THE MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SPECIAL SECONDARY EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN

GULISTAN STATE UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF PHILOLOGY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

QUALIFICATION WORK

on theme "Clauses in Enlish Language and their role in Expanding Message"

Prepared by: Student of group 1-43
Xamidova Nilyufer

_____

SUPERVISOR:
Fozilov M.

_____

GULISTAN – 2014

CONTENTS

Introduction

Topicality of the qualification paper. Studying a language requires knowledge of structure of English sentences. Without knowing the forms, functions of these sentences one can not deliver messages in target language. Moreover, the main aim of the language and language learning is to learn how to compose different types of messages (utterances, sentences) that create communication between people. In grammar books the sphere of grammar that studies the given quality of language is called syntax. We study syntax because it enables human beings to compose complex messages (utterance, sentence). Suppose an unhappy worker utters the single word *idiot*! He or she might have muttered *stupid, unfeeling, ignorant idiot*, with four words combined into a phrase. The speaker might even have said *That stupid, unfeeling, ignorant idiot is the new manager*!, in which the phrase the new manager and the phrase that stupid, unfeeling, ignorant idiot are combined into a clause by means of is. The given qualification paper attempts to study deeper types and functions of clauses that help us to make complex messages. We think knowing the means of forming complex messages or sentences is important because they make up the units of speech which make communication between people possible.

It is topical to study syntax as syntax has to do with how words are put together to build phrases, with how phrases are put together to build clauses or bigger phrases, and with how clauses are put together to build sentences. In small and familiar situations, humans could communicate using single words and many gestures, particularly when dealing with other members of the same social grouping (nuclear family, extended family, clan and so on). But complex messages for complex situations or

complex ideas require more than just single words; every human language has devices with which its speakers can construct phrases and clauses.

The aim of the qualification paper is to study structure and functions of clauses in forming sentences and the role of these types of sentences in expanding messages.

In the course of research the below given **tasks** were set:
- to study the nature of utterances (message) in English and consider message as actual sentence;
- to study relevant literature devoted to the study of utterances, their types, forms and functions;
- to define the place of clauses in English language;
- to consider different types of examples of sentences with different types of clauses;
- to consider and analyze clauses that expand and complete utterances in English language.

Novelty of the qualification paper. In the course of the research various grammar books were analyzed and studied. The qualification paper contains information related to the English syntax and the main clause types of English language. In the research we defined the importance of clauses that perform bearer of message, the role of complex sentences, various types of clauses in expanding message and that create valid communication.

The subject of the research is English clause structures.

The object of the research is the role of clause types in expanding and delivering well-founded messages (utterances).

Practical value of the qualification paper can be defined with the validity and importance of materials that can be applied in teaching and learning English grammar, especially the syntax of the English language. Materials provided and results achieved in the research can be used in the

courses of English grammar, English stylistics at the foreign languages departments of higher education institutions.

Theoretical value of the paper. The work considers suggestions, opinions and works of many well-known grammarians of linguistics on English grammar and syntax. The work puts into one system the importance of clause structures in human communication. In the course of writing the qualification paper we also tried to comment on theoreticians, works devoted to the study of English syntax.

Structure of the qualification paper. The paper consists of introduction, the main part, conclusion and the list of used literature.

The first chapter of the main part is dedicated to the analysis of English sentences in communication, types of messages according to their form and aim.

The second chapter is dedicated to the study of adverbial clause in the English language which is considered one of the most complex clauses of English syntax.

Conclusion sums up the results and presents the value of findings in the qualification paper.

The list of used literature contains more than 30 literature on English grammar and syntax.

Chapter 1. Definitions of Message in English Grammar

1.1 Message as an actual sentence

The sentence is the highest structural and the main communicative linguistic unit. It is a language unit given by its semantic and structural sentence-types. It is actualized in speech by the message which appears actual sentence. The grammatical description of the message differs essentially from the grammatical analysis of the sentence which underlies the message semantically.'The main categories'of actual sentences (messages) differ from the immediate constituents of the sentence. They are identified as the Theme and the Rheme. These categories are considered universal due to the universality of the speech units themselves. The indication of these categories is surely idioethnic. Every human language possesses a variety of formal speech devices for the indication of the themes or the rhemes in concrete messages. [3]

The Theme and the Rheme arc prcdicational categories. They are distinguished as the indispensable contentive parts of the message which is formed as the unit of "communicative predication".

The message is formed on the basis of the sentence and embodies in its central part the structural and predicative properties of the corresponding sentence-type. As a result, the two predicational acts are reflected in the message: the act of propositional predicating (пропозиционально-логического преднциропапня) and the act of communicative predicating (коммуникативного предицирования). The first of these results in establishing predicative relations between the parts of the proposition which underlies the nuclear predication of the sentence

and of the corresponding message, respectively. The act of communicative predicating is basic in the complex of illocutionary acts carried out in the process of forming an message with its theme-rheme scheme. [4]

It is performed by the concrete speaker over the concrete semioiogical propositional content given lexically in a particular message. Manipulating mentally with the content of the message the speaker can make this or that point rhematic in order that his communicative intention be realized sufficiently. The theme appears the concrete communicative subject. It can be given in the message and it can be displaced in the communicative situation. As to the rheme, it is always present in the message. It is the communicative predicate without which no message is consistent. [2]

The theme — rheme semantic scheme of the utteranoe is inseparable from the lexical representation of the semiological information rendered by the message. [4]

In normal messages the grammatical subject is the theme whereas the grammatical predicate represents the rheme, in deviating cases special devices, which every language is in possession of, should be intentionally used by the speaker for the indication of the main communicative utterantial categories.[4]

As preliminary illustration compare the actualizations of one particular sentence-type:

$$N + Vfin + N_1 + D$$

The officials treated the boy cruelty.

Did the officials treat the boy cruelly?

The officials did not treat the boy cruelly.

Didn't the officials treat the boy cruelly?

These are messages with symmetric correlation of "logical subject—theme" and "logical predicate — rheme". In deviating cases from normal

messages the correlations may be asymmetric or either thematization/rhematization is marked by special formal devices.

Compare messages like the following with the previous illustrations:

The boy was treated cruelly by the officials.

The boy was treated cruelly.

i4s to the boy, he was treated cruelly by the officials.

It was the boy who was treated cruelly by the officials.

It was the officials who treated the boy cruelly.

The devices of intentional theme — rheme indication make up a system of communicative actualizers the character of which in concrete languages is predetermined by the structure of the language and by the degree of its syntheticity or analyticity.

In languages of synthetic order the devices of theme — rheme indication are naturally of synthetic character, namely, those which presuppose the marking of the communicative semantic shift by the internal alternation of the message-form. It is the word-order (permutation, inversion, extraposition) that serves as the regular theme — rheme indicator in Russian due to the flexibility of the word-order. Most frequently, the rhematic element [11] is placed in the final position of the message. [5]

Compare:

Студенты, поехали на экскурсию в Самарканд.

В Самарканд на экскурсию поехали студенты.

Студенты поехали в Самарканд на экскурсию.

The word-order in English is fixed and the distribution of elements is standard. Due to the decay of the ever-rich case system the grammatical relations between elements in English messages are marked by word-position. The theme — rheme indication by the word-order devices is not regular at present. Although the cases of permutation and inversion are

rather useable in scientific and publicistic prose they are commonly treated as stylistic devices.

Compare:

In the targe liberated territory live almost 8 million people. Along the walls are the stands with glass cases of apparatus for demonstrations. In Section 3 were covered the problems of core- ferentiality.

In English the rhematic element [11], i. e. the rheme carrier, can occur In different positions of an message because'preference is given to other devices than the word-order. Much depends upon the types and the forms of speech because, for instance, paralingual devices can be effectively used for the indication of the thematic/rhematic relations in oral speech, especially in dialogues. [6]

The indication of the rheme of the message can be achieved with the help of some functionally specialized words which occur before the element they refer to and make it rhematic. They are identifying or particularizing particles: only, just, namely, etc., e. g.:

The Millingtons were always late: he had only to get into the car and drive away. (Collier). *The others spoke only a few words, pointing out some building or street.* (Joyce). *She was just going to take a cigarette off the mantelpiece...* (Mansfield).

The $V_{be} + V_{en}$ form, which is qualified as the passive construction, may be effectively employed for the indication of the functional per* spective of an message. Its functional design is variable under the influence of contextual factors. The meaning rendered by the given construction-form is contextually conditioned. [8]

The passive verb-form seems to be functionally specialized even when it renders its original paradigmatic meaning of "being acted upon". The occurrence of the passive verb-form transfers emphasis to the subject, the latter becomes Thematic whereas the predicate turns out thematic. The

rhematic character of the subject in English sentences with passive constructions may be marked by special devices, such as negative words, particles or articles, e. g.:

Members are being called out at the vehicle licensing department. [48]. *The Tories must be left under no illusions.* [48]. *Anti-Union legislation had been defeated before in 1974 and it would be defeated again.* [48].

In sentences without additional indications of the rhematic nature of the subject either the subject or the predicate may be interpreted as rhematic. The rhematic subject is emphasized in its denotation of the object of the action. The rhematic predicate in the passive form is neutralized in its meaning of passivity. It acquires a new meaning. The meaning of the indefinite-personal activity prevails over the original meaning of the passive form. [7]

The use of the so-called "by-objects" may influence upon the meanings of the subject and the passive verb-form: it sometimes takes upon itself the meaning of agentivity, the meaning of passivity revealing more vividly. Still, much depends upon the semantics of the Ven element. Compare:

He was awakened in the morning by a hand placed on his arm. [41]. *But he was buoyed up by a wonderful exhilaration.* [41]. *Yesterday management and representatives of the three unions were joined by officials of the Advisory Counciliation and Arbitration Service.* [48]. [8]

The semantic shift in the meanings rendered by the passive verb- form has become regular. The form very often loses its paradigmatic meaning of passivity and develops into a device expressing the indefinite-personal meaning. This meaning becomes the distinguishing semantic feature of the $V_{be} + V_{en}$ form.

In the following extract the role of the V_{be} -f Ven forms in forming up the message semantically seems evident. [12]

The sick man had been brought ashore and put in hospital on the quarantine station, but telegraphic instructions had been sent from Apia to say that the schooner would not be allowed to enter the harbour till it was certain no other member of the crew was affected. [41].

