the meaning of the particle.

The question of the place of a particle in sentence structure remains unsolved. The following three solutions are possible:

(1) a particle is a separate secondary member of the sentence, which should be given a special name;

(2) a particle is an element in the part of the sentence which is formed by the word (or phrase) to which the particle refers (thus the particle may be an element of the subject, predicate, object, etc.);

(3) a particle neither makes up a special part of the sentence, nor is it an element in any part of the sentence; it stands outside the structure of the sentence and must be neglected when analysis of a sentence is given.

Each of these three views entails some difficulties and none of them can be proved to be the correct one, so that the decision remains arbitrary.

5. The Interjection

Interjections have for a long time been an object of controversy. There has been some doubt whether they are words of a definite language in the same sense that nouns, verbs, etc. are, and whether they are not rather involuntary outcries, not restricted to any given language but common to all human beings as biological phenomena are.

Modern scholars consider interjections part of the word stock of a language as much as other types of words. Interjections belonging to a certain language may contain sounds foreign to other languages. Thus, for instance, the Russian
interjection *ax* contains the consonant phoneme [x], which is not found in English, etc.

**Semantic features**

The characteristic features which distinguish interjections from practically all other words lie in a different sphere. The interjections, as distinct from nouns, verbs, prepositions, etc., are not names of anything, but expressions of emotions.

Another characteristic feature of the meaning of interjections is, that while some of them express quite definite meanings (for instance, *alas* can never express the feeling of joy), other interjections seem to express merely feeling in general, without being attached to some particular feeling. The interjection *oh*, for example, may be used both when the speaker feels surprised and when he feels joyous, or disappointed, or frightened, etc. The meaning of the interjection itself is thus very vague.

**Syntactic features**

On the sentence level the function of interjections is a controversial matter. The usual interpretation is that the interjection stands outside the structure of the sentence. Another view is that it is syntactically a kind of parenthesis at least in some cases. The controversy cannot be decided by objective investigation and the answer only depends on what we mean by sentence structure on the one hand, and by some element or other being outside the sentence structure, on the other.

6. The Modal Word

The modal word, occupying in the sentence a more pronounced or less pronounced detached position, expresses the attitude of the speaker to the reflected situation and its parts. Here belong the functional words of probability (*probably*, *perhaps*, etc.), of qualitative evaluation (*fortunately*, *unfortunately*, *luckily*, etc.), and also of affirmation and negation.

Modal words stand in a special relation to the sentence. They are not sentence members, since giving an evaluation of the entire situation presented in the sentence, they stand on the outside. For instance, in the sentence *Perhaps,*
dimly, she saw the picture of a man walking up a road (Christie) the modal word perhaps is not a sentence member, but if we remove it, the meaning of the utterance will change – it will be just a statement of the fact.

Academician Shcherba states that there are some words that do not belong to any part of speech. Prof. Ilyish regards the words yes, no and please as standing outside the part of speech system. This point of view is also supported by Prof. Smirnitsky.
Lecture 10
The Phrase: Principles of Classification

1. The phrase as the basic unit of syntax. Differential features of the phrase and of the sentence.

2. Types of phrases. The traditional part of speech classification of phrases. Nominative classifications of phrases.

3. Types of syntactic relations.

1. The phrase as the basic unit of syntax.

Differential features of the phrase and of the sentence

One problem concerning the phrase is the absence of a universal term. Before the 20th century the word “phrase” was used to denote this linguistic phenomenon, however, it was dismissed by H. Sweet who considered it too vague. There appeared new terms, such as “word group” and “word cluster”. Later L. Bloomfield restored the past status of “phrase”, and currently this term is widely used by American linguists.

Another problem is connected with the definition of the phrase. Despite the fact that the phrase, along with the sentence, is a basic unit of syntax, there is no universally accepted definition of the phrase. Some scholars define the phrase as a combination of at least two notional words which do not constitute the sentence but are syntactically connected. However, the majority of Western linguists and Russian researchers Prof. B. Ilyish and V. Burlakova believe that a combination of a notional word with a functional word can be treated as a phrase as well, that is they term “phrase” every combination of two or more words, which is a grammatical unit but is not an analytical form of some word. The problem is disputable since the role of functional words is to denote some abstract relations and they are devoid of nominative power. On the other hand, such combinations are syntactically bound and they should belong somewhere. We shall adhere to the view supported by B. Ilyish and V. Burlakova.

Despite all the controversies regarding the essence and nature of the phrase, the most adequate interpretation seems to be as follows: the phrase is any
syntactically organized group including either notional words (*happy life, very nice, to ignore the comment*), or both notional and functional words (*on the table, in the bag, under the tree*) connected with any of the existent types of syntactic connection. The phrase is a linear language unit that can be either a part of the sentence, or a separate sentence thus acquiring not only intonation coloring and corresponding phrase stress, but also communicative orientation. Thus, the phrase can be defined as a **syntactically organized group of words of any morphological composition based on any type of syntactic connection**.

The difference between the phrase and the sentence is fundamental: the phrase is a nominative unit which fulfils the function of polynomination denoting a complex referent (phenomenon of reality) analyzable into its component elements together with various relations between them; the sentence is a unit of predication which, naming a certain situational event, shows the relation of the denoted event towards reality.

**General characteristics of the phrase are:**

1) A phrase is a means of naming some phenomena or processes, just as a word is. As a naming unit it differs from a compound word because the number of constituents in a word-group corresponds to the number of different denotates (*a black bird – a blackbird; a loud speaker – a loudspeaker*).

2) Each component of the word-group can undergo grammatical changes without destroying the identity of the whole unit: *to see a house - to see houses – saw houses* (grammatical modifications of one phrase).

A sentence is a unit with every word having its definite form. A change in the form of one or more words would produce a new sentence.

3) A word-group is a dependent syntactic unit, it is not a communicative unit and has no intonation of its own. Intonation is one of the most important features of a sentence, which distinguishes it from a phrase.

The correlation of the phrase and the sentence is a bit different from that of other language units. Usually, the sentence is considered a unit of the level higher than the phrase. However, according to some scholars, eg. Yu. S. Maslov, the
phrase can be a sentence or a part of a sentence while the sentence can be realized as a phrase, a group of interconnected phrases and a separate word.

2. Types of phrases

Linguists discuss different classifications of phrases, all of them having their own advantages.

The traditional classification of phrases is based on the part of speech status of the phrase constituents, therefore nounal, verbal, adjectival, adverbial, etc. phrases are singled out.

Phrases can also be classified according to the nominative value of their constituents. According to Prof. Blokh, syntagmatic groupings of notional words alone, syntagmatic groupings of notional words with functional words, and syntagmatic groupings of functional words alone should be differentiated, therefore three major types are identified: notional, formative and functional.

According to the theory worked out by the American linguist L. Bloomfield, phrases can be classified into two groups: endocentric and exocentric. The former include phrases one or any constituent part of which can function in a broader structure as the whole group.

Eg. Red flower – He gave me a red flower. He gave me a flower.
Flowers and chocolate. – He gave me flowers. He gave me chocolate.

As for exocentric structures, according to Bloomfield, none of their constituent parts can replace the whole group in a broader structure.

Eg. He gave, to the girl.

Endocentric structures are further divided into subordinate (red flower) and coordinate (flowers and chocolate). Exocentric structures are divided into predicative (He gave) and prepositional (to the girl). Bloomfield’s classification was further developed by his followers. It was made more detailed. Some new types of phrases were singled out. A significant drawback of this scheme is that it is not based on a single principle applied at every stage of the classification to all discriminated types of structures.
According to the classification based on the internal structure of phrases, two groups can be singled out: kernel phrases and kernel-free phrases.

Kernel phrases are grammatically organized structures in which one element dominates the others. This element is not subordinated to any other element within the group, therefore it is the leading element, that is, the kernel of the given phrase (for example, *a nice place, well-known artists, absolutely positive, to run fast, to see a movie, to taste good*).

According to the direction of dependencies, that is, the position of the dominating and subordinated elements relative of each other, all kernel phrases are divided into regressive and progressive (with the left and right position of dependent elements respectively).

Further types of regressive and progressive kernel phrases can be singled out according to what part of speech the head word belongs. The following types are differentiated:

- **Regressive:**
  - substantive (a good girl),
  - adjectival (absolutely clear),
  - verbal (to fully understand),
  - adverbial (very quickly).

- **Progressive:**
  - substantive (a feeling of comfort),
  - adjectival (independent of your decision),
  - verbal (to read a book),
  - prepositional (on the wall).

Kernel-free phrases are divided into dependent and independent, which are further subdivided into one-class and hetero-class and characterized by a certain type of syntactic connection.

Three types of syntactic connections can be singled out: coordination, subordination and accumulation.

**Coordination:** coordinate phrases consist of two or more syntactically equivalent units joined in a cluster which functions as a single unit. The member units can be potentially joined together by means of a coordinate conjunction.

**Subordination:** subordinate phrases are structures in which one of the members is syntactically the leading element of the phrase. This dominating element is called the head-word, or the kernel, and can be expressed by different parts of speech.
Accumulation: the accumulative connection is present when no other type of syntactic connection can be identified.

Cf. (to give) the boy an apple – (to give) an apple to the boy

The presence of a certain syntactic connection between the words in the phrase “the boy an apple” can be proved by the fact that the change of order results in the change of the form.

The accumulative connection is widely spread in attributive phrases made up by attributes expressed by different parts of speech (these problematic (issues); some old (lady)). The position of the elements relative to each other is fixed, they cannot exchange their positions (*problematic these (issues); *old some (lady)).

So, according to the type of syntactic connection, the following subclasses are singled out:

1. Independent one-class phrases with
   - syndetic coordination (sense and sensibility),
   - asyndetic coordination (the Swiss, the Dutch, the Germans);
2. Independent hetero-class phrases with interdependent primary predication (he runs).
3. Dependent one-class phrases with the accumulative connection (sharp green (pencil)).
4. Dependent hetero-class phrases with
   - accumulative connection (my green (pencil)),
   - interdependent secondary predication ((to find) the cup broken; (she took the box), her fingers pulling the ribbon)).

3. Types of syntactic relations

Syntactic relations of the phrase constituents are divided into two main types: agreement and government.

Agreement takes place when the subordinate word assumes a form similar to that of the word to which it is subordinate, that is formal correspondences are established between parts of the phrase. The sphere of agreement in Modern
English is extremely small: it is found in the pronouns *this* and *that*, which agree in number with their head word (*that chair – those chairs*).

As to the problem of agreement of the verb with the noun or pronoun denoting the subject of the action (*Jack is eating; Jack and Jenny are eating*), this is a controversial problem. The questions is whether the verb stands, say, in the plural number because the noun denoting the subject of the action is plural, so that the verb is in the full sense of the word subordinate to the noun, or whether the verb expresses by its category of number the singularity or plurality of the doer (or doers). There are some phenomena in Modern English which would seem to show that the verb does not always follow the noun in the category of number. Such examples as, *The police have arrived too late*, on the one hand, and *The United States is a democracy*.

**Government** takes place when the subordinate word is used in a certain form required by its head word, the form of the subordinate word not coinciding with the form of the head word. The role of government in Modern English is almost as insignificant as that of agreement. Government can be observed between the verb and its object expressed either by a personal pronoun or by the pronoun *who*, the verb being the governing element (*to rely on him, to be proud of her*).

Agreement and government are considered to be the main types of expressing syntactic relations, however, there exist some special means of expressing syntactic relations within a phrase. They are adjoinment and enclosure.

**Adjoinment** is described as absence both of agreement and of government. Combined elements build syntactic groups without changing their forms. A typical example of adjoinment is a combination of an adverb with a head word (*to nod silently, to act cautiously*).