The indefinite-personal meaning of the V_{be} + V_{en} form reveals itself with greater force in some stereotyped syntactic constructions. There are two main constructions of the type:

a)   It - V_{be} + V_{en} + that-clause.

b)   N + V_{be} + V_{en} + V_{en}

It is revealed that the Prime Minister is actively planning to escalate her offensive to break trade union power. [48]. It cannot be denied that the people of London were given a direct part in controlling the force they spend so much money on. [48]. Labour's Opposition leaders are known to be extremely concerned about the breakdown of understanding between president Carter and his European allies. [48]. [12]

The relations between the elements Vbe and Ven in the cliche construction "it + V_{be} - V_{en} resemble rather those in the structures where the verb to be is not an auxiliary one but a linking element in the specific type of nominal predicate. It is probably the combination $V_{b}e$ + + V_{en} itself and the construction "it + V_{be} - V_{en}" that function as auxiliaries of the analytical syntactic formations. The interpretation suggested here does not contradict the common definition of the analytical linguistic from which is said to consist of the two parts: auxiliary and notional.

The messages like The delegation was reported to arrive soon and It was reported that the delegation would arrive soon appear analytical in form. The boldfaced elements can be qualified as operatory auxiliaries which form up the informative part of the message by indicating the

indefinite-personal activity in conveying a piece of information. With this point in view, the second message is not, in fact, a complex sentence in its traditional definition. The clause it is reported is not the main clause which must be the informative and grammatical centre of the composite sentence. [11] The content of the other clause is of primary informative significance:

It was reported   *that the delegation would arrive soon.*

Aux.   *Informative part*

There are constructions in which the position of the Vcn is occupied by some other elements, but all of them can render different pragmatic and evaluative meanings, e.g.;

It is significant that the council has tried to establish channels of communication through to the police with joint committees. [48]. It is of great regret that we will be unable to produce the extra two pages in this weekend's issue of the Morning Star. [48].

The theme — rheme scheme of the message, with the rheme being its nucleus, is the speech exponent of the structure of virtual thought. But their correlation seems intermediated by the correlation of the message with the underlying sentence-type, on the one hand, and by the correlation of the sentence with the proposition as logical form, on the other hand.

The relation between the underlying virtual statement (виртуальное суждение) and the actual statement (актуальное суждение) resembles the relation between content and expression. The actual statement is not a mere formal manifestation of the form of virtual statement, It is its specific explication which is qualitatively different, it is its actual form, or either, it is its "immediate actuality".

The logico-scmantic content is rendered by the actual sentence part of the message. More exactly, it is rendered by the subject-predicate predicative complex. The logico-semantic content has two aspects — ibe semioiogicai propositional content and the operatory propositional content.

The denotative and significative components of the propositional content rendered by the corresponding sentence-type find their actualization by the lexical filling of the constituent positions of the subject and the predicate. The relational aspect of the propositional content is expressed grammatically, i. e. by a particular propositional function which the predicate has in relation to the subject. [22]

The operatory propositional content is rendered by special grammatical devices which function as propositional operators. The class comprises quantors, negators and modals. [22]

In addition, there is specifically utterantial propositional content representing actual statement which is formed as the result of both thematization (the formation of the subject) and rhematization (the formation of the predicate).

The logico-semantic characterization of messages presupposes the consideration of the regularities in forming the message as actual statement, the latter being constituted, if messages are normal, by the subject (theme) — predicate (rheme) relational scheme. The functional design of the predicate in relation to the subject is basic for the formation of the actual statement. The rhematization of this or that point of the content reflects the speaker's communicative intention in focusing the point which appears actually essential for his self-expressing and for the realization of the communicative speech strategy. The speaker formulates rhematic predicates preferably, taking into consideration their logico-functiona] potential. The extrapolation of the taxonomy of logical predicates upon their linguistic representation is not very much contradictory. Moreover, it is helpful in the attempt to classify messages on logico-functional criteria. [23]

There should be certain logical congruence and semantic concordance between the immediate constituents of the message. The interdependence

between the nature of the subject and the character of the predicate is evident byt it can be exposed taking into consideration quite opposite points of departure: the subject or the predicate. [21]

The propositional function of the predicate is its predicative relation to the subject which is established as the result of forming a proposition. The formation of the proposition and the formulation of the statement are complexes of mental operations among which predicating is central. The subject-predicate predicative complex of the message reflects these operations undertaken on the part of the speaker. As a result, the predicate seems to dominate over the subject due to its predicate function and rhematic nature. It probably restricts and regulates also the filling of the subject position because of its predicating significance. [14]

But the nature of the subject should not be ignored. For instance, its referentness (referentiality) to extralingual referents of different nature may lay constraints upon the co-occurrence of the subject and the predicate. Primary distinctions are made between the subjects of denotative referentiality, which refer to objective referents, and the subjects with significative referentiality, which have referents in subjective reality, thus referring to notions. This is based on the logical taxonomy of terms (nominators), on distinguishing denotative terms versus significative ones. Each type of the subject nominators possesses additional semantic characteristics which are relevant for the logico- syntactic functioning of these terms as arguments to the predicate: *humanity/non-humanity, individuality/generality, animateness/in animateness* and the like. [1]

For the subjects of denotative referentiality the differentiation of two opposite spheres in objective reality, that of nature and that of man with his specifically human activities, appears crucial.

The semantic feature of "humanity/non-humanity" in the semantics of the subject or of the predicate predetermines the functional orientation of

the predicate, its predicate function and the logico-se- mantic significance of the message.

Compare the meanings of the predicates and of the verbs themselves in sentences with quite different subjects.

She turned and went quickly to the door. (Galsworthy). The next hour went quickly and did her good. (Galsworthy). And everything went on beautifully... (Joyce). *A woman was standing near the~lop of the first flight.* (Joyce). *Her photograph stood before the pier glass. (Joyce). At the next farmhouse, which stood low and broad near the high road, tubs of water had been put out.* [44]. There are some other characteristics of denotates (objective referents) which may be relevant for the nature of the subject and its relationships with the predicate of particular type. Much depends upon the status of objective referents which can be things, phenomena, categories, relations and events. The reference of the subject to such referents leads to its co-occurrence with different predicates.

Nominality is another distinguishing feature of the elements functioning as subjects. It means that the position of the subject can be occupied by any element of the class of nominals: nouns, pronouns, nominalized words or expressions and clauses. Implicit substantivity is characteristic of the nominals as their significate but they display differences in the way of nomination. [14]

The functional characterization of messages should be based a) on the semantic subcategorization of the subject and predicate elements, and b) on the functional designs, of these constituting elements in generating the message as the product of a number of mental and speech acts, the act of predicating being basic. [3]

The introduction of the subject precedes the predicational act and the role of the acts and operations resulting in the formulation and introduction of the subject is not at all the least. The introduction of the subject is a

logico-syntactic operation succeeding the reference act (referential act) which provides the relatedness of the statement to objective reality. The referential act itself is a complex of constituting acts and preliminary operations. [3]

1.2 Functional typology of messages

The logico-functional classification of messages is only one aspect of the functional consideration of speech units. The propositional function of the predicate in its predicative relations to the subject serves as criterion for the differentiation of the logico-functional types of sentences and corresponding messages, the latter being the actualizations of the former. The predicate function is realized in the process of predicating, i.e. in the process of establishing the predicative relations between the predicate and its correlative subject. In normal messages which appear actual sentences the process of communicative predicating reflects correlatively the process of propositional predicating in consequence of which the nucleus of the sentence is formed. The correlation between the grammatical subject and the theme of the corresponding message is in accord and concord with the correlation of the grammatical predicate and the rheme of the message. In case of deviation from this regularity the principle of the logico-functional typology of sentences does not coincide with that of the messages, though their isomorphism is obvious. [4]

1.2.1 Actional Messages

Their functional meaning is rendered by the actional verb. It cha-racterizes the subject as an active agent of an action (active constructions) or as a patient who (which) is acted upon (passive constructions).

The invariant pattern according to which actional messages are derived is N + V_{act} The subcategorization of the V_{aut} is irrelevant for the general qualitative characterization of actional messages themselves but it is important for the differentiation of the logico-semantic variants of actional verbal predicates with their design to denote human versus non-human activities. The term "actional messages" is of general application to both variants of messages concerning human and non-human activities. As to the subject of actional messages it possesses several features concording with the actionality of the predicate. The nominal element of the subject is a nominator (denotator) of an individual discrete active object. Its semantic features like animateness/inanimateness, humanity/non-humanity, personality/impersonality are of great relevance. Proper names and personal pronouns are rather frequently used with actional predicates. Since much of obligatory referentiality is implicitly given in the N element, the determiner (d) takes upon itself the definitization and identification of an object. It testifies for the fact that definite determiners are regularly used with the subject nouns in actional messages. [5]

The predicates of active actional messages seem very much rhematic. Their rhematic character is confirmed by the use of the verbs in Continuous or by the attending V_{ing} forms.

It is not occasional that nearly all the subjects in the rather a dynamic description that follows are expressed by the agentive or personal nouns and pronouns whose semantics is in accord with the actio- nality of the predicate verbs:

Mor's blood turned to ice. The scene about him was annihilated. He sprang up from his seat and got out into the aisle, stumbling in front of Evy who was also rising. He made for the nearest door at the back of the Gym. But a stampede had already started. The boys in the back raws had got up and were pushing towards the door. Their excited voices grew

louder and louder, Mor was caught in the midst. As he fought his way through he caught a last glimpse of the scene in the Gym. Bledyard was still standing in the light of the screen, his rod lifted, looking back now towards the audience — while throughout the Gym the boys were standing up, pushing, climbing over the chairs... [49].

The predicate in the passive actional messages indicates that the subject does not act or is not acting but is acted upon. Some linguists assume that the passive form of actional verbs may acquire new functional design and develops into a device for marking the rhematic nature of the subject in case there is no other indication of the shift in the functional perspective of the message.

The verb in the passive voice form seems neutralized in its actionality, with the indefinite-personal meaning prevailing, e. g.:

When they had penetrated into the castle they were received courteously by an old servant. (Chesterton). At present the energy sector was run in a way that set one industry against another... [48]. Victories have been won in recent days in Winnipeg, Calgary and Edmonton. (Canadian Tribune).

There are actional messages which contain a circumstantial adverbial element in their predicate part. This element may be optional for the structural organization of the corresponding sentence-type but it is communicatively significant because it takes upon itself the focus of the rheme proper. It is not the actionality of the verb which is made rhematic but the circumstance or condition of an action. Accordingly, such variants of actional messages are rather to be qualified as cir- cumstantional: N 4- Vact 4- D. Some unspecified verbs of "motion" or "location" need, as a rule, circumstantial specification on the part of directional or spatial adverbials. Other adverbials can also become rhematic, e. g. [12]:

He arrived early at the theatre. [31]. Captain James Mus- grave looked out into the main gallery. (Chesterton). He went and stood in the doorway to see better. (Greene). He stood looking down at her, feeling slightly awkward. [31].

1.2.2 Performative Messages

The notion of "a performative" has not yet received a more or less exact definition. The very idea of performing or carrying out a verbal act in the process of interpersonal communication remains vague in its interpretation.

Performative messages are too specific to be classed under "actional messages" though predicates in such messages are represented by actional verbs. An insight into their peculiarities makes us aware of the fact that the verbs which can be used in explicitly performative messages have two distinct properties. Firstly, they are used to denote in act which can be carried out by speaking- only in the process of communication. Secondly, the action is not so much nominated and denoted by the verb in the statement as performed by the speaker with the help of the statement. Thus, / promise to come soon is not a statement describing a promise but an act of promising itself carried out by the speaker. Performative messages are non-statements in which the verb describes the action performed by the subject. [15]

The invariant pattern according to which performative messages are formed is the regular N + Vrm construction. But there are certain restrictions as to the filling of the constituent positions and certain appropriacy conditions for the use of performative messages [17].

The subject in performative messages is always I and the predicate is always in the present-tense form which indicates the moment of uttering

and the time of that verbal action which is performed with the help of the given message.

The appropriacy conditions for the Vnn to function as a performative verb are extralingual conditions of situational character. Thus, the message *I order a cup of tea* will be a performative message if it is uttered under conditions appropriate for performing an act of "ordering". Similarly, there should be, for instance, appropriate conditions for the functioning of the performative message / announce the meeting open [18].

In a word, the predicate (Vnn) can be identified as the performative verb (Vperf) only in case it represents a mental and verbal act undertaken by the speaker under quite appropriate situational conditions. Functional ambiguity is frequent with English verbs which can occur as performative and non-performative predicates. Sometimes the functional ambiguity of a verb can be obliterated by the use of Continuous instead of Present Tense. When used in Continuous some verbs lose their performativeness and behave like assertive verbs proper [19].

Compare:

I warn you that your friend will not stand for you.

(to warn = Vperf)

1 am warning you that your friend will not stand for you.

(tO Warn = Vnon-perf)

Since performative messages are non-statements they cannot be assessed as true or false but rather as appropriate or inappropriate because in keeping with the speech-act interpretation the values "true" and "false" can be assigned only to messages which constitute a description of some event and are statements on the part of the speaker. All verbs of "belief" share with verbs of "saying" their performative character but their performativeness, if any, is too specific. The present tense of such verbs

signifies "present-moment" meaning coinciding with the time of the message [21].

The verb itself indicates "belief" as it is:

/ think she is right.

I suspect she is right.

The consideration of performatives alongside actional verbs seems efficient for the contrastive exposure of their semantic and functional differences. In performative messages the predicate expressed by a verb with performative power is neutralized in its logical predicate function because it does not predicate activity over the subject. The performative is a specific lingual entity which is used intentionally by the speaker as an instrument in performing a verbal act [24].

The performative is not the verb itself but the combination I + Vperf as a whole where the element / is the marker of the first-person agent of the action. It is obligatory for English performative messages due to the analytical character of its structure. In synthetic languages the first-person subject with the verbs used performatively can be and, regularly, is indicated by inflection.

Compare:

I announce the meeting open. 1 warn that you wilt fall.

Объявляю собрание открытым. Предупреждаю, ты упадешь.

The performative message (/ 4- Vporr) is rarely used isolatedly, as it is, because there should be that "saying" with the help of which a verbal act is performed. There are explicitly and implicitly performative messages. In the messages with explicit performativeness the performative part I + Vperf is used with a formular saying in case it can be used under different appropriacy conditions. But the formula itself can reveal its performativeness of a means for performing a particular verbal act. In such

cases the "performative" is zero, or rather, it is implicated in the semantics of the formular (cliche) saying.

We agreed to dwell upon the functional peculiarities of English messages in accordance with the subject — predicate relations. It is sufficient to emphasize that performative messages reveal the actiona- lity of the predicate in a specific way, the message itself being a means for the speaker to carry out this or that verbal act.

1.2.3 Characterizing Messages

The functional design of the predicate in such messages is to characterize the subject this way or another. The characteristics supplied by the predicate are of two types: qualitative and quantitative.. Accordingly, characterizing messages fall into two separate groups.

Qualifying messages have predicates which predicate a quality over the subject by attributing this quality to the object denoted by the subject. In other words, the predicate provides a qualitative characteristics of the subject. The qualitative predicate is compound. Its invariant pattern Vbe H~ A varies, though not considerably in filling the constituent positions. The general semantic characteristics of the predicate complement (A) is its implied qualitativeness.

Its position is regularly occupied by adjectives, adjectivized participles and by the statives which characterize the subject indicating the state of the subject as its quality. The verb to be, which is invariant among other fillers of the V-position, can be substituted by a range of verbs. The substitutability of the verbs reveals the nature of the verb to be. In the combination with Aqu elements the verb to be is substituted by a number of verbs which share its copulative function.

But in combination with the statives the range of its substitutors seems greater because the stative can render some characteristics additional to the existentionality or actionality of the subject. In such cases statives pattern with different verbs and the restrictions of their substitutability are hardly relevant. Several specialized verbs of "presence" or "location" (to stand, to lie, to sit, to stay, etc.) very often pattern with statives.

Compare:

The sea was green. The desert was very dirty-looking. [29]. The sky had become lighter, very much lighter. (Garnett). She thought, he is a very clean man, very neat and spruce, (Hill). The big windows of Demoyles drawing-room stood open upon the garden. [49]. She sat very silent again. [31]. They were rich, really rich, not just comfortably well off, which is odious and stuffy and sounds like one's grandparents. (Mansfield).

Some semantic shift is feasibly traced with the statives which can be used with human and nbn-human subjects, e. g,:

The bay stood as if petrified. [31]. *The nurses were astonished that the men were dazzled.* (Spark). But he was still speechless,—1 struck, dumb by the realization of fearful guilt. (Bennett).

There is another kind of qualifying messages in which the action performed by the subject is characterized qualitatively by the qualitative adverbials which appear indispensable. to the predicate part of the message. Moreover, it is this communicatively obligatory element that marks the rhematic character of the predicate: N + V + Dqu, e. g.: Macphail looked at him shrewdly. [41]. *They cannot walk fast enough.* (Mansfield*). He turns the page slowly.* (Mansfield). *He stared at me uncomprehendingly.* (Chaplin). *The wind was blowing hard for days. (Bennett). He turned abruptly and walked on.* (Aldington*). Repton sniffed derisively.* (Coppard). *He studied it intently, alertly considering its size and every feature of stability.* (Sanson).

Quantifying and measuring messages are functionally specialized on providing quantitative characteristics of the subject. The predicate contains a quantifying element "Q" whose position can be occupied by numerals, numericals and by different quantifying or measuring adverbials: N + V + Q:

He was four feet long and God knows how heavy... [29]. Mrs Beer is seventy-eight... (Cary). When he looked at the moon again it had risen a hand's breadth above the trees. (Conrad). There was a good deal of confused talk... (Joyce).

Chapter 2. Structure and Function of Adverbial clauses in English Language

We must start the discussion of adverbial clauses by pointing out that the term "adverbial" should not be taken as an adjective derived from the noun "adverb" (which would make it a morphological term), but as a syntactical term, in the same way that it is used in the phrase "adverbial modifier" denoting a secondary part of the sentence.

With reference to adverbial clauses a question arises that is not always easy to answer, namely: whether they modify some part of the main clause or the main clause as a whole. The answer may prove to be different for different types of adverbial clauses and the question will have to be considered for each type separately. The criteria to be applied in settling this question have, however (at least partly), to be stated in advance.

We will first try out a method that has proved valid, on the whole, for determining whether a clause is an object clause or not. It will serve both for finding whether a clause is an adverbial clause or not, and if it is one, what it modifies. The method consists in dropping the clause in question and finding out what has been lost by dropping it and what part of the main clause has been affected by the omission (it may be the whole of the main clause). If this method does not yield satisfactory results in some particular case we will think of possible other ways of ascertaining the function of the subordinate clause [23].

The conjunctions introducing adverbial subordinate clauses are numerous and differ from each other in the degree of definiteness of meaning. While some of them have a narrow meaning, so that, seeing the conjunction, we may be certain that the adverbial clause belongs to a certain type (for example, if the conjunction is because, there is no doubt that the adverbial clause is a clause of cause), other conjunctions have so

wide a meaning that we cannot determine the type of adverbial clause by having a look at the conjunction alone: thus, the conjunction as may introduce different types of clauses, and so can the conjunction while. With these conjunctions, other words in the sentence prove decisive in determining the type of adverbial clause introduced by the conjunction. 1

Some adverbial clauses can be easily grouped under types more or less corresponding to the types of adverbial modifiers in a simple.

A word of caution is necessary here. A subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction because, or when, etc., need not necessarily be an adverbial clause at all. It may, for instance, be a predicative clause, as in the sentence This was because he had just arrived. Since the subordinate clause comes immediately after the link verb be it cannot possibly be an adverbial clause but must be a predicative one. Sentence, which have been considered above. Others are more specific for the complex sentence and do not fit into "pigeonholes" arranged in accordance with the analysis of the simple sentence. Among those that will easily fit into such "pigeonholes" are clauses denoting place, those denoting time (or temporal clauses), clauses of cause, purpose, and concession, and also those of result. There are also clauses of comparison and of degree [23].