An adverb can only be connected with its head word in this manner, since it has no grammatical categories which would allow it to agree with another word or to be governed by it.

While adjoinment is typical of Russian, enclosure is peculiar to Modern English. By *enclosure* (замыкание) some element is put between the two parts of
another constituent of a phrase. It is, as it were, enclosed between two parts of another element.

The most widely used type of enclosure is use of an attribute between the article (determiner) and the head-noun (a pretty face, your perfect man, one good essay). Many words other than adjectives and nouns can be found in that position. The then president — here the adverb then, being enclosed between the article and the noun it belongs to, is in this way shown to be an attribute to the noun. In the phrase a go-to-devil expression the phrase go-to-devil is enclosed between the article and the noun to which the article belongs, and this characterises the syntactic connections of the phrase.
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The Sentence: General.

The Simple Sentence

1. The notion of sentence. The sentence as a language unit.
2. Structural classifications of simple sentences.

1. The notion of sentence. The sentence as a language unit

Complexity of the sentence makes it difficult to work out its adequate definition. The sentence is a central syntactic construction. It is a minimal unit of speech communication.

The difference between the phrase and the sentence is fundamental: the phrase is a nominative unit which fulfils the function of polynomination denoting a complex referent (phenomenon of reality) analyzable into its component elements together with various relations between them; the sentence is a unit of predication which, naming a certain situational event, shows the relation of the denoted event towards reality. **Predication** establishes the relation of the named phenomena to actual life. The general semantic category of **modality** is also defined by linguists as exposing the connection between the named objects and surrounding reality. However, modality, as different from predication, is not specifically confined to the sentence; this is a broader category revealed both in the grammatical elements of language and its lexical, purely nominative elements.

An important structural feature of the sentence is its entirety, that is, no word of the given sentence can be the head or a dependent element relative to words that stand outside this sentence.

So, the sentence can be defined as an immediate integral unit used in speech communication, built up of words according to a definite syntactic pattern and characterized by predication. It possesses the following properties:

1. The sentence as a linguistic expression of extralinguistic reality must be actualized. Actualization of the sentence content makes predicativity an inseparable property of every sentence.
2. The sentence, just like any other meaningful language unit, has a form. Every sentence has an intonation pattern.

3. The sentence occupies the highest hierarchical position relative to other structural language units since the final purpose of all structural language units is to build sentences. Unlike the sentence, the text does not have accurate and unambiguous structural characteristics. There are no universal structural schemes of the text. None of semantico-structural means used to join sentences is specific to the text. Therefore, the text cannot be considered a structural language unit.

2. Classifications of simple sentences

Sentences can be classified according to their structural, semantic and pragmatic properties. In this lecture we will deal with structural classifications.

One traditional scheme for classifying English sentences is by the number and types of finite clauses: sentences are divided into simple and composite, the latter consisting of two more clauses. Composite sentences will be the subject of the next lecture, and here we will focus on classifications of simple sentences.

Simple sentences are usually classified into one-member and two-member. This distinction is based on a difference in the main parts of a sentence. One-member sentences do not contain two such separate parts; in these sentences there is only one main part (e.g. Silence! Come here!) Such sentences contain neither the subject nor the predicate. Instead there is only one main part. It is a disputed point whether the main part of such a sentence should, or should not, be termed subject in some cases, and predicate, in others. As it was pointed out by academician V. Vinogradov, grammatical subject and grammatical predicate are correlative notions and the terms are meaningless outside their relation to each other. He suggested that for one-member sentences, the term "main part" should be used, without giving it any more specific name.

Prof. Blokh, however, does not accept this approach because, in his view, it is based on an inadequate presupposition that in the system of language there is a
strictly defined, "absolute" demarcation line between the two types of constructions. Instead he suggests that all simple sentences of English be divided into two-axis constructions and one-axis constructions. In a two-axis sentence, the subject axis and the predicate axis are directly and explicitly expressed in the outer structure. In a one-axis sentence only one axis or its part is explicitly expressed, the other one being non-presented in the outer structure of the sentence.

However, this point of view is not widely accepted, so we shall adhere to the traditional approach. One-member sentences are further divided into:

a) nominal or "naming" sentences;

b) infinitival sentences.

**Nominal sentences** name a person or thing. The main member in such sentences is expressed by a noun.

e.g. *Winter. Snow.*

The main member of infinitival sentences is expressed by an infinitive. **Infinitival sentences** are fairly common in spoken English and literary prose. Like other units of predicative value, they can communicate not only their denotative meaning but also the connotative suggestions of various circumstances of their use.

e.g. *To talk like that to your own mother! To have eloped with a butler!*

One-member sentences should be kept apart from two-member sentences with either the subject or the predicate omitted, i.e. from **elliptical sentences.**

Ellipsis in sentence-structure is a natural syntactic process in linguistic development presented as normal practices in many, if not all, languages. In terms of traditional grammar, elliptical sentences are generally identified as sentences with the subject or predicate missing. Some grammarians hold another point of view recognising ellipsis also in sentences where the secondary parts of the sentence are felt as missing. Such was A. M. Peshkovsky's treatment of elliptical sentences in Russian. This view was also shared by B. Ilyish, L. S. Barkhudarov and D. A. Shtelling in regards to English. And this is the view we shall adhere to in our course. So an **elliptical sentence** is a sentence with one or more of its parts left
out, which can be unambiguously inferred from the context. The main sphere of elliptical sentences is dialogue.

e.g. *Where are you going?* – *To the movies.*

In terms of structure the following types of elliptical sentences are singled out:

a) omission of the subject: e.g. *Hope to see you soon.*

b) omission of the predicate in patterns with there is, there are, e.g. *Too many mistakes, I am afraid.*

c) omission of auxiliary, copulative and other function verbs, e.g. *You like it here?*

d) omission of the subject and auxiliary verb, e.g. *Hear me?*

e) omission of the subject and the copula-verb, e.g. *Glad to see you again.*

**Classification of sentences according to prof. Pocheptsov**

Prof. Pocheptsov suggests the following classification of sentences.

All sentences are divided into sentences proper and quasi-sentences.

Sentences proper are communications, they have the subject-predicate base and differ in the way they relate contents to reality.

Quasi-sentences are not communications, they do not have the subject-predicate base. These are either vocatives (*John*), or interjectional sentences expressing emotions (*Oh*), or meta-communicative sentences used to open or close a speech contact (*Good day*). Quasi-sentences are granted the status of sentences just because they can substitute for sentences in the flow of speech being characterized by separateness and acquiring intonational characteristics of the sentence.
Sentences proper are further divided into declarative (*John came*), interrogative (*Did John come*), optative (*If John came*) and inductive (*Come*).

An interrogative sentence is an inquiry of information that the author of the sentence does not have.

A declarative sentences is a communication of information.

Both an optative and inductive sentences express the speaker’s voluntative attitude to some event. The difference is that in the first case the desire does not get satisfied while in the second case it is realized by means of verbal influence on the participant of the situation being the source of the corresponding action.
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Constituent Structure of the Sentence. Syntactic Processes

1. The traditional scheme of sentence parsing.
2. The main sentence parts: the subject and the predicate, their types.
3. The secondary sentence parts: attribute, object, adverbial modifier.
4. The structural scheme of the sentence. The elementary sentence.
5. Syntactic processes.

1. The traditional scheme of sentence parsing

The study of the constituent structure of the sentence presupposes analysis of its parts. The established classification of sentence parts reflects their important property – whether or not they are involved in forming the predicative center of the sentence. Traditionally the main and the secondary parts have been singled out. Besides these two types there is one more — elements which are said to stand outside the sentence structure. The two generally recognized main parts are the subject and the predicate. The secondary parts include the object, the adverbial modifier, and the attribute. Other secondary parts are also sometimes mentioned — the apposition (its relation to the attribute is variously interpreted), the objective predicative, and occasionally some other parts, too. However, everything is relative, thus if we approach the problem of sentence parts from the point of view of the structural-semantic minimum of the sentence, then many objects and some adverbial modifiers will turn out to be as important and needed as the subject and the predicate.

  e.g. She opened the door. The book is on the table.

2. The main sentence parts: the subject and the predicate, their types

The subject and the predicate have a unique standing in the system of sentence parts. They form the backbone of the sentence. They are interdependent and independent of any other sentence member while all other members can be
dependent either on the subject or on the predicate. The subject and the predicate can form a sentence on their own.

  e.g. *She smiles. He is running.*

**The Subject**

The subject is one of the two main parts of the sentence. It denotes the thing whose action or characteristic is expressed by the predicate. It may be expressed by different parts of speech, the most frequent ones being: a noun in the common case, a personal pronoun in the nominative case, a demonstrative pronoun, a substantivised adjective, a numeral, an infinitive, and a gerund. It may also be expressed by a phrase.

The subject performs two main functions: categorial and relative. The **categorial function** of the subject consists in naming the possessor of the predicative feature expressed by the predicate. The **relative function** of the subject consists in its being the original element in the syntagmatic development of the sentence, thus constituting the predicate’s left environment as opposed to its right environment.

As it has already been mentioned, the subject always goes with the predicate, therefore, one-member nominal sentences do not have a subject.

**The Predicate**

The predicate denotes the action or property of the thing expressed by the subject. It can be expressed by numerous ways. The predicate expresses the predicative feature which characterized the object expressed by the subject, thus it realizes the **categorial function**. Being a link between the subject and the right environment of the verb, it performs the **relative function**.

According to morphological characteristics, four types of predicates can be singled out:

  - verbal;
  - nominal;
  - phraseological;
  - contaminated.
The predicate can be subject to the syntactic process of complication, thus, according to their structural characteristics, predicates can be simple and complicated. Therefore, eight types of predicates can be identified.

Simple verbal  
I took an apple.

Simple nominal  
The coincidence was extraordinary.

Simple phraseological  
He gave me a smile.

Simple contaminated  
He sat motionless.

Complicated verbal  
The girl began to cry.

Complicated nominal  
He turned out to be a thief.

Complicated phraseological  
You should have taken a look at the map.

Complicated contaminated  
He seemed to be lying asleep.

(Mind that Prof. Ilyish’s idea of simple and compound nominal predicate is different from the traditional view. NB what he calls double predicate - Catherine's blood ran cold with the horrid suggestions which naturally sprang from these words. (J. AUSTEN))

3. The Secondary Sentence Parts

The Object

The complexity of the object as a sentence member makes difficult to work out an adequate approach to describing this phenomenon. Different classifications of objects have been proposed both by Russian and foreign scholars. The most common ones are as follows:

1. Objects are divided into direct, indirect and prepositional.

This classification is far from perfect since the principle it is based on is not consistent. Direct and indirect objects are singled out on the basis of the contents while prepositional objects are differentiated based on the formal feature (presence of preposition). Besides, indirect and prepositional objects can overlap.
2. Objects are grouped into *prepositional* and *non-prepositional*.

The drawback of this classification is that the underlying principle is not specific uniquely to objects.

3. Prof. Pocheptsov singles out the following types of objects:

   - **Object object** (дополнение объекта) is a sentence member dependent on the verb, adjective or a word of the category of state that denotes an object of action or of quality. It can be *prepositional* or *non-prepositional*.

   - **Addressee object** (дополнение адресата) denotes a person or an object to which some action performed by the subject (if the verb is in the Active Voice) is directed.

     e.g. I called her.

     *prepositional*: I sent a letter to her.

     *non-prepositional*: I sent her a letter.