We may mention briefly the types of clauses which do not give much occasion for theoretical discussion, and turn our chief attention to those which do, and also to comparing subordinate clauses to the corresponding adverbial modifiers in a simple sentence, as stated above [22].

3.1 Clauses of Place

There appears to be only one way of introducing such clauses, and this is by means of the relative adverb where, and in a very few cases by the phrase from where. For instance, . . .*Miss Dotty insisted on looking into all*

the cupboards and behind the curtains to see, as she said, "if there were any eyes or ears where they were not wanted." [49] This way of indicating the whereabouts of "eyes or ears" serves to characterise it by referring to a situation expressed by the subordinate clause, rather than to indicate the precise places meant. Then go where you usually sleep at night. [34] Here the room where the person addressed is asked to go is characterised by what takes place there.

Here is an example of a prepositional whereclause denoting place in the literal sense of the term: From where he stood, leaning in an attitude of despair against the parapet of the terrace, Denis had seen them. . . [21] The clause from ... the terrace denotes the place from which the action of the main clause (Denis had seen) was performed. Occasions for this particular way of denoting the place of an action appear to be rather rare. Here, however, is another example: *I gathered up my damp briefcase and ancient mackintosh and made my way down to where a thin penetrating drizzle swept the streets from the direction of the sea [24].*

Here are some more examples: *But Magnus stayed where he was.. .* [32] But Meiklejohn lay where he had fallen. (Idem) *This time she did not wave gaily, but went directly to where he stood ...* [34]

Occasionally a **where clause** can be used together with an adverb indicating place, as in the sentence "*Come on here where I am, honey,*" *Lujean called, at the same time beckoning urgently to her.* [34] The adverbial modifier here would seem to indicate clearly enough where the speaker wants her friend to come, so the clause where I am serves to state the point more emphatically, rather than give any essentially new information [27].

There has been some discussion whether the word where introducing a subordinate clause of place is an adverb or a conjunction. The latter view was suggested by a certain analogy with the conjunction when introducing

clauses of time. However, the possibility of the word where being preceded by the preposition from, as in some of the above examples, is a definite argument against its being a conjunction [28].

The number of sentences with an adverbial clause of place is negligible as compared with those containing an adverbial clause of time. The cause of this is plain enough. It is only in exceptional cases that the speaker or writer deems it necessary to denote the place of an action by referring to another action which occurred at the same place. In the vast majority of cases he will rather indicate the place by directly naming it (at home, in London, at the nearest shop, and so forth). Sentences with adverbial clauses of place are therefore used only in cases where the speaker or writer avoids naming the place of the action, or in sentences of a generalising character, or again in sentences where the place is perhaps hard to define and the name is unimportant [28].

Clauses of place can also be used in a metaphorical sense, that is, the "place" indicated may not be a place at all in the literal meaning of the word but a certain generalised condition or sphere of action. This of course is made clear by the context, that is, by the lexical meanings of the other words in the sentence. Compare the following sentences. *Where people wish to attach, they should always be ignorant.* [30]*Wherever the choice has had to be made between the man of reason and the madman, the world has unhesitatingly followed the madman. [32]* Both the adverb wherever and the meaning of the sentence as a whole show that not a concrete place but a general review of conditions is meant.

Two very well known sentences are also cases in point: the proverb Where there is a will there is a way and the famous line from Thomas Gray's poem "*On a Distant Prospect of Eton College*": *Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise.*

It is of no special importance whether we shall term such clauses of metaphorical meaning clauses of place or invent a new term to denote them. Anyway, there would seem to be no basic objection to give them that name, provided we keep in mind that spatial notions are apt to be interpreted metaphorically [27].

3.2 Clauses of Time (Temporal Clauses)

The number of conjunctions used to introduce temporal clauses is very considerable, and it seems to be growing still at the expense of nouns denoting time units, with the definite article, such as the moment, the instant, etc. Temporal clauses are used much more frequently than clauses of space [25].

On the one hand, time relations are much more varied than space relations. If we want to indicate the time when an action occurred by referring it to another action, the time relations between the two may be various. The one action may be taking place at the very time when the other action was being carried out; or it may have begun a short while after the other action was finished, or it may have ended just as the other action was about to begin, etc., etc [27].

On the other hand, it is a very common occurrence to indicate the time of an action by referring it to the time of another action, with which it happens to be connected either by some causal link or by a fortuitous coincidence in time. The speaker or writer may in many cases use this way of indicating the time of an action, rather than an adverbial modifier of time in a simple sentence (such as, at five o'clock, etc.), because the exact time may be either unknown (this especially refers to actions in the future), or irrelevant. The time relation between the action of the main clause and that of the subordinate clause may be expressed with a very great degree of

exactness: the two actions may be simultaneous, or the one may precede the other, or follow it, or it may last until the other has begun, etc [28].

There is one more point to be noted here. The action of the head clause may be connected with that of the temporal clause by some causal tie, that is, if the action of the temporal clause did not take place, that of the main clause would not take place either; or the connection may be purely temporal, with no causal relation implied. This is especially characteristic of temporal clauses indicating natural phenomena, such as sunrise, sunset, etc., which are not the cause of anything happening in human relations but merely an external method of reckoning time as it passes. The cases of the first kind (with causal relation implied) are to be seen in the following examples: *She made a little curtsy as he bowed...* [43] *So, between sport and pedantry, she was busy enough, and on most nights her eyes closed the minute her head touched the pillow.* (R. WEST) A case of the second kind (with no causal relation implied) is seen in an example of a different character: *As she stood hanging to the sill, a deafening explosion burst on her ears, louder than any cannon she had ever heard.* [43] Of course this difference depends entirely on the lexical meanings of the words making up the main and the subordinate clause.

Occasionally a whenclause indicates an action opposed to that of the main clause, rather than the time when that main action occurred:

Where on earth was the double game, when you've behaved like such a saint? [42]

Here, too, it is the lexical meanings of the words which make the relation clear. Of course a whenclause of this kind can only come after its head clause.

There are two more points to be mentioned in connection with temporal clauses, and they both bear on the temporal clause losing its

subordinate character and tending to become independent of the clause with which it is connected.

One of these is the type of sentence which consists of a clause narrating some situation and followed by a when clause telling of an event which burst into the situation and which is the central point of the whole sentence. Such a when clause always comes after the main clause and this may be considered its grammatical peculiarity. A clear example of this type may be seen in the following sentence: *Judith had just gone into her room and closed the door when she heard a man's voice in the parlour, and in a few minutes she heard the closing of Eve's bedroom door.* [34] It is quite clear here that the when clause does not indicate the time when the action of the first clause took place but contains the statement which is the centre of the whole composite sentence. It is also evident that a whenclause of this kind must necessarily come after the head clause within the composite sentence. Compare also the following passages: It was the middle of the August afternoon when Harry Emory got back to his office at the canning factory after lunch and he felt drowsy and sluggish and downright lazy in the summer heat. [34] Once more, we see from the lexical meanings of the words that the **when clause** does not indicate the time when the action of the other clause took place. It might indeed be argued that it is the other way round: the first clause indicates the time when the action of the when clause took place. This way of constructing the sentence seems to be designed to lay the main stress on the time indication, that is, to mark it out as the rheme of the whole sentence.

In the meanwhile, they proceeded on their journey without any mischance; and were within view of the town of Keynsham, when a halloo from Morland, who was behind them, made his friend pull up, to know what was the matter. [30]That the whenclause does not indicate the time of the action of the main clause but contains the most important information

of the sentence is clear from the character of the predicate were within view, which denotes something static, and of the predicate group made his friend pull up (the subject being a halloo), which indicates a sudden momentary action. Compare also: *The next Friday afternoon Fern was walking slowly along the street in front of the courthouse when Judge Price crossed the lawn.* [34]

In such a sentence the reasons for calling the whenclause a subordinate one are very much weakened. It most certainly does not indicate the time when the action of the first clause took place, nor does it in any way correspond to an adverbial modifier of time in a simple sentence. This appears to be sufficient proof that the whenclause is not a subordinate clause, and the sentence which contains it is not a complex sentence. This might be termed "emancipation" of a subordinate clause.

Another phenomenon of "emancipation" affects clauses introduced by the conjunction while and following the main clause. The conjunction while, as is well known, expresses simultaneity of an action with another action. However, this meaning of simultaneity can, under certain conditions, change into a different meaning altogether. If, say, two people simultaneously perform quite different actions, possibly opposed to one another in character, this state of things may serve to characterise the two people as opposed to each other. This may be the meaning of a sentence like the following: *Magnus briefly outlined the case for the independent sovereignty of Scotland, while Frieda listened without any remarkable interest.* [32] It is clear that the while clause does not here express the time when the action of the first clause took place: it rather expresses an action opposed in its character to the first action, and in this much it serves to characterise the doer of the action. We might here put the conjunction and instead of while and the actual meaning would be the same, though the sentence would now be a compound one. Since, therefore, the function of

the second clause is quite different from the usual function of a subordinate adverbial temporal clause, and since no purely grammatical peculiarities make it necessary to term the second clause a subordinate one, we may say that it is not subordinate and the sentence not complex.

A subordinate clause introduced by the conjunction while may sometimes express contrast, rather than time relation, even when it occupies front position, that is, when it precedes the main clause. Here is an example containing three while clauses of this kind: *Thus, while I have a certain amount of intelligence, I have no aesthetic sense; while I possess the mathematical faculty, I am wholly without, the religious emotions; while I am naturally addicted to venery, I have little ambition and am not at all avaricious.* [21] The lexical meanings of the words, both in the main and in the subordinate clauses, show beyond doubt that the connection between each of the whileclauses and the main clause following it is based not on time but on contrast. The sentence gives a characteristic of the man, and not a description of what he is doing at one time or another. Such examples, though they may not be numerous, go far to show that a **while clause** may express contrast even though it precedes its head clause.

We shall meet with another case of "emancipation" when we come to clauses of concession.

There is some affinity between temporal and causal clauses, and also between temporal and conditional ones.

Causal Clauses

The affinity between temporal and causal clauses is manifested by the fact that both kinds of clauses can be introduced by the conjunction as, and nothing but the context, i. e. the lexical meanings of the words involved, will enable us to tell whether the clause is temporal or causal. Thus the difference between the two kinds is not grammatical in these cases. Let us consider the following two examples: *The rain neither enticed nor*

repelled, but only trickled down his big umbrella off onto the upturned collar of his old army officer jacket as he walked down the path. [33] There obviously cannot be a causal tie between the fact stated in the main clause and that stated in the as clause. As they (Beaumont and Fletcher) are indissolubly associated in the history of English literature, it is convenient to treat of them in one place. (COUSIN) Here the causal connection between the clauses is obvious.

Compare also two since clauses: *For ever since he had fled from Kansas City, and by one humble device and another forced to make his way, he had been coming to the conclusion that on himself alone depended his future* [38], with a clearly temporal meaning, and "So," said Helen, "*since you obviously don't know how to behave in Great Britain, I shall take you back to France directly, you are well enough to travel*" [39], where the connection is causal.

There would be no necessity to analyse the meanings of the words, etc., if the subordinate clause were introduced by a conjunction which can have one meaning only, for instance, the conjunction because. No clause introduced by this conjunction could ever be a temporal clause.

A special problem, which has received much attention, attaches to clauses introduced by the conjunction for. In many ways they are parallel to clauses with because, and we may wonder whether there is any valid reason for saying that because clauses are subordinate and for clauses coordinate. Indeed the following two examples seem to prove the parallelism: *It was Richie who played, for Lucien had discouraging business paper to read.* [39] On earth there may be some truth in this, because the people are uneducated... [42]

But at the same time there is a basic difference between the two types. Becauseclauses indicate the cause of the action expressed in the main clause. They can be used separately as an answer to the question why...?,

as in the following bit of dialogue: "*I must have come." "Why?" "Because I must. Because there would have been no other way."* [42] A for clause could not possibly be used in this way. The reason is that a for clause expresses an additional thought, that is, it is added on to a finished part of the sentence, as in the following extract: "What game are they all playing?" poor Fleda could only ask; for she had an intimate conviction that Owen was now under the roof of his betrothed. [39]

It would also be impossible to replace because by for in the following sentence: *But either because the rains had given a freshness, or because the sun was shedding a most glorious heat, or because two of the gentlemen were young in years and the third young in the spirit — for some reason or other a change came over them.* [45]

This peculiarity of forclauses as distinct from becauseclauses is in full harmony with the fact that forclauses can also come after a full stop, thus functioning as separate sentences, much as sentences introduced by the conjunction but do, as in the following extract: *This thought, together with one other — that once more after dinner he was to see Roberta and in her room as early as eleven o'clock or even earlier — cheered him and caused him to step along most briskly and gaily. For, since having indulged in this secret adventure so many time, both were unconsciously becoming bolder.* [38] The following solutions appear to be plausible:

(1)   forclauses are always coordinate, never subordinate ones,

(2)   forclauses are subordinate ones in all cases, and no objective difference is to be found between them and becauseclauses, (3) for clauses occupy an intermediate position, the difference between coordination and subordination being here neutralised, and tend sometimes toward the one, sometimes toward the other extreme. Possibly the last solution is the most acceptable.

3.3 Conditional Clauses

Conditional clauses may be introduced by several conjunctions such as if (the most general one), unless, provided, supposing (with more specialised meanings), and the phrase in case.

An essential peculiarity of conditional clauses, or, we should rather say, of conditional sentences (including both the main and the subordinate clause), is the use of verbal forms. Here the actual meaning of" a verbal form depends entirely on the syntactical context: it may acquire a meaning which it would never have outside this context.

The classification of conditional sentences is familiar enough. The main types are three: (1) *If we can get to the bicycles, we shall beat him.* [39] (2) *If they could derive advantage from betraying you, betray you they would . . .* (Idem) (3) *If you had been arguing about a football match I should have been ready to take a more lenient view of the case,..* [32]

There may, however, also be other types, with the action of the subordinate clause belonging to the past and its consequence to the present, e. g. *Anyhow, if you hadn't been ill, we shouldn't have you here* [49], etc.

As we have discussed the possible interpretations of forms like knew, had known, should know, should have known in Chapter XI, we need not go into that question here.

Subordinate conditional clauses can also, like some types of clauses considered above, get emancipated and become independent sentences expressing wish. From a sentence like If I had known this in advance 1 should have done everything to help, etc., the conditional clause may be separated and become an independent exclamatory sentence: If I had known this in advance! The conjunction if in such a case apparently ceases to be a conjunction, since there is no other clause here. The conjunction

then becomes a particle typical of this kind of exclamatory sentence. 1 The following examples will illustrate this point: *If only she might play the question loud enough to reach the ears of this Paul Steitler.* [33] Compare the following sentence: *If you will just send that back to him, — without a word.* [48] In the first example it is quite evident that the word if does not connect anything with anything else and can therefore hardly be termed a conjunction at all: it rather approaches the status of a particle used to introduce an exclamatory sentence. As to our second example, things are less clear. It might be possible to assume that this is a subordinate conditional, clause, with a main clause, something like it will be all right, or, perhaps, something like I shall be grateful, but this of course could never be proved to be the case. If that view is rejected, nothing seems to remain but to assume that we have here an independent sentence, which is to all intents and purposes imperative (as it amounts to a request), and that here, too, the conjunction if has practically become a particle used to introduce that sort of sentence. Transition cases of this kind are most valuable for understanding the mechanism, as it were, of grammatical development.

The same is found in the third clause of the following compound sentence: *It's really rather ghastly and one oughtn't to laugh, but if you could see them, my dear.* [49] One might say that this clause is subordinate and that a head clause is "omitted" after it, e. g. you would understand me. But it seems simpler to take the ifclause as an independent clause expressing something like wish and coordinated with the two preceding clauses.

3.4 Clauses of Result

Clauses of result give rise to some discussion, since the distinction between them and some other types of subordinate clauses is in some cases doubtful and to a certain extent arbitrary.

It should first of all be noted that the term "clauses of result" must not be taken to imply that the result was necessarily planned in advance, or that it was consciously aimed at. The result may have been brought about without anybody's intention. So these clauses might be termed "clauses of consequence", but since that term is also liable to different interpretations, we may as well stick to the usual term "clauses of result".

Clauses of result may be connected with the head clause in either of two ways: (1) the clause is introduced by the conjunction that, while in the head clause there is the pronoun such or the adverb so, which is correlative with the conjunction; (2) the subordinate clause is introduced by the phrase so that.

The latter variety does not give rise to any special discussion. Lot us, for instance, take the sentence: *In the centre of the chamber candlesticks were set, also brass, but polished, so that they shone like gold.* (BOWEN, quoted by Poutsma)

The head clause describes a situation, and the subordinate clause says what the result (or consequence) of that action was. 1

Things are somewhat less clear with clauses of the first variety (those introduced by the conjunction that, with a correlative such or so in the head clause). Here two possible ways of interpreting the facts appear. Let us take a sentence with the adverb so in the head clause correlative with the conjunction that introducing the subordinate clause: *She was so far under his influence that she was now inclined to believe him*. [32]

One way to look at this sentence is this: the head clause tells of some state of things, and the subordinate clause of another state of things which came as a result or consequence of the first. Taken in this way, the clause appears as a clause of result. However, that is not the only possible way of taking it. The other way would be this: the subordinate clause specifies the degree of the state of things expressed in the head clause by illustrating the

effect it had. If the sentence is taken in isolation, it is absolutely impossible to tell which of the two views gets closer to the mark. The question might be settled by finding (or adding) a sequel to this sentence, which would make the situation quite clear: one possible sequel would show that the state of things described in the subordinate clause had some interest in itself, so that it was not mentioned merely to illustrate the intensity of the state described in the head clause and in that case the subordinate clause would have to be taken as an adverbial clause of result. With another sequel, it would be obvious that the state of things described in the second clause had no interest as such, but was mentioned exclusively in order to illustrate the degree of the state of things described in the head clause. In that case the clause may be taken as an adverbial clause of degree.

Now reasonings of this sort are quite obviously nongrammatical. They are founded on an examination of a context outside the sentence, and a lexical, not a grammatical context at that. So from the grammatical viewpoint all this is irrelevant. The choice between the two interpretations appears to be arbitrary: neither of the two can be proved to be the only correct one.

It remains now for us to consider the mutual relations between an adverbial clause of result and an adverbial modifier of result in a simple sentence.

Adverbial modifiers of result in a simple sentence are extremely rare. Here is a case in point: *She was shaken almost to tears by her anger.* [33] Taking into account the lexical meanings of the words involved, we may perhaps term the phrase almost to tears an adverbial modifier of result.

In the vast majority of cases the result is an action or a situation which cannot be adequately expressed without a subordinate clause.

2.5 Clauses of Purpose

Clauses expressing purpose may, as is well known, be introduced either by the conjunction that or by the phrase in order that. There is a basic difference between the two variants. A clause introduced by in order that is sufficiently characterised as a clause of purpose, and nothing else is needed to identify it as such. A clause introduced by that, on the other hand, need not necessarily be a clause of purpose: it can also belong to one of several other types. To identify it as a clause of purpose other indications are needed, and the most usual of these is the verb may (might) or should as part of its predicate.

A clause of purpose can also be introduced by the phrase so that, and some special signs are needed to distinguish it from a clause of result.

Let us take as an example the following sentence with two clauses introduced by the phrase so that. *Although slightly nearsighted, Elisabeth, so that nothing might damage the charm of her dark brown eyes, tragic and wide apart under straight brows, wore no glasses but carried instead a miniature lorgnette, for which she now searched in her purse, unobtrusively and on her lap so that Steitler, who was speaking to her son, would not notice.* [33]

Both clauses here are clauses of purpose, not result, and this is seen from the following facts: as to the first clause, its position between the subject of the main clause (Elizabeth), and its predicate (wore), shows beyond doubt that it cannot express result: the result could not possibly be mentioned before the action bringing it about was stated. Another point speaking in favour of the clause being one of purpose is its predicate (might damage). As to the second clause introduced by so that, its position at the end of the sentence does not tell anything about its being a clause of purpose or of result. That it is a clause of purpose is seen from the

predicate (would not notice), which would have no reasonable sense in a clause of result. If we make a slight change and replace the predicate would not notice by did not notice, the clause will decidedly be a clause of result. So the meaning of the clause appears to depend entirely on the verb would.