   - **Subject object** (дополнение субъекта) is used with a verb in Passive and denotes the doer of the action expressed by the verb. It is always *prepositional* – by/with N

**The Adverbial modifier**

It is a secondary part of the sentence modifying a part of the sentence expressed by a verb, a verbal noun, an adjective, or an adverb, and serving to characterise an action or a property as to its quality or intensity, or to indicate the way an action is done, the time, place, cause, purpose, or condition, with which the action or the manifestation of the quality is connected.

Adverbial modifier is characterized by mostly free distribution. It can be a constituent of any sentence. It can be a component of a structural scheme of a sentence only when used with verbs of adverbial directivity. According to their meaning, adverbial modifiers are subdivided into adverbial modifiers of:

- place and degree;
- direction; manner;
- time; attending
- frequency; circumstances;
- description; purpose;
- comparison; consequence;
- condition; exception;
- attending cause;
- description concession;
- comparison; exception;
- condition; exception.
The Attribute

Attribute is a dependent element of a nominative phrase that denotes an attributive quality of an object expressed by a noun. It is a secondary part of the sentence modifying a part of the sentence expressed by a noun, a substantival pronoun, a cardinal numeral, and any substantivised word, and characterizing the thing named by these words as to its quality or property.

According to the position relative to the head word, attributes can be prepositive and postpositive. The position of an attribute with respect to its head word depends partly on the morphological peculiarities of the attribute itself, and partly on stylistic factors.

Apposition has been often regarded as a special kind of attribute, and sometimes as a secondary part of a sentence distinct from an attribute. Apposition is a word or phrase referring to a part of the sentence expressed by a noun, and explaining and specifying its meaning by giving it another name. Appositions are usually expressed by nouns.

The major problem concerning the secondary sentence parts is caused by the fact that characteristic features of each of the three types are not clearly defined, therefore describing a given word or phrase as an object or an attribute in some cases, or describing it as an object or an adverbial modifier, in others, often proves to be a matter of personal opinion or predilection.

There are some elements of the sentence which are neither its main parts, nor any of the usual secondary ones. They are the direct address and the parenthesis. (Refer to the book by Ilyish for more information).

4. Structural Schemes of the Sentence. The Elementary Sentence

There are no structural limits for increasing the size of the sentence and expanding its structure, however, the opposite procedure has a specific limit, the
limit being the elementary sentence. Omission of some element of the elementary sentence destroys it as a structural and semantic unit.

Thus, the sentence “A low rumbling sound had broken the silence around them.” (from Harry Potter and the Sorcerer’s Stone) can be made more complicated by adding new attributes, introducing dependent clauses, inserting modal words, etc. The process will have no end. However, omission of elements that do not affect the structural and semantic completeness of the sentence can go on until it meets a certain limit. Such limit for the sentence under consideration is “A sound had broken the silence”. It realizes the syntactic structure made up by the subject + a simple predicate expressed by a verb of non-prepositional directivity + a direct object.

The structural scheme of the sentence is a sentence structure minimal by its composition and simplest by grammatical and semantic structure. A construction built according to a structural scheme and realizing all of its components is called an elementary sentence. Prof. Pocheptsov lists some structural schemes for verbal sentences and examples of corresponding elementary sentences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural schemes</th>
<th>Elementary sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject – predicate expressed by a verb of non-directed action (Active Voice)</td>
<td>Pages rustle. (S. Bedford)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject – predicate expressed by a verb of non-prepositional-object directivity</td>
<td>Mor was enjoying the port.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– direct object</td>
<td>(I. Murdoch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject – predicate expressed by a verb requiring two non-prepositional objects:</td>
<td>'I've taught him that.' (J. Galsworthy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object of addressee and object of patient (Active voice) – non-prepositional object</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– non-prepositional object of addressee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– non-prepositional object of patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The set of structural schemes specific to every language is the initial basis for building actual sentences as facts of speech.

One point that should be mentioned here is the status of passive sentences. The question is whether they should be included into the set of structural schemes as active sentences or whether they should be regarded as secondary constructions built on the basis of active sentences. As it has been shown by psycholinguistic experiments, passive sentences do not appear in actual speech as results of transforming active sentences. Besides that, there are some passive sentences that do not have corresponding active sentences (e.g., *I was born in France*). Therefore, a passive sentence is not a derivative of an active one but an independent syntactical phenomenon.

The total number of structural schemes in a language is a few dozens of units.

5. Syntactic Processes

The relations between an elementary sentence and a sentence whose composition goes beyond the limits of an elementary one can be presented as expansion of the elementary sentence into “complete” or, on the opposite, curtailment of the latter to elementary. Such an interpretation of relations between elementary and “complete” sentences allows interpreting the elementary sentence
as non-expanded and the sentence the structure of which is restricted by components determined by the structural scheme as an expanded sentence.

Expansion of an elementary sentence is a result of work of syntactic processes. The basic syntactic processes include: expansion, complication, development, adjunction and inclusion.

Expansion (расширение) consists in adding of some syntactic units to another unit. The added elements have the same syntactic status as the expanded element. The simplest type of expansion is repetition of some element in a syntagmatic chain.

e.g. Good, good boy. I walked and walked.

Compression goes together with expansion. A construction is compressed when some part common for the elements of expansion remains unexpanded.

e.g. I was about to spit into his face, slam the door behind me and walk away.

Elements of expansion can be connected by relations of two different types:

1) additive;
2) specificative.

Addition (аддиция) takes place when each element of expansion relates to others as both semantically and syntactically independent unit. (e.g. She cried bitterly and with despair.)

Specification (спецификация) can be observed when one syntactic unit semantically develops the other, makes it more specific. (e.g. I’ll give you a call tomorrow, after 5 p.m.)

Specificatively related units are connected both semantically and syntactically not only with the head word but also with the preceding element of specification.

Complication is a syntactic process that consists in transforming the structure of a syntactic unit from simple to complex. The complicacy of structure presupposes a mutual syntactic dependence of the unit’s constituents.

e.g. She cried. She began to cry.
Most often, the process affects the predicate and the object.

**Complication of the predicate.** The following three types of complication are singled out according to the morphological appurtenance of the complicating element:

1) active-verbal complication (e.g. *I have to go*);
2) passive-verbal complication (e.g. *He is expected to come*);
3) adjectival complication (e.g. *He is unlikely to come*).

In the first two types the complicating element is a verb either in the active or in the passive form respectively, in the third type – an adjective, a participle or a category of state word with a copula-verb.

**Complication of the object.** Complication of the direct object is possible after verbs of certain semantics. It consists in adding an infinitive, a participle, an adjective, or a prepositional group to a noun or a pronoun performing the function of the object. The object and the complicating element stand in the relations of secondary predication.

*e.g. I found him attractive. She considered me a fool.*

Complication of other sentence members expressed by nominal parts of speech is also possible, but it is not so widely spread.

*e.g. complication of the subject: There is someone hiding in the kitchen.*

*complication of the predicative: It was him standing in the dark.*

**Contamination** has a restricted usage. It can be applied only to the predicate. The result of contamination is the so-called **double, or contaminated, predicate**.

*e.g. The sun shone glaring and dazzling.*

**Development** (развертывание) is a modification of one element by another element which depends on the former. Syntactic groups (they can be noun groups, verb groups, adjectival groups, adverb groups, etc.) that appear in the result of development are of endocentric character, their syntactic behavior is that of the central element before it was modified

*e.g. N → AN: flower – beautiful flower;*
\( \rightarrow \) \( V \): walked – walked slowly;
\( \rightarrow \) \( Adv \): beautiful – strikingly beautiful.

**Adjunction** (присоединение) is similar to development. It consists in modifying words as syntactic elements with particles (e.g. *only for you, just in case, even at such a great sum*).

**Inclusion** (включение) consists in inserting modal words and similar elements into a sentence. (e.g. *Apparently, this is the only way out. A true friend, indeed.*) The specific status of these elements (certain semantics, independence of other sentence members, non-fixed position within the sentence boundaries) does not allow regarding them as a sentence member.

**Isolation** is a syntactic process aimed at accentuating some sentence member or sentence member group. The needed effect is reached by prosodic means, pausation being used most often. **Parcellation** is a particular case of isolation. Parcellation takes place when the isolated element forms a separate sentence. (e.g. *I used to. At home.*)

The examined syntactic processes deal either with modifying the structure of a syntactic element aimed at making it more complicated, or with expanding the element.

Substitution, representation and ellipsis play a different role. They are characterized by general text dependence and orientation towards compression. The resulting element is correlated either with some preceding or following elements.

**Substitution** (замещение) is a use of words with generalized structural meaning instead of words and constructions with specific meaning which were mentioned earlier.

*e.g. Do you want me to open the window? – Yes, please do.*
*Would you kindly pass me an apple? – Do you want a red one?*

**Representation** (репрезентация) consists in using a part of some syntactic unit representing the whole unit.

*e.g. Could you help me? – I will be happy to.*
He is not coming tonight, is he? – I hope not.

Ellipsis (опущение) takes place when a structurally needed element of the construction is not explicitly used but only implied. The omitted element can be restored from the context.

e.g. It seems so strange! – It is!

**Conclusion:** Accepting the elementary sentence and the syntactic process as important syntactic notions, we can conclude that a sentence, on the one hand, is a construction whose structure is built according to the language system, and on the other, the structure of the sentence can be expanded and reduced according to specific communication needs and conditions.
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Semantic Structure of the Sentence.

Actual Division of the Sentence

2. Actual division of the sentence. The notion of theme and rheme.
3. Language means of expressing the theme and the rheme.

1. Semantic Roles and Semantic Configurations

A semantic role is the underlying relationship that a participant has with the main verb in a clause. It is also known as semantic case, thematic role, theta role (generative grammar), and deep case (case grammar). Semantic role is the actual role a participant plays in some real or imagined situation, apart from the linguistic encoding of those situations. If, in some real or imagined situation, someone named John purposely hits someone named Bill, then John is the agent and Bill is the patient of the hitting event. Therefore, the semantic role of Bill is the same (patient) in both of the following sentences:

John hit Bill. Bill was hit by John.

In both of the above sentences, John has the semantic role of agent.

A set of semantic roles and an action expressed by a verb constitute a linguistic semantic model of an extralinguistic situation and are called semantic configuration. The set of semantic roles preset by the lexico-semantic peculiarities of the verb makes us the role structure of the verb. The semantic configuration is the semantic minimum of the sentence. The role structure of an actual sentence may include roles that are not part of the semantic minimum.

The theoretical status of semantic roles in linguistic theory is still a largely unresolved issue. For example, there is considerable doubt about whether semantic roles should be regarded as syntactic, lexical or semantic/conceptual entities. However, the most common understanding is that semantic roles are semantic/conceptual elements. It should be noticed that there is no agreement about which and how many roles are needed. This is precisely one of the major drawbacks of the semantic role list approach. Although most theories of thematic
roles assume that there is only a small finite number of them, no consensus has been reached on the number or nature of the roles. Proposals range from just a few to hundreds of them. The most common semantic roles include:

**Agent/Causer:** The ‘doer’ or instigator of the action denoted by the predicate.
  
  e.g. *John* killed *Harry*.

**Patient:** The ‘undergoer’ of the action or event denoted by the predicate.
  
  e.g. *Mary* fell over

**Theme:** A participant which is characterized as changing its position or condition, or as being in a state or position.
  
  e.g. The *cat* died.

**Experiencer:** The living entity that experiences the action or event denoted by the predicate.
  
  e.g. *John* felt happy

**Recipient/Possessor:** Entity receiving/ possessing some entity.
  
  e.g. *John* got *Mary* a present

**Goal:** The location or entity in the direction of which something moves.
  
  e.g. *John* went *home*.

**Benefactive:** The entity that benefits from the action or event denoted by the predicate.
  
  e.g. He showed *me* the stone.

**Source:** Object from which motion proceeds.
  
  e.g. *Mother* promised me a new toy.

**Factive:** The result of the action denoted by the predicate.
  
  e.g. *Mother* baked *scones*.

**Instrument:** The medium by which the action or event denoted by the predicate is carried out.
  
  e.g. The *key* opened the door.

**Locative:** The specification of the place where the action or event denoted by the predicate is situated.
  
  e.g. The *building* houses several organizations.
It should be noted that some semantic roles can be minimized, that is, become a component of the semantic structure of a word. Presence of a mini-role in a verb’s semantics prevents it from appearing in the sentence.

e.g. to floor – to bring down to the floor (locative)
He floored the intruder with one blow. - * He floored the intruder to the floor with one blow.

to bag – to put into a bag (locative)
to nose – to push with the nose (instrument)
to sugar – to saturate with sugar (material/substance)
to catholicize – to turn to Catholicism (factitive)
to feed – to supply food (patient)
to winter – to stay during the winter (temporative)

2. Actual Division of the Sentence

The actual division of the sentence, called also the "functional sentence perspective", exposes the informative perspective of the sentence showing what immediate semantic contribution the sentence parts make to the total information conveyed by the sentence. The sentence can be divided into two sections – theme and rheme.

The theme is the part of the proposition that is being talked about (predicated). The theme expresses the starting point of communication; it means that it denotes an object or a phenomenon about which something is reported. Once stated, the theme is therefore "old news", i.e. the things already mentioned and understood.

The predicate that gives information on the topic is called rheme. The rheme expresses the basic informative part of the communication, emphasizing its contextually relevant centre. Between the theme and the rheme are positioned intermediary, transitional parts of the actual division of various degrees of informative value (these parts are sometimes called "transition").
The theme of the actual division of the sentence may or may not coincide with the subject of the sentence. The rheme of the actual division, in its turn, may or may not coincide with the predicate of the sentence — either with the whole predicate group or its part, such as the predicative, the object, the adverbial.

The theme need not necessarily be something known in advance. In many sentences it is, in fact, something already familiar, as in some of our examples, especially with the definite article. However, that need not always be the case. There are sentences in which the theme, too, is something mentioned for the first time and yet it is not the centre of the predication. It is something about which a statement is to be made. The theme is here the starting point of the sentence, not its conclusion.

3. Language means of expressing the theme and the rheme

Many languages, like English, resort to different means in order to signal a new topic, such as:

- Stating it explicitly as the subject (which tends to be considered more topic-like by the speakers).
- Using passive voice to transform an object into a subject (for the above reason).
- Emphasizing the topic using clefting.
- Through periphrastic constructions like "As for...", "Speaking of...", etc.
- Using left dislocation (called topic fronting or topicalization, i.e. moving the topic to the beginning of the sentence).

Examples:

The dog bit the little girl.

The little girl was bitten by the dog.

It was the little girl that the dog bit.

Speaking of the girl, she was bitten by the dog.

The little girl, the dog bit her.
Means to express the rheme include: a particular word order with a specific intonation contour, an emphatic construction, a contrastive complex, intensifying particles, the indefinite article, ellipsis, and graphical means.

Examples:

They found the report extremely valuable. – *Extremely valuable* they found the report.

*It is the report* that I need.

I need *the report, not the statistical data*.

I need *only the report*.

The orchestra greeted the guests at the entrance. – *There was an orchestra* greeting the guests at the entrance.

Where are you going? – *To the movies*.

Please be careful. – *I am* being careful.
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1. The Definition of the Composite Sentence

Unlike a simple sentence that consists of a single independent clause with no dependent clauses, a composite sentence is built up by two or more predicative lines. It can be defined as a structural and semantic unity of two or more syntactic constructions each having a predicative center of its own, built on the basis of a syntactic connection and used in speech communication as a unit of the same rank as the simple sentence.

The following characteristics should be kept in mind when discussing composite sentences:

- the type of syntactic connection (coordination or subordination);
- the rank of predicative constructions, that is, the place occupied by the predicative construction in the hierarchy of clauses;
- presence or absence of connectors and their character.

A general classification of composite sentences can be based on the first two criteria – the type of syntactic connection and the rank of predicative constructions. Here compound and complex sentences are singled out. In the compound sentence predicative constructions of the high rank are connected by means of coordination while in the complex sentence – by means of subordination.

According to the way in which parts of the composite sentence are joined together, two types can be singled out:

1) syndetic (by means of connectors);
2) asyndetic (without any connectors).
The connector can either be a conjunction, a pronoun or an adverb. If it is a conjunction, its function in the sentence is to join the clauses together. If it is a pronoun or an adverb (i.e. a relative pronoun or a relative adverb), then it serves as a part of one of the two clauses which are joined (a subject, object, adverbial modifier, etc.), and also joins the two clauses together.

There can be disputable cases when it is not quite clear a composite sentence is syndetic or asyndetic. It depends on the way we view a particular word.

*e.g.* The one thing she seems to aim at is Individuality; *yet* she cares nothing for individuals.

The second clause of the composite sentence opens with the word *yet*, so we may say that it is an adverb and the connection is asyndetic, or else, that it is a conjunction and the connection is syndetic.

### 2. Compound Sentences

**Compound sentences** are structures of co-ordination with two or more immediate constituents which are syntactically equivalent, i.e. none of them is below the other in rank.

The process of **coordination** involves the linking of structures of equal grammatical rank — single words and phrases in elementary compound groups or independent clauses in compound sentences. The coordinative conjunctions and the correlatives serve to produce coordination by joining the grammatically equivalent elements. Two or more clauses equal in rank can together be given the status of a single sentence. Such co-ordinated units make up a compound sentence.

The formative words linking the parts of a compound sentence fall into the following types: 1) **coordinative conjunctions**, 2) **conjunctive adverbs**, 3) **fixed prepositional phrases**.

Coordinative conjunctions are rather few in number: *and, but, or, yet, for*.

Sentence-linking words, called conjunctive adverbs are: *consequently, furthermore, hence, however, moreover, nevertheless, therefore.*
Some typical fixed prepositional phrases functioning as sentence linkers are: \textit{at least, as a result, after a while, in addition, in contrast, in the next place, on the other hand, for example, for instance.}

Coordinate connectors can establish different semantic relations between clauses. Coordinate sentence linkers can be grouped in the following way:

1. \textbf{Copulative}, connecting two members and their meanings, the second member indicating an addition of equal importance, or, on the other hand, an advance in time and space, or an intensification, often coming in pairs, then called correlatives: \textit{and; both... and; equally... and; alike... and; at once... and; not... nor for neither, or and neither}; not (or never)... not (or nor)... either; neither... nor, etc.

2. \textbf{Disjunctive}, connecting two members but disconnecting their meaning, the meaning in the second member excluding that in the first: \textit{or, and in questions whether... or with the force of simple or; or... either; either... or, etc., the disjunctive adverbs else, otherwise, or... or, or... else, in older English other else.}

3. \textbf{Adversative}, connecting two members, but contrasting their meaning: \textit{but, but then, only, still, yet, and yet, however, on the other hand, again, on the contrary, etc.}

4. \textbf{Causal}, adding an independent proposition explaining the preceding statement, represented only by the single conjunction \textit{for: The brook was very high, for a great deal of rain had fallen over night.}

5. \textbf{Illative}, introducing an inference, conclusion, consequence, result: \textit{namely, therefore, on that account, consequently, accordingly, for that reason, so, then, hence, etc.}

6. \textbf{Explanatory}, connecting words, phrases or sentences and introducing an explanation or a particularisation: \textit{namely, to wit, that is, that is to say, or, such as, as, like, for example, for instance, say, let us say, etc.}
3. Complex Sentences

Complex sentences are structures of subordination with two or more immediate constituents which are not syntactically equivalent. In the simplest case, that of binary structure, one of them is the principal clause to which the other is joined as a subordinate. The latter stands in the relation of adjunct to the principal clause and is beneath the principal clause in rank.

The semantic relations that can be expressed by subordination are much more numerous and more varied than with co-ordination: all such relations as time, place, concession, purpose, etc. are expressly stated in complex sentences only.

To express subordination of one syntactic unit to another in a complex sentence English uses the following means: conjunctions: when, after, before, while, till, until, though, although, that, as, because; a number of fixed phrases performing the same function: as soon as, as long as, so long as, notwithstanding that, in order that, according as, etc.; conjunctive words: the relative pronouns who, which, that, whoever, whatever, whichever, and the relative adverbs where, how, whenever, wherever, however, why, etc.

In complex sentences, traditionally, the main and the subordinate clause are singled out. There can be different approaches to classifying subordinate clauses. One is based on the correlation of subordinate clauses to sentence members. Here subjective, predicative, objective, attributive and adverbial clauses are differentiated. According to correlation of subordinate clauses to parts of speech, the following types of subordinate clauses are identified: substantive (the subjective, predicative and objective clauses in the preceding classification), adverbial and adjectival (attributive). There is a certain correlation between the two classifications, which is quite expected since there is a certain connection between a word’s belonging to a part of speech and its syntactic functions.

The following types of subordinate clauses are usually differentiated based on the semantic relations between the principal and the subordinate clause:

1. Subject and Predicate Clauses:
A subject clause may contain either a statement or a question. In the former case it is preceded by *that*: in the latter it is introduced by the same words as interrogative object clauses.

e.g. *That she wants to help us is beyond any doubt.*

When he is coming has not been decided yet.

Commoner that the patterns with the initial that are sentences introduced by *it*, with the *that*-clause in end-position.

e.g. *It is clear that he will never agree to it.*

2. Object Clauses:

The simplest case of such clauses are patterns in which a sub-clause can be replaced by a noun which could be then an object in a simple sentence.

e.g. *I know what she wants.*

*You can take whatever you like.*

3. Attributive Clauses

Like attributive adjuncts in a simple sentence, attributive clauses qualify the thing denoted by its head word through some actions, state or situation in which the thing is involved.

It has been customary to make distinction between two types of attributive sub-clauses: **restrictive** and **continuative** or **amplifying clauses** (*"defining"* and *"non-defining"*) This division is however too absolute to cover all patterns.

Restrictive clauses are subordinate in meaning to the clause containing the antecedent; continuative clauses are more independent: their contents might often be expressed by an independent statement giving some additional information about the antecedent that is already sufficiently defined. Continuative clauses may be omitted without affecting the precise understanding of the sentence as a whole. This is marked by a different intonation, and by a clear break preceding the continuative clause, no such break separating a restrictive clause from its antecedent. The presence or absence of such a pause is indicated in writing and in print by the presence or absence of a comma before as well as after the sub-clause.