Compare also the following sentence:

Mrs Cox did not object to this so long as they talked English, so that she could keep a line on the conversation; if it was French, she did not know what they were up to. [39] Here the words talked English and could keep a line point to the meaning of purpose, rather than result.

2.6 Clauses of Concession

These clauses express some circumstance despite which the action of the main clause is performed. They are of several types. One type comprises clauses introduced by the conjunctions though, although, and (in a somewhat highflown style) albeit, which can have no other meaning but the concessive. Another type is represented by clauses of the pattern "predicative (noun or adjective) + as + subject + link verb", in which the concessive meaning is not directly expressed by the conjunction as or, indeed, by any other single word, but arises out of the combined lexical meanings of different words in the sentence.

The first type may be illustrated by such sentences as: *Resolutely she smiled, though she was trembling.* (R. WEST) It does not call for any special comment for the time being. The second type may be seen, for example, in the sentence *Clever as he was, he jailed* to grasp the idea, where the concessive meaning arises from the contrast in meaning between the word clever, on the one hand, and the phrase failed to grasp, on the other. If this needs any proof, it can be provided by the simple expedient of

introducing a change into the head clause, namely, replacing the phrase failed to grasp by the word grasped: Clever as he was, he grasped the idea — here the meaning is causal, rather than concessive, and this of course depends only on the combination of lexical meanings of the words clever and grasped. The pattern of the sentence, with the conjunction as a part of it, merely expresses some kind of connection between what is expressed in the subordinate clause and what is said in the head clause.

Adverbial modifiers of concession are occasionally found in a simple sentence, and the preposition despite or the phrase in spite of is the usual way of introducing them. When the obstacle opposing the performance of the action is some other action, especially when it is performed by another agent, the more usual way of expressing it is by a subordinate clause.

Clauses introduced by the conjunction though can also, in certain circumstances, go beyond their essential concessive meaning; that is, in these circumstances they do not denote an action or situation in spite of which the action of the other clause takes place. Such clauses may be emancipated, that is, they may acquire an independent standing, and even become a separate sentence, as in the following example:

I suppose that I am ticketed as a Red there now for good and will be on the general blacklist. Though you never know. You never can tell. [41]

The sentence *Though you never know* does not express an obstacle to the statement contained in the preceding sentence, but a new idea, or an afterthought limiting what had been said before.

The second type of concessive clause is seen in the following sentences: . . . *and great as was Catherine's curiosity, her courage was not equal to a wish of exploring them (the mysterious apartments. — B. I.) after dinner.* [30]It is the combination of lexical meanings great ... curiosity, courage . . . not equal that shows the meaning to be concessive. But deplorable as it might be, and undoubtedly was, there was another

aspect of the case that more vitally concerned himself. It is the words *another* and *more vitally* that point to the concessive meaning.

Compare also: *And yet somewhere through all this gentleness ran a steel cord, for his staff was perpetually surprised to find out that, inattentive as he appeared to be, there was no detail of the business which he did not know; while hardly a transaction he made did not turn out to be based on a stroke of judgement.* (DURRELL)

Another type again may be seen in a sentence like this: *Coinciding with his holiday inclinations this request might have been successful in whatever words it had been couched.* [32]

Here it seems to be the meaning of the pronoun *whatever* which lies at the bottom of the concessive meaning of the clause.

Let us now turn to the question of clauses of manner and comparison and adverbial modifiers in a simple sentence.

It is quite clear from the outset that a clause of comparison or manner is used when an action described in the head clause is to be characterised by comparing it to some other action. Adverbial modifiers in a simple sentence give only limited possibilities for this. They can be used to express that sort of idea if the comparison is not, strictly speaking, between the actions themselves but between different subjects performing the same action. This particular kind of comparison may indeed be expressed with the help of the conjunction *like*, as in the following example: *I never see a young, woman in any station conduct herself like you have conducted yourself.* [38] This usage belongs to low colloquial style.

A similar kind of idea can also be expressed by means of a dependent appendix introduced by the conjunction *as*. In fact in some cases the difference between a simple sentence with a dependent appendix of this type and a complex sen tence with a subordinate clause of comparison

appears to be very slight: one may be changed into the other by merely adding or dropping the corresponding form of the verb do or be: He works as efficiently as you (do), He was as excited as she (was), etc. It is therefore natural that sentences without the form of do or be should have been considered as elliptical, with the verb "understood". However, as we have adopted the principle of not admitting ellipsis unless this is strictly necessary, we have chosen to treat those sentences (without do or be) as simple ones with a dependent appendix. So, accordingly, comparing them now with the complex sentences, we may state that the difference in such cases appears to be stylistic rather than anything else. The complex sentences are somewhat more literary in style than the simple ones with the dependent appendix introduced by the conjunction as.

The same considerations apply to the subordinate clauses with the conjunction that and simple sentences with a dependent appendix introduced by the same conjunction: compare I am taller than he (is), He works better than they (do), etc.

Chapter 3. Object and attributive clauses in English

3.1 Structure and function of object and attributive clauses

Object clauses are less easily defined and less easily recognizable than either subject or predicative clauses. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that views differ as to what the limits of the notion "object clause" should be. We may try to apply the same criterion that worked well in the case of subject and predicative clauses, viz. omit the subordinate clause and see what part of the sentence is missing and by what part of a simple sentence the vacant position might be occupied. But we shall not always arrive at a clear decision.

The easiest cases are those in which the subordinate clause can be replaced by a noun which would then be an object in a simple sentence. This applies, for instance, to sentences of the type *He bought what he wanted. If we drop the subordinate clause what he wanted we get the unfinished sentence He bought .. .*, which has no definite meaning until we add some word that will function as an object. This may of course be any noun denoting a thing that can be bought, for instance, He bought a briefcase. The similarity in syntactical position between a briefcase and the subordinate clause what he wanted appears to be sufficient reason for saying that what he wanted is an object clause. Compare the following example: *Owen had grown larger to her: he would do, like a man, whatever he should have to do.* [39]

The same may be said about the sentence Tom may marry whom he likes. 1 Here the clause whom he likes may be replaced by any noun that will fit into the context, for instance, by any feminine name: Tom may marry Jane, where Jane will be an object. This, again, seems sufficient reason for stating that the clause whom he likes is an object clause: its

syntactical function is the same as that of the noun Jane which we put in its place. This sentence differs from the preceding in one respect: the subordinate clause may be eliminated without the sentence becoming impossible or incomplete: Tom may marry. This of course depends on the meaning of the verb marry, which in the sense 'enter upon a married state' does not necessarily require a noun or pronoun to make the meaning of the sentence complete.

Here are some more examples: *And Cecil was welcome to bring whom he would into the neighbourhood.* [45] *But Steitler, no more than six or seven years the older as Motley correctly guessed, had made use of his seniority by developing what Motley was quick to recognise as a definite way with him, a generally constant manner under cover — or in easy despite — of which he met the world, was recognised always as quite uniquely himself.* [33] The object clause coming after developing seems to go on as far as the noun manner, where a subordinate clause of the second degree begins, namely an attributive one to this noun. Object clauses of this type are very characteristically English, and in translating such sentences into another language, for example, into Russian, the turn of the sentence has usually to be changed altogether. Compare also: Fes, my father can seldom be prevailed on to give the waters what I think a fair trial. [30]Give somebody (something) a fair trial is a phraseological unit, with both nominal elements in it necessary for its existence. This has not prevented, in the last example, the substitution of an object clause (what I call a fair trial) for the phrase a fair trial. This plainly shows that the subordinate clause is here exactly similar in function to the object in a simple sentence, and that the term "object clause" is therefore fully justified.

There is also another type of object clause. This is found in sentences having in the main clause a predicate verb which combines almost

exclusively with object clauses and only with a very few possible objects (within a simple sentence). A typical verb of this kind is the verb say. Compare the following example: *She could not say what it was.* [44] If we drop the subordinate clause we get the unfinished sentence *She could not say. . .* The words that can come after the verb say and perform the function of object in a simple sentence are very few indeed: these are chiefly the pronouns this, that, anything, everything, and the noun the truth.

On the whole it may be said that subordinate clauses are much more characteristic of the verb say than an object in a simple sentence.

The same may be said about the verb ask. If we take the sentence *She asked whether this was true, and drop the subordinate clause, we shall get the unfinished sentence She asked. . .* The possibilities of completing this sentence by means of an object within the framework of a simple sentence are again very limited: there may be the pronouns this, that, something, nothing, and the noun a question. In this case, too, a subordinate clause is much more characteristic of the verb than an object in a simple sentence. Compare also the following example: *He merely suggested that Motley's peculiar gifts tended to make him animate and inflate whatever might, seem to him the most appealing among the host of potentialities attending any unextraordinary human situation; that if, as certainly might be the case, there were validity in his suspicions, he, Tristram, could be no more than very interested to hear of it.* [33] The object clause, whatever might seem to him the most appealing among the host of potentialities attending any unextraordinary human situation, is rather long; yet it does not produce any difficulty for the reader to identify the that which comes immediately after it as a conjunction parallel to the first that (the one coming after suggested) and, consequently, to range the clause introduced

by the second that as standing on the same level as the first thatclause (that Motley's peculiar gifts. . .).

The idea will naturally suggest itself of treating the subordinate clause as the typical element following the verb say or ask, rather than as something to be defined by comparing it to an object in a simple sentence.

Now let us pass on to the verbs with which a subordinate clause is the only formation that can follow them to express the contents of the action expressed by the verb.

The verb exclaim is a case in point. Completing it by a word functioning as an object in a simple sentence is impossible: none of the words suggested for the verbs say and ask will do here. Neither the pronouns this, that, something, everything, nor any noun could come after the verb exclaim. So if we apply the criterion which served for the preceding verbs, we cannot find an object of this kind in a simple sentence with this verb and argue that, since the subordinate clause is identical in function to that object, it is bound to be an object clause. The argument in favour of the view that it is an object clause would then have to be more farfetched and it would have to be something like this: the subordinate clause after the verb exclaim is an object clause because its syntactical function is similar to that of the subordinate clause after the verb say or ask, and that clause is to be recognised as an object clause because its function is the same as that of a few pronouns and nouns which can come after the verb say or ask in a simple sentence.

Now this argument may or may not be found convincing. If it is, all clauses of this kind after the verbs exclaim, wonder, and a number of other verbs will have to be accepted as object clauses (which of course is the traditional view). If it is not found convincing the subordinate clauses after such verbs will have to be taken as a special type of clauses, which in this case will not fit into the system of subordinate clause parallel to parts of a

simple sentence but will have to be organised on some other principle. They might be termed "subordinate clauses of indirect speech". This is a possible view but it entails some inconvenience. In the first place, this type of clause would remain outside the system which is based on analogy with parts of a simple sentence; secondly, if we recognise clauses of indirect speech as a separate type, we shall obviously have to include in it the clauses following the verbs say, ask, etc. as well, though with these verbs a few pronouns and nouns are possible as objects in a simple sentence.

In this case, as in so many others, no binding decision is possible: the solution a scholar arrives at will largely depend on his own opinion of the relative value of the arguments brought forward in favour of this or that view.

Occasionally an object clause may come before the main clause: .. .*whatever courtesy I have shown to Mrs Hurtle in England I have been constrained to show her.* [48] In this example the object clause, which of course depends on the predicate have been constrained to show of the head clause, comes first. This is a clear indication that the object clause represents the theme of the sentence, whereas the rheme is represented by the head clause, and the most important element in this rheme is of course the word constrained. In fact the essential meaning of the sentence might have been put briefly in these words: *My courtesy to Mrs Hurtle was constrained.* In that case the theme would be represented by the subject group, and the rheme by the predicate.

In speaking of object clauses, special attention must be paid to clauses introduced by prepositions. These clauses may be termed prepositional object clauses, on the analogy of prepositional objects in a simple sentence.

We must note that a prepositional object in a simple sentence does not always correspond to a prepositional object clause: for instance, the verb

insist, which always combines with the preposition on (or upon) in a simple sentence, never has this preposition when followed by an object clause.

Most verbs, however, which combine with a preposition in a simple sentence, do so in a complex sentence as well: a case in point is the verb depend, which always combines with the preposition on (or upon), no matter what follows: compare It depends on what you will say, It depends on whether you will come. Here are some examples: *The conversation was as brief and uncomplicated as that, freed from whatever implication the memory of their earlier encounter might have added to it.* [33] This is a peculiarly English way of putting it, and it appears to be more idiomatic than the other way, which, however, is also possible, namely, The conversation was as brief and uncomplicated as that, freed from any implication that the memory of their earlier encounter might have added to it.

The following example is very illuminating since a prepositional clause going with the verb think is then followed by prepositional objects within the main clause: *He thought for a few minutes of what she had said — of Arthur's rottenness — socially and personally — and of all that they stood for — individually alive, socially progressive.* [49] As the prepositional clause of what she had said stands on the same syntactic level as the prepositional phrases of Arthur's rottenness and of all that they stood for (the latter including an attributive subordinate clause), it is quite clear that their functions are identical, that is, the clause is an object clause.

A prepositional clause is also found in this sentence from a novel by A. Trollope: *After what had passed, young Round should have been anxious to grind Lucius Mason into powder, and make money of his very bones!* After what had passed clearly performs the same function in the

sentence that would be performed, say, by the prepositional phrase after these events in a simple sentence. Since that prepositional phrase would have been an adverbial modifier of time (and this is seen from the lexical meanings of the words making it up), the same function must be ascribed to the prepositional clause that we have here.

Compare also the following example: *He questioned me on what Caroline had said.* (SNOW) By substituting a phrase for the clause introduced by the preposition on, we get a simple sentence with a prepositional object, e. g. He questioned me on Caroline's opinion. So the prepositional clause is clearly shown to be the equivalent, in a complex sentence, of a prepositional object in a simple one. Compare also the following example: *How far back did you burrow, Julia? To when our hearts were young and gay at Wellesley?* [41]

An example of the syntactical equivalence of a word (or phrase) and a clause is also seen in the following sentence.

Vitiate the minds or what pass for the minds of the people with education, teach them to read and write, feed their imaginations with sexual and criminal fantasies known as films, and then starve them in order to pay for these delightful erotic celluloids. [49] What pass for the minds stands obviously in the same relation as the minds, on the one hand to the words of the people with education, and on the other to the verb vitiate, to which both of them are objects. The syntactic equivalence of the noun the minds and the clause what pass for the minds is made especially clear by this syntactical tie in two directions. Such examples as these are the strongest argument in favour of classifying subordinate clauses on the same principle as parts of a simple sentence.

In our next example there are no homogeneous parts of this kind, but otherwise the function of the subordinate clause is seen very clearly: *I could not write what is known as the popular historical biography.* [49]

The corresponding simple sentence would be, I could not write a popular historical biography. So, if we term the noun a biography the direct object in the latter sentence, there seems to be no reason whatever to deny that the subordinate clause in the former sentence is an object clause. Compare also: I've no doubt about that he is an estimable young man, but I knew nothing about him except what you have told me. [32]

Such sentences may be cited as an argument for recognising noun clauses" in Modern English. It is clear that constructions of this kind are only possible if prepositions in a language do not require any special case and may be followed by practically any kind of word, including a conjunction.

The specific qualities of an object clause as distinct from an object in a simple sentence are not difficult to state.

An object clause (clauses of indirect speech included) is necessary when the notion to be expressed cannot conveniently be summed up in a noun, or a phrase with a noun as its head word, or a gerund and a gerundial phrase, but requires an explicit predicative unit, that is, a subject and a predicate of its own. Or, to put it in a different way: an object clause is necessary when what is to be added to the predicate verb is the description of a situation, rather than a mere name of a thing.

In some cases, though, an object in a simple sentence may have a synonymous object clause, as in the following cases: I heard of his arrival — I heard that he had arrived, etc. The meaning of the two sentences in each case is exactly the same, but there is a certain stylistic difference: the simple sentence with the prepositional object sounds rather more literary or even bookish than the complex sentence with the object clause, which is fit for any sort of style.

A peculiar case of a prepositional object clause is seen in this sentence: *George had drunk a. cup of coffee with himself and Simon that*

morning, had told them of a play he planned to write, then, on to the subject of his weekend, all that he had seen, a good amount of what he had thought or wanted people to think that he had thought, and to the description of a, young man named Steitler. [33] The noun amount is head word to a prepositional clause, with two homogeneous predicates, had thought, and wanted; with the second of these predicates there is the complex object people to think, and the infinitive to think is head word to an object clause, that he had thought. Now this had thought in the object clause is understood to have as its object the pronoun what which immediately follows the words amount of. Thus, the word what, while being part of the firstdegree subordinate clause, is object to the predicate of the seconddegree clause.

3.2 Attributive clauses

A subordinate clause is said to be attributive if its function in the complex sentence is analogous to that of an attribute in a simple sentence. It differs from an attribute in so far as it characterises the thing denoted by its head word through some other action or situation in which that thing is involved. This could not, in many cases at least, be achieved within the limits of a simple sentence. Compare, for example, the sentence By *October Isabelle was settled in the house where, she intended, she would live until she died*. (R. WEST) The clause where ... she would live with the dependent clause until she died contains information which could not be compressed into an attributive phrase within a simple sentence.

It is common knowledge that attributive clauses can be defining (or restrictive, or limiting) and non-defining (or non-restrictive, or descriptive). The non-defining ones do not single out a thing but contain some additional information about the thing or things denoted by the head

word, e. g. Magnus, who was writing an article for Meiklejohns newspaper, looked up and said, "*That's an interesting little essay, isn't it?*" [32] Non-defining attributive clauses pose the question of boundary line between subordination and coordination, which in this case becomes somewhat blurred. This is especially evident in the so-called continuative clauses, which are used to carry the narrative a step further, namely in sentences like the following: But in the morning he went to see Meiklejohn, whose enthusiasm on hearing the news was very comforting. [32] We shall have the governess in a day or two, which will be a great satisfaction. (BAIN, quoted by Poutsma) Sentences of this kind may be taken as specimens of subordination weakened and a subordinate clause passing on to something like a coordinate position in the sentence. We shall see other varieties of this development in our next chapter.

The question about the place of an attributive clause deserves a few remarks. Most usually, of course, an attributive clause comes immediately after its head word. This is too common to need illustration. But that is by no means an absolute rule. Sometimes an attributive clause will come, not immediately after its head word, but after some other word or phrase, not containing a noun. This is the case, for instance, in the following sentence: *He wanted Ann to die, whom his son passionately loved, whom he had himself once come near to loving.* (SNOW) The intervening infinitive to die, coming between the attributive clauses and their head word Ann, does not in any way impede the connection between them.

A different kind of separation is found in the following sentence: Jeremy saw the scene breaking upon him that he had dreaded all day and he felt no energy to withstand it. [49] The subordinate clause that he had dreaded all day has the noun scene as its head word. Now this noun forms part of the complex object the scene breaking upon him. No ambiguity is created by the separation, as the subordinate clause cannot possibly refer to

the pronoun him, and there is no noun between scene and the subordinate clause. That the word that is the relative pronoun and not the conjunction, is seen from the fact that dreaded, being a transitive verb, has no object coming after it; that the phrase all day is not an object is obvious because if the thing denoted by it were thought of as the object of the action the phrase must have been all the day.

3.3 Appositional clauses and parenthetical clauses

Speaking of the simple sentence and its parts, we recognised the apposition as a special part of the sentence, not as a variety of an attribute. In a similar way, we will treat appositional clauses as a special type of subordinate clauses, not as a variety of attributive clauses, though they have some features in common with these.

Appositional clauses always modify a noun, usually an abstract noun, such as fact, thought, idea, question, suggestion, and the like. An appositional clause is introduced by the conjunction that (never by the pronoun that), by the conjunction whether, and its meaning is to show what idea, thought, or question, etc., is spoken of.