4. Clauses of Cause:
Clauses of cause are usually introduced by the conjunctions because, since, and as and indicate purely causal relations.

e.g. *I had to go home since it was getting dark.*

*As we have just bought a new house, we cannot afford a new car.*

*I did not arrive on time because I had missed my bus.*

5. Clauses of Place:

Clauses of place do not offer any difficulties of grammatical analysis; they are generally introduced by the relative adverb *where* or by the phrase *from where, to where*, etc.

e.g.: *He went to the café where he hoped to find his friend.*

6. Temporal Clauses:

Temporal clauses can be used to denote two simultaneous actions or states, one action preceding or following the other, etc.

e.g. *When we finished our lunch, we left.*

7. Clauses of Condition:

Conditional sentences can express either a real condition ("open condition") or an unreal condition:

*If you ask him he will help you* (real condition)

*If you asked him, he would help you* (unreal condition)

8. Clauses of Result:

Clauses of result or consequence are characterized by two patterns:

- clauses introduced by the conjunction *that* correlated with the pronoun *such* or the adverb *so* in the main clause;

- clauses introduced by the phrasal connective *so that*.

e.g. *Suddenly she felt so relieved that she could not help crying.*

9. Clauses of Purpose:

Clauses expressing purpose are known to be introduced by the conjunction *that* or *lest* and by the phrase *in order that*.

e.g. *I avoided mentioning the subject lest he be offended.*

10. Clauses of Concession:
The following types of concessive clauses are clauses that give information about the circumstances despite or against which what is said in the principal clause is carried out:

e.g. *I went to the party, though I did not feel like it.*

11. Clauses of Manner and Comparison:

Sub-clauses of manner and comparison characterize the action of the principal clause by comparing it to some other action.

e.g. *She was nursing the flower, as a mother nurses her child.*

4. Asyndetic Sentences

In some composite sentences clauses are not attached to one another in any grammatical way, they simply abut against each other, they make contact but are not connected. Grammar books differ in identifying the linguistic essence of such syntactic structures. In traditional grammar asyndetic sentences, just as syndetic ones, were classified into compound and complex. For instance, the sentence *He came to her; she did not move* would be classed among the compound sentences, and the sentence *I can see what you are driving at* among complex ones.

This traditional treatment of asyndetic composite sentences was criticized by some scholars. For example, a different approach is found in N. S. Pospelov's treatments of asyndeton in Russian syntax where asyndetic sentences are viewed as a special syntactic category with no immediate relevance to subordination or coordination.

Various approaches to classifying asyndetic composite sentences have been sought, but none of them has provided an adequate interpretation of this phenomenon so far.

According to Prof. Ilyish, in some types of asyndetic composite sentences, there is a main and a subordinate clause, while the other types of asyndetic sentences do not admit of such a distinction.

E.g. *This is the most interesting book I have ever read.* – attributive clause

*I think you should go there right away.* – object clause

*Should any problems occur, give me a call.* – conditional clause
The old man felt offended; he had been treated unjustly. – causal clause

He pressed the button, something clicked inside. – clause of result

As it can be seen from the above examples, the semantic relations between clauses are signalled only by the lexical meaning of the words making up the sentence. This example is illustrative of the interaction between vocabulary and syntax which should not be overlooked in grammatical analysis.

5. Transition From Simple To Composite Sentences

The notions of simple sentence and composite sentence are well defined and distinctly opposed to each other, but still some transitional elements can be found between them. Such sentences are termed transitional or semi-composite. The following syntactical phenomena can be considered transitional cases:

1) sentences with homogeneous parts (sometimes also termed "contracted sentences");
   2) sentences with a dependent appendix;
   3) sentences with secondary predication.

By **homogeneous parts** of a sentence we mean parts of the same category (two or more subjects, two or more predicates, two or more objects, etc.), standing in the same relation to other parts of the sentence (e.g. *I invited both my friends and colleagues*). Some types of sentences with homogeneous parts quite clearly fit into the general type of simple sentences, but there can be very complicated structures containing a common subject and homogeneous predicates, each having its own objects and adverbial modifiers. The reason why we cannot call such sentences compound is that they have only one subject and thus cannot be separated into two clauses.

Sentences with a dependent appendix are structures which clearly overstep the limits of the simple sentence and tend towards the complex sentence, but which lack an essential feature of a complex sentence. They include:
1) phrases consisting of the conjunction *than* and a noun, pronoun, or phrase following an adjective or adverb in the comparative degree (*e.g.* *I have met many people much smarter than you*);

2) sentences containing an adjective or adverb, which may be preceded by the adverb *as*, and an additional part consisting of the conjunction *as* and some other word (an adjective, a noun, or an adverb) (*e.g.* *Her features were as soft and delicate as those of her mother*).

In each case a finite verb might be added at the end (either be, or do, or have, or can, etc.), and then the sentence would become a complex one, but as they are, such sentences occupy an intermediate position between complex and simples sentences.

**Sentences with secondary predication.**

Every sentence has predication, without it there would be no sentence. In a usual two-member sentence the predication is between the subject and the predicate. There are also sentences that contain one more predication, which can be termed secondary predication.

In English there are several ways of expressing secondary predication:

1) the complex object (*e.g.* I saw you take it.) The syntactic function of the group *you take* (or of its elements) can be considered either a complex object (in this case the group is treated is a single syntactic unit) or an object and an objective predicative. The choice between the two interpretations remains arbitrary. There is no universal approach.

O. Jespersen has proposed the term "nexus" for every predicative grouping of words, no matter by what grammatical means it is realised. He distinguishes between a "junction", which is not a predicative group of words (*e.g.* reading man) and "nexus", which is one (*e.g.* the man reads). If this term is adopted, we may say that in the sentence I saw him run there are two nexuses: the primary one I saw, and the secondary him run. In a similar way, in the sentence I found him ill, the primary nexus would be I found, and the secondary him ill.
2) the absolute construction.

The absolute construction expresses attending circumstances — something that happens alongside of the main action. This secondary action may be the cause of the main action, or its condition, etc., but these relations are not indicated by any grammatical means.

The absolute construction is, as we have seen, basically a feature of literary style and unfit for colloquial speech. Only a few more or less settled formulas such as *weather permitting* may be found in ordinary conversation. Otherwise colloquial speech practically always has subordinate clauses where literary style may have absolute constructions.

6. Mixed type of composite sentences

Not every sentence we come across in a text or in oral speech is bound to be either syndetic or asyndetic, either compound or complex, etc. Several or all of these characteristics can be found in a sentence at the same time. It can contain several clauses, some of them connected with each other syndetically, that is, by conjunctions or connective words, while others are connected asyndetically, that is, without any such words; some of the clauses are co-ordinated with each other, while others are subordinate, so that another part of the whole sentence is complex, etc. The amount of variations is probably unlimited. Such sentences are often referred to as mixed sentences. Prof. Blokh uses the term *complex-compound sentence* (or compound-complex sentence) to name a sentence that consists of multiple independent clauses, at least one of which has at least one dependent clause.

   e.g. Though Lois was very jauntily attired in an expensively appropriate travelling affair, she did not linger to pat out the dust which covered her clothes, but started up the central walk with curious glances at either side. Her face was very eager and expectant, yet she hadn’t at all that glorified expression that girls wear when they arrive for a Senior Prom at Princeton or New Haven; still, as there were no senior proms here, perhaps it didn’t matter. (F. S. Fitzgerald)
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1. Semantics and Pragmatics

Describing the ways in which sentences are formed, many scholars make reference to meaning and how sentences express it. In modern linguistics, meaning is not treated as a unitary phenomenon. The analysis of meaning is treated as divisible into two major domains. The first deals with the sense conventionally assigned to sentences independently of the contexts in which they might be uttered. This is the domain called **semantics**. The second deals with the way in which utterances are interpreted in context, and the ways in which the utterance of a particular sentence in a certain context may convey a message that is not actually expressed in the sentence and in other contexts might not have been conveyed. This is the domain called **pragmatics**.

Semantics is thus concerned with the meaning that is directly expressed, or encoded, in sentences, while pragmatics deals with the principles that account for the way utterances are actually interpreted in context. Pragmatics is concerned not with the meaning of sentences as units of the language system but with the interpretation of utterances in context. Utterances in context are often interpreted in ways that cannot be accounted for simply in terms of the meaning of the sentence uttered. A central principle in pragmatics, which drives a great deal of the utterance interpretation process, is that the addressee of an utterance will expect it to be **relevant**, and will normally interpret it on that basis.

One of the major problems concerning semantics and pragmatics is lack of adequate definition. The definitions that have been offered do not delimit pragmatics from semantics either clearly and neatly, or to everybody’s satisfaction. G. Leech distinguishes between three possible ways of structuring this
relationship: **semanticism** (pragmatics inside semantics – Searle), **pragmaticism** (semantics inside pragmatics – Austin) and **complementarism** (semantics and pragmatics complement each other, but are otherwise independent areas of research – Leech).

2. Indirect Meaning of the Utterance

When there is a mismatch between the expressed meaning and the implied meaning we deal with indirectness. Indirectness is a universal phenomenon: it occurs in all natural languages.

There can be three types of indirect meanings conveyed by a sentence: presupposition, implication and reference.

**Presupposition**

**Presupposition** is defined as an indirect proposition that can be inferred from the sentence.

The notion of presupposition has been borrowed from mathematical logic, according to which sentence S presupposes sentence S’ if sentence S’ can be inferred from sentence S and negating sentence S does not affect inferability of S’. Sentence S’ must be true, otherwise sentence S cannot be true.

*e.g.* John knows that Mary got married. John does not know that Mary got married.

presupposition: Mary got married.

*Do you want to do it again?*

presupposition: You have done it already, at least once.

*My wife is pregnant.*

presupposition: The speaker has a wife.

In linguistics, presupposition is a background belief, relating to an utterance, that must be mutually known or assumed by the speaker and addressee for the utterance to be considered appropriate in context and will generally remain a necessary assumption whether the utterance is placed in the form of an assertion, denial, or question. Presupposition has to do with informational status. The
information contained in a presupposition is backgrounded, taken for granted, presented as something that is not currently an issue.

It is important to remember that negation of an expression does not change its presuppositions: *I want to do it again* and *I don't want to do it again* both mean that the subject has done it already one or more times; *My wife is pregnant* and *My wife is not pregnant* both mean that the subject has a wife. In this respect, presupposition is distinguished from implication.

So, presupposition as a linguistic phenomenon is characterized by two features, that is,

1) it can be inferred from the sentence;
2) it does not depend on negation or questioning.

Another feature characteristic of presupposition is pragmaticism, that is, the content of presupposition is pragmatic since presupposition reflects the author’s attitude towards what is stated or asked in the sentence.

So, presupposition possesses the following features: indirectness, inferability, independence of negation and pragmaticism of contents. Since the first three features do not allow any differentiation, it seems logical to classify presuppositions according to their pragmatic contents.

**Factive presupposition (factiveness)**

*e.g.* *John knows that Mary got married.* *John thinks that Mary got married.*

Despite the identical external structure, semantically the two sentences are different. The difference lies in the author’s attitude towards what is said in the clause dependent on the predicate. In the first case, the author regards the proposition *Mary got married* as a fact, which cannot be said about the proposition in the second sentence. The presuppositional contents contained in these two sentences is called factive presupposition, or factiveness. Predicates forming this type of presupposition are referred to as factive as well as words or word combinations expressing such predicates.

Factive words include such verbs as *to admit, to amuse, to bother, to confess, to discover, to ignore, know, to realise, to regret, etc.*, adjectives *glad,*...
exciting, important, lucky, proud, regrettable, remarkable. The verbs to assume, to believe, to imagine, to seem, to think and adjectives certain, eager, likely, possible, sure are non-factive.

Factiveness as any other type of presupposition is important in the study of English syntax as a factor influencing the syntactic form of the sentence and determining the construction’s transformation potential. For example, Complex Object with the infinitive can be used only after non-factive verbs of mental activity.

Emotiveness

An emotive predicate expresses a subject emotional attitude of the author towards what is being said that can be defined as corresponding or non-corresponding to the speaker’s desires and expectations.

e.g. John knows that Mary got married. John regrets that Mary got married.

Emotive verbs include such verbs as to bother, to regret, to resent, to dislike, to hate, etc.

Emotive predicates have some syntactic peculiarities that are absent in non-emotive ones, for example, emotive verbs can be modified by the adverb much while non-emotive verbs cannot.

So, the notion of presupposition allows systematizing and explaining some semantic and syntactic peculiarities.

Implication and Inference

Presupposition is not the only type of indirect sentence meaning. Consider the following example:

e.g. She somehow contrived to pass the exam.