Here is a typical example: *"One suffers so much," Denis went on, "from the fact that beautiful words don't always mean what they ought to mean."* [21]

In this sentence it is the grammatical context that shows that the word that introducing the subordinate clause is a conjunction, not a relative pronoun. It cannot be a relative pronoun, because it cannot be the subject of the clause since there is a subject (the beautiful words), and it cannot be the object either, since there is an object clause to the predicate don't mean. So it cannot be a part of the clause and it can only be a conjunction introducing the clause.

Compare also this sentence:

I had little hope that my reproof would get through so easily; and it did not. [49]

An appositional clause may be separated from its head word, as in the following example:

But he did announce his opinion to his daughter-in-law that the ends of justice would so be best promoted, and that if the matter were driven to a trial it would not be for the honour of the court that a false verdict should be given. [48]

The two appositional clauses, that the ends of justice would so be best promoted, and that . . . it would not be for the honour of the court, with the two subordinate clauses of the second degree of subordination attached to it, obviously have the noun opinion as their head word. However, the first of the appositional clauses is separated from its head word by the phrase to his daughter-in-law. No ambiguity can arise here, as the lexical meanings of the words contained in the appositional clauses show that the clauses cannot possibly have daughter-in-law as their head word: that combination would make no sense. So here again, as in the other examples we have considered, separation of the subordinate clause from its head word is permissible where the lexical meanings of the words prevent any ambiguity or misunderstanding.

In the following example the appositional clause is separated from its head word by a verb:

But before Scarlett could start the two on their homeward journey, news came that the Yankees had swung to the south and were skirmishing along the railroad between Atlanta and Jonesboro. [43]

The subordinate clause, that the Yankees ... Jonesboro, of course has the noun news as its head word, and the predicate verb came cannot obscure the relation.

The same is found in the following sentence, where the appositional clause introduced by the conjunction whether is separated from the noun word, to which it belongs, by the adverbial modifier now.

They're waiting for Sir Robert's word now whether old Smokey's got to go. [49]

In our treatment of parenthetical clauses, we will follow the lines set down for treatment of parentheses in a simple sentence: we will distinguish parenthetical clauses from inserted clauses and state that their function is the same as that of parentheses in a simple sentence.

The relation between parenthetical and subordinate clauses gives rise to some discussion. The traditional view held by most grammarians was that parentheses are not parts of a simple sentence but are outside it, and in a similar way parenthetical clauses were held not to be an organic part of a complex sentence and, consequently, not to be subordinate clauses but to be outside the structure of the sentence. In the same way that we have abandoned this view with reference to parentheses in a simple sentence, and recognised them as parts of the sentence, we will abandon the traditional view with regard to parenthetical clauses, and we will treat them as subordinate clauses of a special kind. This view is confirmed by the fact that the same conjunction as which we found introducing attributive, temporal, causal, and other types of clauses, can also introduce a parenthetical clause of a very familiar type exemplified by the following sentence: *Catherine endeavoured to persuade her, as she was herself persuaded, that her father and mother would never oppose their son's wishes.* [30]The clause introduced by the conjunction that is here subordinated to the main clause, and at the same time it is also subordinated to the asclause, which is apparently a kind of parenthetical clause (having also a shade of meaning of comparison). In this way it is at

the same time a firstdegree subordinate clause from one viewpoint, and a second degree clause from another.

The following example is also instructive: Hope, if it was Hope, had not heard him, and the chances of their ever meeting again were as slight as they were unimportant to him. [33] Let us consider what will be changed if the ifclause is dropped. What will be actually lost is the information that he was not quite certain whether it was Hope after all. If it was not she, he could not assert that she had not heard him. So this ifclause curiously vacillates between a conditional and a parenthetical clause, and of course no choice between the two is here possible on grammatical, or, indeed, on any other grounds.

There appears to be no reason to deny that a parenthetical clause of this kind is a subordinate clause. If this view is endorsed there is every reason to suppose that a sentence consisting of a main and a parenthetical clause is a usual kind of complex sentence.

Parenthetical clauses introduced without any conjunction do not belong here and they will be considered in the chapter on asyndetic composite sentences.

CONCLUSION

The given qualification paper was dedicated to the study of nature of utterances (message) in English grammar and the role of clause types in expanding message and delivering full, valid communication.

We said earlier in this introduction that humans need syntax in order to compose complex messages. Messages convey meaning, but elementary syntax books typically begin by stating forcibly one central important point: you cannot analyse syntax coherently and consistently by appealing in the first place to the meaning of words, phrases, clauses and sentences. All verbs in English declarative clauses require a noun to their left; even where the buyers are known, they must be mentioned by means of a noun. Verbs also require a noun to their right. Without one, the clause in which they occur is incomplete and the message conveyed by the clause is incomplete for speakers of English.

In the course of our research we discovered that When a speaker interacts with others to exchange information, or to influence their behaviour and get things done, she adopts for herself a certain role, such as 'questioner' and, in doing so, assigns a complementary role, such as 'informant', to her addressee. Unless the conversation is very one-sided, the roles of 'questioner' and 'informant' tend to alternate between the interlocutors engaged in a conversation. The clause is the major grammatical unit used by speakers to ask questions, make statements and issue directives. The exchange of information is typically carried out by the indicative mood or clause type.

On the basis of our study and according to the modern literature on English grammar and linguistics we outlined the following conclusions:
- The term 'sentence' is widely used to refer to quite different types of unit. Grammatically, it is the highest unit and consists of one independent clause, or two or more related clauses.

Orthographically and rhetorically, it is that unit which starts with a capital letter and ends with a full stop, question mark or exclamation mark.

- 'Complex sentence' is the term we shall use to refer to a unit consisting minimally of two clauses of equal status, or two clauses of unequal status. Coordinated clauses and those in an appositional relationship have equal status. Dependent clauses have an unequal status with respect to a main clause.

- In everyday uses of English, people various patterns and types of clauses.

In our research we considered adverbial clause as the main clause type which serve in expanding message in communication between people.

We also discovered the following points regarding the function of clauses:

- The clauses which comprise a complex sentence are related in two different ways: syntactically and semantically;

- Syntactic relationships are basically of equivalence, holding between clauses of equal status, or of non-equivalence, holding between clauses of unequal status;

- The semantic relations are grouped under the notion of expansion, by which one clause expands the meaning of another in some way.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE

1. Burt Angela. A to Z Correct English. – How to books LTD. 2002. – 203 p.

2. Carstairs-McCarthy Andrew. An Introduction to English Morphology. – Edinburgh University Press, 2002. – 160 p.

3. Chesterton

4. Eastwood John. Oxford Guide to English Grammar. – Oxford Univ. Press. 1994. – 453 p.

5. Downing Angela. English Grammar. A University Course. – Routledge. 2006. – 640 p.

6. Eckersley C.E. A Concise English Grammar for Foreign Students. – Longmans. 1958. – 149 p.

7. Falk Y.N. Lexical Functional Grammar. – Cambridge Univ. Press. 2000. – 241 p.

8. Goold Brown. The Grammar of English Grammars. - EBook #11615 // http://www.gutenberg.org

9. Kroeger R. Paul. Analyzing Grammar. – Cambridge Univ. Press. 2005. – 383 p.

10. Miller Jim. An Introduction to English Syntax. – Edinburgh University Press, 2002. – 206 p.

11. Newson Mark. Basic English Syntax. - Bölcsész Konzorcium, 2006.-477 p.

12. Radford Andrew. An English Syntax. Introduction. - Cambridge Univ. Press, 2004. - 258 p.

13. Teschner Richard. Analyzing the Grammar of English. – Georgetown Univ. Press. 2007. – 246 p.

14. Valeika Laimitus. An Introductory Course in Theoretical English Grammar. – Vilnius. 2003. – 135 p.

15. Wekker Herman. A Modern Course in English Syntax. – Routledge, London. 1996. – 201 p.

16. Блох М.Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. – Москва, 1981. – 383 с.

17. Винокур О. Введение в изучение филологических наук. – Москва, 2000. – 176 с.

18. Волкова Л.М. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. – Киев, 1999. – 30 с.

19. Иванова И.П. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. – Москва, 1981. – 287 с.

20. Ильиш Б.А. Строй современного английского языка. – Ленинград, 1971. – 363 с.

21. Каушанская В.Л., Ковнер Р.Л. A Grammar of the English Language. – Москва, 2008. – 381 с.

22. Каушанская В.Л., Ковнер Р.Л. Грамматика английского языка. – Ленинград, 1963. – 322 с.

23. Корунец И.В. Сравнительная типология Английского и украинских языков. – Киев, 2003. – 379 с.

24. Раевская Н.М. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. – Киев, 1976. – 292 с.

25. Рейман Е.А. Английский артикль. Коммуникативная функция. – Ленинград, 1988. – 88 с.

26. Хорнби А.С. Конструкции и обороты английского языка. – Москва, 1992. – 336 с.

27. Смирницкий А. Синтаксис английского языка. – Москва, 1957. – 284 с

28. Хаймович Б.С., Роговская И. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка (на английском языке). – Москва, 1966. – 288 с.

Works cited

29. Aldridge J. Signed with Their Honour (Brown, Little & Co, 1942)

30. Austen J. Pride and Prejudivce. http://www.gutenberg.org

31. Aldington R. Death of a Hero // http://www.gutenberg.org

32. Bates H.E. The Two Sisters (1926) // http://www.gutenberg.org

33. Bennett A. My Father Knew Lloyd George, 1965 // http://www.gutenberg.org

34. Caldwell E. The Bastard (1929)

35. Chesterton G. The Napoleon of Notting Hill, UK: DMU.

36. Coppard A.E. The Black Dog and Other Stories (1926)

37. Canadian Tribune // http://www.canadiantribune.ca

38. Dickens Ch. David Copperfield. http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net

39. Dreiser T. An American Tragedy. http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net

40. Greene G. The Silent American. http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net

41. Galsworthy, John. http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net

42. Hemingway E. A Farewell to Arms

43. Joyce J. Ulysses // http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net

44. Lawrence, H.D. The Trespasser (1912)

45. Maugham S. The Man with the Scar http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net

46. Mitchell M. Gone with the Wind

47. Murdoch, Iris. The Unicorn http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net

48. Moring Star // http://www.morningstaronline.co.uk/

49. Spark M. The Comforters (1957) http://www.cummingsstudyguides.net

50. Trollope A. An Eye for an Eye (1879)