The implied meaning of the sentence is that she passed the exam. However, it differs from presupposition as it is negation-sensitive. An indirect proposition inferred from the original utterance and dependent on negation is called implication.

In mathematical logic, implication is a logical operation joining two propositions into one by means of the logical connector “if… then”: “if A, then B”
where A is the *antecedent* and B is the *consequent*. In linguistics, implication is not an operation of inference, but the result of the operation.

Another type of indirect meaning is inference. **Inference** is an indirect proposition independent of negation that can possibly be inferred from the original utterance, but not necessarily so.

* e.g. *She did her best to pass the exam.*
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1. Speech acts theory. Classification of speech acts

For much of the history of linguistics and the philosophy of language, language was viewed primarily as a way of making factual assertions, and the other uses of language tended to be ignored. However, the acclaimed work of the philosopher J. L. Austin (1911-1960) led philosophers to pay more attention to the way in which language is used in everyday activities. J.L. Austin claims that many utterances (things people say) are equivalent to actions. When someone says: “I name this ship” or “I now pronounce you man and wife”, the utterance creates a new social or psychological reality. Speech acts theory broadly explains these utterances as having three parts or aspects: locutionary, illocutionary and perlocutionary acts.

Locutionary acts are simply the speech acts that have taken place.

Illocutionary acts are the real actions which are performed by the utterance, where saying equals doing, as in betting, plighting one’s troth, welcoming and warning.

Perlocutionary acts are the effects of the utterance on the listener, who accepts the bet or pledge of marriage, is welcomed or warned.

Some linguists have attempted to classify illocutionary acts into a number of categories or types. David Crystal, quoting J.R. Searle, gives five such categories: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations.

Representatives – here the speaker asserts a proposition to be true, using such verbs as: affirm, believe, conclude, deny, report.

Directives – here the speaker tries to make the hearer do something, with such words as: ask, beg, challenge, command, dare, invite, insist, request.
Commissives – here the speaker commits himself (or herself) to a (future) course of action, with verbs such as: guarantee, pledge, promise, swear, vow, undertake.

Expressives – the speaker expresses an attitude to or about a state of affairs, using such verbs as: apologize, appreciate, congratulate, deplore, detest, regret, thank, welcome.

Declarations – the speaker alters the external status or condition of an object or situation, solely by making the utterance: I now pronounce you man and wife, I sentence you to be hanged by the neck until you be dead, I name this ship...

Other scholars identify more pragmatic types of sentences. They include constatives, promisives, menacives, requestives, injunctives, offertives, permissives, prohibitives, and quesitives.

Constatives are statements about something. They are always assertions, never questions or inducements. e.g. This is my cat.

Promisives are sentences containing a promise. Just like constatives, they are always declarative. e.g. We’ll get you a new book.

The same is true for menacives – sentences containing a threat. e.g. You’ll be sorry.

Directives induce the addressee to some action. e.g. Open the door. Come here.

Two types of directives are usually differentiated: requestives – sentences containing a request, and injunctives – sentences containing an order.

Cf. Please help me with this suitcase. Get out of here!

Offertives are sentences containing an offer. e.g. Have a cigarette.

Permissives are sentences containing a permission or asking for a permission. e.g. You may take this apple.

Prohibitives contain prohibition. e.g. You are not allowed to go outside after 10 p.m.

Quesitives are sentences containing a question. e.g. What’s your name?
It should be noted that the specifics of pragmatic contents of an utterance can impose some formal restrictions on the sentence. For example, a constative can never be a question, promisives and menacives always refer to future and contain future tense forms.

**Performatives**

An interesting type of illocutionary speech act is that of performatives. These are speech acts of a special kind where the utterance of the right words by the right person in the right situation effectively is (or accomplishes) the social act. In some cases, the speech must be accompanied by a ceremonial or ritual action. Whether the speaker in fact has the social or legal (or other kind of) standing to accomplish the act depends on some things beyond the mere speaking of the words. These are felicity conditions.

Here are some examples from different spheres of human activity, where performatives are found at work. These are loose categories, and many performatives belong to more than one of them:

---

*Universities and schools*: conferring of degrees, rusticating or excluding students

*The church*: baptizing, confirming and marrying, exorcism, commination (cursing) and excommunication

*Governance and civic life*: crowning of monarchs, dissolution of Parliament, passing legislation, awarding honours, ennobling or decorating

*The law*: enacting or enforcing of various judgements, passing sentence, swearing oaths and plighting one’s troth

*The armed services*: signing on, giving an order to attack, retreat or open fire

*Sport*: cautioning or sending off players, giving players out, appealing for a dismissal or declaring (closing an innings) in cricket

*Business*: hiring and firing, establishing a verbal contract, naming a ship

*Gaming*: placing a bet, raising the stakes in poker
In these expressions, the action that the sentence describes (nominating, sentencing, promising) is performed by the sentence itself; the speech is the act it effects (unlike in so-called *constantives* that only carry a piece of information). In contrast, *perlocutionary* speech acts cause actions that are not the same as the speech.

**Felicity conditions** are conditions necessary to the success of a speech act. They are conditions needed for success or achievement of a performativa. Loosely speaking, felicity conditions are of three kinds: preparatory conditions, conditions for execution and sincerity conditions.

**Preparatory conditions** include the status or authority of the speaker to perform the speech act, the situation of other parties and so on. Only certain people are qualified to declare war, baptize people or sentence convicted felons.

The situation of the utterance is important. If the US President jokingly “declares” war on another country in a private conversation, then the USA is not really at war. This, of course, happened (on 11 August 1984), when Ronald Reagan made some remarks off-air, as he thought, but which have been recorded for posterity: “My fellow Americans, I’m pleased to tell you today that I’ve signed legislation that will outlaw Russia forever. We begin bombing in five minutes.” One hopes that this utterance also failed in terms of sincerity conditions.

**Conditions for execution** require that external circumstances must be suitable. “Can you give me a lift?” requires that the hearer has a motor vehicle and is able to drive it somewhere and that the speaker has a reason for the request.

**Sincerity conditions** show that the speaker must really intend what he or she says. In the case of apologizing or promising, it may be impossible for others to know how sincere the speaker is. Moreover sincerity, as a genuine intention (now) is no assurance that the apologetic attitude will last, or that the promise will be kept. There are some speech acts – such as plighting one’s troth or taking an oath – where this sincerity is determined by the presence of witnesses.
2. Pragmatic transposition of sentences

Sometimes a sentence characterized by formal features of some pragmatic type in speech acquires illocutionary power of sentences of another type. Such cases are referred to as **indirect speech acts**. Indirect speech acts are commonly used to reject proposals and to make requests. For example a speaker asks, “*Would you like to meet me for coffee?*” and another replies, “*I have class.*” The second speaker used an indirect speech act to reject the proposal. This is indirect because the literal meaning of “*I have class*” does not entail any sort of rejection. Typical cases include:

- **constative >> requestive**: *e.g. It is rather cool here. (Please close the window.*)*
- **quesitive >> requestive**: *e.g. Do you have any cash on you? (Please lend me some.*)*
- **constative >> offertive**: *e.g. There is some chocolate on the tea table. (Have some.*)*

A sentence used transpositionally still retains its original meaning. The two meanings co-exist, the indirect one being layered upon the original one.

It is obvious that there are some restrictions as to types of sentences that can be transposed. A sentence of any pragmatic type cannot be transposed into any other pragmatic type.

Apparently, pragmatic transposition of sentences is socially motivated. The choice of an indirect pragmatic type is explained by extralinguistic conditions of the communicative situation.
Lecture 17
The Cooperative Principle.
The Politeness Principle

1. Conversational implicature.
2. The Cooperative Principle and Grice’s maxims.
3. The Politeness Principle and Leech’s maxims.

1. Conversational Implicature

In a series of lectures at Harvard University in 1967, the English language philosopher H.P. (Paul) Grice outlined an approach to what he termed conversational implicature – how hearers manage to work out the complete message when speakers mean more than they say. An example of what Grice meant by conversational implicature is the utterance:

“Have you got any cash on you?”

where the speaker really wants the hearer to understand the meaning:

“Can you lend me some money? I don’t have much on me.”

Consider the following:

parent Did you do your homework?
child I finished my essay.
parent Well, you better do your algebra too.

The parent inferred that the child had not done all her homework, even though she did not assert she didn’t. The parent inferred that if the child explicitly mentioned only one of her assignments, she had not done the other; that is, mentioning only the essay and failing to mention algebra implicates that she had not done her algebra.

The conversational implicature is a message that is not found in the plain sense of the sentence. The speaker implicates it. The hearer is able to infer (work out, read between the lines) this message in the utterance by appealing to the rules governing successful conversational interaction. Grice proposed that implicatures
like the second sentence can be calculated from the first, by understanding three things:

− The usual linguistic meaning of what is said.
− Contextual information (shared or general knowledge).
− The assumption that the speaker is obeying what Grice calls the cooperative principle.

2. The Cooperative principle and Grice’s maxims

In 1975, H. P. Grice published a seminal article entitled "The Co-operative Principle" that created quite a stir on the linguistic scene and generated a large number of linguistic publications that built on Grice’s postulates. Paul Grice proposes that in ordinary conversation, speakers and hearers share a cooperative principle. The basic assumption is that any discourse, whether written or spoken, is a joint effort. Both the speaker and the addressee have to follow certain pragmatic, syntactic, and semantic rules in order to communicate effectively. They have to cooperate. The Cooperative Principle is an attempt to show how speaker’s meaning arises from sentence meaning.

As phrased by Paul Grice, who introduced it, it states, "Make your contribution such as it is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged." Though phrased as a prescriptive command, the principle is intended as a description of how people normally behave in conversation. Put more simply, people who obey the cooperative principle in their language use will make sure that what they say in a conversation furthers the purpose of that conversation. Obviously, the requirements of different types of conversations will be different.

The cooperative principle can be divided into four maxims, called the Gricean maxims,

The principle can be explained by four underlying rules or maxims describing specific rational principles observed by people who obey the cooperative principle; these principles enable effective communication. (David
Crystal calls them **conversational maxims**. They are also sometimes named **Grice’s or Gricean maxims**.) They are the maxims of quality, quantity, relevance and manner.

- **Quality**: Try to make your contribution one that is true. – Speakers should be truthful. They should not say what they think is false, or make statements for which they have no evidence.

- **Quantity**: Give the right amount of information. – A contribution should be as informative as is required for the conversation to proceed. It should be neither too little, nor too much. (It is not clear how one can decide what quantity of information satisfies the maxim in a given case.)

- **Relevance**: Be relevant. – Speakers’ contributions should relate clearly to the purpose of the exchange.

- **Manner**: Be perspicuous [*i.e.* clear, easy to follow]. – Speakers’ contributions should be perspicuous: clear, orderly and brief, avoiding obscurity and ambiguity.

Of these maxims, the most important is the Maxim of Relation: in listening to someone, we assume that whatever that person is saying to us is somehow relevant to the conversational situation. So, for example, in the following interchange:

**A**: Mary lost a book today.

**B**: Well, I saw Jane carrying around a new book this afternoon.

Person A will infer from B’s utterance that Jane is somehow responsible for the disappearance of Mary’s book, even though B did actually not say that Jane was responsible: the Maxim of Relation gives us license to infer that B would not have said what s/he did unless the information B provided was somehow relevant to the statement A made. In this way, B’s statement licensed a conversational implicature. Consider also the following:

**A**: Do you like wine?

**B**: Thanks.
If at a party, A stands before B and asks if s/he likes wine, B is allowed to infer that A is offering B wine even though A did not literally make an offer of wine. The Maxim of Relation licenses B to infer that A is offering wine since that understanding would make A’s question most relevant to the context in which it was said. In other words, understanding what someone is saying to us involves not just understanding the literal meaning of their utterances, but also making inferences about how that literal meaning is relevant to the current situation. This means that we could infer two different messages from the same utterance depending on how we interpret the situation. So, if someone says, *A: You can close the door.* we could interpret the statement as a not-too-polite request to close the door or as a statement about the condition of the door [= ‘the door can be closed’] depending on the context in which it is uttered: conversational implicature is sensitive to the context of the utterance.

The other maxims are also important. For example, consider the following letter of recommendation:

**Dear Sir or Madam:**

Mr. Hardbottom faithfully turns his work in on time and actively participates in discussions in seminars.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Bonebreak

This letter does not contribute the correct amount of information [thus violating the Maxim of Quantity], which allows the inference that there is a reason why the correct amount of information is *not* being provided, namely that to do so would involve saying negative things about the recommendee.

According to Grice, the maxims are learned guidelines for social interaction. “It is just a well-recognized empirical fact that people do behave in these ways [i.e. in ways that the maxims prescribe]; they learned to do so in childhood, and have not lost the habit of doing so” (Grice 1989:29).

Grice does not of course prescribe the use of such maxims. Nor does he suggest that we use them to construct conversations. But they are useful for
analysing and interpreting conversation, and may reveal purposes of which (either as speaker or listener) we were not previously aware. Although presupposed to be adhered to by the participants, the maxims are often deliberately broken. Very often, we communicate particular non-literal meanings by appearing to "violate" or "flout" these maxims.

If we **VIOLATE** the maxims, it means that we break them **surreptitiously**, or **covertly**, so that other people do not know. If we violate the maxim of quality, we lie. If we violate the maxim of quantity by not giving enough information, if someone finds out we can be accused of 'being economical with the truth', another deceit. As with laws, some maxim violations can be more heinous than others. Lying in a court of law is disapproved, but 'white lies', small lies to keep the social peace, are often thought as acceptable.

If we **FLOUT** a maxim, we break it in a **flagrant** (and often foregrounded) way, so that it is obvious to all concerned that it has been broken. If this happens, then it is clear that the speaker is intending the hearer to infer some extra meaning over and above what is said. Maxims can be flouted, e.g., in phatic or small talk (**quantity**), ‘white lies’ (**quality**), humour, irony, teasing, banter, puns (**manner**), topic shift, seemingly irrelevant remarks whose relevance is implied and may only be disclosed by inference (**relation**). Some **tropes** (figures of speech) are built on the breach of CP: **hyperbole** (exaggeration: *to wait an eternity*), **litotes** (understatement, esp. that in which an affirmative is expressed by the negative of its contrary: *not bad at all*), **tautology** (repetition: *War is war, and there will be losers*), **paraphrase**, **euphemism**, **metaphor** and esp. **irony** (conveys a meaning that is the opposite of its literal meaning: *How nice!* said after someone’s *I failed another exam*).

It should be made very clear here that **breaking of any of the maxims of the Cooperative principle does not mean that there is invariably a breakdown of communication**. There may appear to be the apparent breaking of a maxim to the analyst, whereas the interactants may feel that the cooperative principle in general, or even the maxim itself, has **not** been broken. The breaking of a maxim
may also involve some kind of trade-off, where one breaks a maxim in order to uphold another maxim, the latter of which may be more important in the communicative situation than the former.

It should be pointed out that the maxims suggested by Grice are not the only ones. Grice recognizes existence of other maxims as well: “There are, of course, all sorts of other maxims (aesthetic, social, or moral in character), such as “Be polite,” that are also normally observed by participants in talk exchanges, and these may also generate nonconventional implicatures” (Grice 1989:28)

Grice’s research was further developed by Western scholars who worked out some “new” maxims: Do not contradict yourself without explanation (Stewart 1983), Prepare for conversation (St George 1987), Speak idiomatically unless there is some special reason not to (Searle 1979), Do not request what you do not want (Harnish 1976), Do not mislead (Corliss 1981), etc., etc.

3. The Politeness principle and Leech’s maxims

G. Leech was the father of the social-pragmatics approach to Grice’s research. He worked on “a broader, socially and psychologically oriented application of pragmatic principles” (Leech 1983:80). G. Leech (1983) proposed the six maxims of the **Politeness Principle** (PP) as a way of complementing the CP and explaining how politeness operates in conversational exchanges. Leech defines **politeness as forms of behaviour that establish and maintain comity.** That is the ability of participants in a social interaction to engage in interaction in an atmosphere of relative harmony. In stating his maxims Leech uses his own terms for two kinds of illocutionary acts. He calls representatives “assertives”, and calls directives “impositives”.

− **Tact maxim** (in directives [impositives] and commissives): minimise cost to other; [maximise benefit to other]

  eg. *Help yourself once more.* and rather not *I will help yourself once more.*

− **Generosity maxim** (in directives and commissives): minimise benefit to self; [maximise cost to self]
e.g. Have you something against a cup of tee? and rather not I have nothing against a cup of tea.

- **Approbation maxim** (in expressives and representatives [assertives]):
  
  minimise dispraise of other; [maximise praise of other]

  *e.g. The soup you cooked tastes good.* and not *The soup you cooked is inedible.*

- **Modesty maxim** (in expressives and representatives): minimise praise of self; [maximise dispraise of self]

  *e.g. It was silly of me.* not *It was silly of you.*

- **Agreement maxim** (in representatives): minimise disagreement between self and other; [maximise agreement between self and other]

  *e.g. I really liked the exhibition.* – *Yes, it was quite interesting.* Not *I found it very boring.*

- **Sympathy maxim** (in representatives): minimise antipathy between self and other; [maximise sympathy between self and other]

  *e.g. I am sorry to hear that your cat died.* Not *I am glad to hear that your cat died.*

Each maxim is accompanied by a sub-maxim (between square brackets), which is of less importance. These support the idea that negative politeness (avoidance of discord) is more important than positive politeness (seeking concord).

Note also that speakers may adhere to more than one maxim of politeness at the same time. Often one maxim is on the forefront of the utterance, with a second maxim being invoked by implication.

Not all of the maxims are equally important. For instance, "Tact" influences what we say more powerfully than does "Generosity", while "Approbation" is more important than "Modesty".

The tact maxim regulates the operation of the directive speech acts (which are marked with highest face-threatening potential) and addresses the dominant type of politeness which, with regard to the addressee, can be ‘measured’ on the **cost-benefit scale**: the more costly an action, the less polite it is, and, conversely,
the more beneficial it is to the addressee, the more polite it is. This helps explain why, for example, imperative mood is not necessarily associated with impoliteness: *Bring me some water* vs. *Have another drink*. Next, **optionality scale** is used to rank options according to the degree of choice offered to the addressee - the degree of politeness matches the degree of indirectness (tentativeness), and, vice versa, increased directness results in greater impoliteness (e.g., *Lend me your car* vs. *Do you think you could possibly lend me your car*?). It appears that while imperatives offer little option of whether or not to comply with the action requested (*Give me some change*), questions (*Have you got a quarter, by any chance?*), hypothetical formulations (*Could I borrow some money?*), and ones using negatives (*You couldn’t lend me a dollar, could you?*) provide greater freedom to deny that request. Of course, politeness formulae (*please*) can always be added to give extra politeness.

We should also differentiate between **absolute** and **relative** politeness; in the absolute sense, *Lend me your car* is less polite than *I hope you don’t mind my asking, but I wonder if it might be at all possible for you to lend me your car*. However, in some situations, the former request could be overpolite (among family members) and the latter one impolite (as an ironic remark).

In all societies, maxims of politeness govern linguistic and non-linguistic behavior. The details of these maxims vary [sometimes greatly] from culture to culture [and subculture to subculture], leading to situations where misunderstandings may occur. In middle-class American society, **M. Noonan** identifies the following five maxims:

- **tact**: Minimize cost to other; maximize benefit to other.
- **modesty**: Minimize praise of self; maximize dispraise of self.
- **phatic**: Keep talking; avoid silence.
- **irony**: If you must cause offence, at least do so in a way which doesn’t overtly conflict with maxims of politeness, but allows the hearer to arrive at the offensive point of your remark indirectly, by way of implicature [inference].
banter: In order to show solidarity with the hearer, say something that is (1) obviously untrue and (2) obviously impolite to the hearer.

Many cultures lack an equivalent of the Phatic Maxim. The Banter Maxim is much more closely associated with males than with females in middle-class American society. Violations of the politeness maxims may invite inferences too, ones which are also context sensitive. For example, a violation of the Phatic Maxim may be interpreted as evidence of anger, sadness, etc. depending on contextual clues.

The Politeness Principle was not the only one singled out by G. Leech. In his book entitled “Principles of Pragmatics” (1983) the scholar describes three principles of interpersonal rhetoric (the Cooperative Principle, the Politeness Principle, the Irony Principle) and four principles of textual rhetoric (the Processibility Principle, the Clarity Principle, the Economy Principle and the Expressivity Principle).
Lecture 18

Text as an Object of Research. The Problem of the Text Unit

1. Text as an object of linguistic research.
2. Cohesion and coherence.
3. Textual categories.
4. Textual units. The supra-phrasal unity and the paragraph.

1. Text as an Object of Linguistic Research

The text is a unit of language in use. It applies to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole – a semantic unit. The text is the object of studies of the branch of linguistics called text linguistics. Text linguistics is a relatively new branch of language studies that deals with texts as communication systems. At the early stage of its development in the 60s of the 20th century, text linguistics dealt mainly with ways of expressing cohesion and coherence and distribution of the theme and the rheme of an utterance according to the rules of the functional sentence perspective. Its original aims lay in uncovering and describing text grammars. The application of text linguistics has, however, evolved from this approach to a point in which text is viewed in much broader terms that go beyond a mere extension of traditional grammar towards an entire text. Contemporary text linguistics studies the text and its structure, its categories and components as well as ways of constructing texts. Text linguistics takes into account the form of the text, but also its setting, i.e. the way in which it is situated in an interactional, communicative context. Both the author of a (written or spoken) text as well as its addressee are taken into consideration in their respective (social and/or institutional) roles in the specific communicative context. In general it is an application of linguistic analysis at the much broader level of text, rather than just a sentence or word.

Despite the fact that there are many publications devoted to problems of text linguistics, there does not exist an adequate definition of the text that would find satisfaction with all researchers. The difficulties that arise when trying to work out a universally acceptable definition of the text can be explained by the fact that
scholars study the text in its various aspects: grammatical, stylistic, semantic, functional and so on.

The text can be studied as a product (text grammar) or as a process (theory of text). The text-as-a-product approach is focused on the text cohesion, coherence, topical organization, illocutionary structure and communicative functions; the text-as-a-process perspective studies the text production, reception and interpretation.

**Text** can be understood as an instance of (spoken or written) language use (an act of parole), a relatively self-contained unit of communication. As a ‘communicative occurrence’ it meets seven **criteria of textuality** (the constitutive principles of textual communication): cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and intertextuality, and three regulative principles of textual communication: efficiency, effectiveness and appropriateness (cf. de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, Malmjaer 1991)

*Regulative Principles of Textual Communication*

The principle of **efficiency** requires that a text should be used with a minimum effort - hence the use of plain (stereotyped and unimaginative) language which, however boring and unimpressive, is easy to produce and comprehend.

In contrast, **effectiveness** presumes leaving a strong impression and the creation of favourable conditions for attaining a communicative goal; this presupposes the use of creative (original, imaginative) language which, however effective, may lead to communicative breakdown.

The principle of **appropriateness** attempts to balance off the two above principles by seeking an accord between the text setting and standards of textuality.

2. **Cohesion and Coherence**

Cohesion can be defined as the links that hold a text together and give it meaning. The term **cohesion** was introduced by Halliday and Hasan in 1976 to denote the way in which linguistic items of which texts are constituted are meaningfully interconnected in sequences. Each piece of text must be cohesive with the adjacent ones for a successful communication.
There are two main types of cohesion: **grammatical**, referring to the structural content, and **lexical**, referring to the language content of the piece and a cohesive text is created through many different ways. In *Cohesion in English*, M.A.K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan identify five general categories of cohesive devices that create coherence in texts: reference, ellipsis, substitution, lexical cohesion, and conjunction.

**Reference** (realized by nouns, determiners, personal and demonstrative pronouns or adverbs) either points out of the text to a real world item (i.e., to its denotate), hence **exophoric** reference (**deixis**: *Can you see that?*), or refers to an item within the text, hence **endophoric** reference. The two possible directions of endophoric reference are backward (**anaphoric** r.; **direct** anaphora: *I met a man. He was wearing ...*, **indirect** anaphora: *It is a solid house. The walls are thick ...*) or forward (**cataphoric** r.: ... the house whose walls are thick); in the case of a reference to an item of which there is (in the given situation) only one instance, we talk about **homophora** (e.g. *Place the books on the table please*). The relationship between two items in which both refer to the same person or thing and one stands as a linguistic antecedent of the other is called **coreference** (compare *He saw himself in the mirror* with *He saw him in the mirror*).

Reference (semantic level)

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXOPHORA</th>
<th>ENDOPHORA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(situational)</td>
<td>(textual)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

**ANAPHORA** (referring to preceding text)  **CATAPHORA** (referring to following text)

Examples:

**ANAPHORA**: Three blind **mice** see how they run.

**CATAPHORA**: I would never have believed *it*. They've accepted the proposal.
EXOPHORA: (a child making noise). Mother: Stop doing that here. I'm trying to work.

Types of reference:
   a. PERSONAL – lexical items replaced with personal pronouns, possessive adjectives, possessive pronouns …
   b. DEMONSTRATIVE – realised by deictic terms: demonstrative adverbs (here, now …), nominal demonstratives (this, these …), definite article (the).
   c. COMPARATIVE – on the basis of identity (same), similarity (such), difference (other, else), numerative (more, less), epithets (better).

Examples of types of reference:

   PERSONAL:        John has moved to a new house.  
                     He had it built last year.
   DEMONSTRATIVE:   I like the push-ups and the sit-ups. 
                     These are my favourites.
   COMPARATIVE:     Mary was a lady in mid-20s.  
                     Such people can't change a flat tyre.

Ellipsis, i.e., omission of something referred to earlier, is an instance of textual anaphora (e.g., Have some more). Types of ellipsis:

   a. NOMINAL – a word functioning as deictic, numerative, epithet or classifier is upgraded from the status of modifier to the status of head.
      i.  -Did you get a first prize? – No, I got a third.
      ii. His sons went into business. Neither succeeded.
   b. VERBAL – the structure does not fully express its systemic features.
      i.  Have you been swimming? Yes, I have. (lexical ellipsis)
      ii. Has she been crying? No, laughing. (operator ellipsis)
c. CLAUSAL – clauses have a two-part structure: MODAL + PROPOSITIONAL ELEMENTS
   i. Who taught you to spell? Grandfather did.

   PRESUPPOSED CLAUSE | ELLIPTICAL FORM | SUBSTITUTION FORM | FULL FORM
   ii. Has the plane landed? | Yes, it has. | Yes it has done.
       | Yes, it has landed.

Substitution is very similar to ellipsis in the effect it has on the text, and occurs when instead of leaving a word or phrase out, as in ellipsis, it is substituted for another, more general word. For example, "Which ice-cream would you like?" - "I would like the pink one" where "one" is used instead of repeating "ice-cream."

Conjunction, creates cohesion by relating sentences and paragraphs to each other by using words from the class of conjunctions or numerals. Types of conjunction:

a. ADDITIVE (includes alternative and negative)– and, nor, or (else), furthermore, thus, likewise …
b. ADVERSATIVE – yet, but, however, actually, instead, at any rate …
c. CAUSAL – so, hence, consequently, because, otherwise …
d. TEMPORAL – then, finally, soon, up to now, in short, to sum up …

Examples:
He was climbing for the whole day…

a. ADDITIVE: …and in all this time he met no one.
b. ADVERSATIVE: …yet he was hardly aware of being tired.
c. CAUSAL: …so by night time the valley was far below him
d. TEMPORAL: …then as dusk fell, he sat down to rest.
**Lexical cohesion** establishes semantic (through lexical devices, such as repetition, equivalence - synonymy, hyponymy, hyperonymy, paraphrase, collocation) and pragmatic (presupposition) connectedness; in contrast with the previous types of cohesion, it operates over larger stretches of text since it establishes chains of related references.

REITERATION – the repetition of the same lexical item + the occurrence of a related item.

*There’s a boy climbing that tree.*

a. Repetition

*The boy’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care.*
b. A synonym or near-synonym

*The lad’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care.*
c. A superordinate

*The child’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care.*
d. A general word

*The idiot’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care.*

REFERENCE: There’s a boy climbing that tree.

a. Identical

*The boy’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care.*
b. Inclusive

*Those boys are always getting into mischief.*
c. Exclusive

*And there’s another boy standing underneath.*
d. Unrelated

*Most boys love climbing trees.*

**Coherence** in linguistics is what makes a text semantically meaningful. The notion of coherence was introduced by Vestergaard and Schroder as a way
of talking about the relations between texts, which may or may not be indicated by formal markers of cohesion. Beaugrande/Dressler define coherence as a “continuity of senses” and “the mutual access and relevance within a configuration of concepts and relations”. Coherence, as a sub-surface feature of a text, concerns the ways in which the meanings within a text (concepts, relations among them and their relations to the external world) are established and developed. Some of the major relations of coherence are logical sequences, such as cause-consequence (and so), condition-consequence (if), instrument-achievement (by), contrast (however), compatibility (and), etc. Moreover, it is the general ‘aboutness’, i.e., the topic development which provides a text with necessary integrity; even in the absence of overt links, a text may be perceived as coherent (i.e., as making sense), as in various lists, charts, timetables, menus.

Coherence is present when a text makes sense because there is a continuity of senses which holds a text together – it has to be semantically and logically OK.

*George entered the room. He saw Mary cleaning the table.*

*John fell and broke his neck. (?) John broke his neck and fell.*

### 3. Textual Categories

The textual category is a property characterizing every text, in other words, it is a typological feature of a text. Textual categories appear and function only in the text as a language unit of the highest rank. It is important to remember that the text is never modeled by one textual category but always by a totality of categories. It is sometimes regarded as a total of categories.

Today the list of textual categories is open: linguists name different textual categories because they approach the text from different angles. Most scholars differentiate between *contensive* and *structural* categories. However, some linguists draw a strict demarcation line between the two while others do not. The most commonly identified textual categories include:

1) **divisibility** – the text can be divided into parts, chapters and paragraphs dealing with specific topics, therefore having some formal and semantic independence;
2) **cohesion** – formal connectedness;

3) **coherence** – internal connectedness (integrity, according to I. R. Galperin);

4) **prospection** (flash-forward) – anticipation of future events;

5) **retrospection** (flash-back) – return to events in the past;

(Both prospection and retrospection break the space-time continuum of the text.)

6) **anthropocentricity** – the Man is the central figure of any text independent of its specific theme, message and plot;

7) **conceptuality** – any text has a message. Expressing some idea, that is, conveying a message is the basis of any creative work;

8) **informativity**

Prof. I. R. Galperin whose book on the text and its categories is one of the most authoritative and often quoted ones identifies three types of information:

- **content-factual information** – information about facts, events and processes taking place in the surrounding world; always explicit and verbalized;

- **content-conceptual information** conveys to the reader the author’s understanding of relations between the phenomena described by means of content-factual information, understanding of their cause-effect relations, importance in social, economic, political and cultural life of people including relations between individuals. This kind of information is deduced from the whole literary work and is a creative re-understanding of these relations, facts, events and processes; not always explicit;

- **content-implicative information** is hidden information that can be deduced from content-factual information due to the ability of linguistic units to generate associative and connotative meanings and also due to the ability of sentences conveying factual information to acquire new meanings.

9) **completeness** – the text must be a complete whole;

10) **modality** – the attitude of the author towards what is being communicated;
11) **the author’s image** – way the author’s personality is expressed in the text.

### 4. Textual Units. Supra-Phrasal Unity and Paragraph

Analyzing the structure of the text, linguists identify semantically connected sentence sequences as certain syntactic formations. One of prospective trends in modern text linguistics is describing such syntactic formations, or text units, identifying patterns according to which they are built and studying relations between them. Irrespective of their specific features, all text units are united by their common function – they represent the text as a whole integrally expressing the textual topic.

There is no universal agreement as to the term that should be used to describe text units. In the Russian tradition the following terms were used to refer to such formations: “phrase”, “strophe”, “prosaic strophe”, “component”, “paragraph”, “microtext”, “period”, “syntactic complex”, “monologue utterance”, “communicative bloc”, “complex syntactic unity”, “supra-phrasal unity”. The latter is the most commonly used one.

It should be noted that there are some scholars who do not recognize the existence of linguistic units beyond the framework of the sentence. This opinion can be explained by the lack of a complete systematic description of linguistic peculiarities of such units.

The problem of text units has been addressed by numerous scholars both in this country and abroad. Speaking about Russian linguists, we should mention the works by I. R. Galperin, O. I. Moskalskaya, E. A. Referovskaya, Z. Ya. Turaeva, G. Ya. Solganik and others. A new approach to the nature of the text was proposed by Prof. Blokh, who introduced the notion of dicteme – the elementary topical textual unit.

The **supra-phrasal unity** is a minimal text unit consisting of two or more sentences united by a common topic. In some cases the SPU can coincide with the text if it’s a short one, for example, a news item in the newspaper, a miniature story, etc. However, most commonly, the SPU is a component of a larger text. The
SPU consists of at least two sentences, it is characterized by topical, communicative and structural completeness and the author’s attitude towards what is being communicated. The SPU is a complex semantico-structural unit, the communicative value of which does not equal the sum of meanings of its constituent sentences, it is a new semantico-structural formation.

It should be noted that sometimes it is not easy to delimit the boundaries of the SPU. In some cases it can coincide with the paragraph (this is especially typical of scientific papers and business documents), while in others the paragraph can be easily divided into several SPUs, for example, in fiction and poetry.

As for the correlation of the supra-phrasal unity and the paragraph, a few decades ago the SPU was considered to be a unit equivalent to the paragraph. In today’s text linguistics there are two approaches to this problem. Some scholars still believe that the SPU coincides with the paragraph, or rejecting the term “supra-phrasal unity”, consider the paragraph to be a complex syntactic unity. Other researchers draw a strict demarcation line between the SPU and the paragraph saying that the former is a unit of composition while the latter is a unit of punctuation.

In the first place, the supra-phrasal unity is essentially a feature of all the varieties of speech, both oral and written, both literary and colloquial. As different from this, the paragraph is a stretch of written or typed literary text delimited by a new (indent) line at the beginning and an incomplete line at the close.

In the second place, the paragraph is a polyfunctional unit of written speech and as such is used not only for the written representation of a supra-phrasal unity, but also for the introduction of utterances of a dialogue, as well as for the introduction of separate points in various enumerations.

In the third place, the paragraph in a monologue speech can contain more than one supra-phrasal unity and the supra-phrasal unity can include more than one paragraph.