MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIALIZED EDUCATION
OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN
GULISTAN STATE UNIVERSITY

The English Language and Literature department.

Gadjiyeva Arzu ’s qualification work on speciality 5220100, English philology on the theme:

“Analysis of English Language.Clause Structure”

Supervisor: M. M. Fozilov

Gulistan-2015

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

Actuality of the qualification paper. Importance of English language as a foreign language is increasing day by day. Nowadays, number of learners of English language is more than ever in our country. This situation can be explained by the worldwide importance of English language and its being the main medium of communication, commerce and diplomacy.

It is widely accepted that English grammar is not as difficult as other foreign languages like German, French and Spanish and others which are learnt in our country. But still there are some crucial points in English grammar, especially in its syntactic structure that requires careful consideration and further studies. One of the points to be discussed is the clause structure of the English language, which is in most cases difficult to comprehend for the learners of this language. Thus, the given qualification set the aim of deeper consideration and explanation of basic forms, structures and functions of clauses in the English language.

The goal of the research is to analyze the structure of English clauses and define the role of English clauses.

According to the main aim of the research we set the following **tasks**:

- to define the concept of clause in English grammar;
- to study basic patterns of English clauses;
- to investigate the structural characteristics of clauses;
- to define the place of subordination and coordination in clause structures;
- to make relevant conclusion about the structural characteristics of basic types of the English clauses.

Object of our research is structure of English clauses.

Subject of our research is basic types of the English clauses.

Novelty of the research. In analyzing and reviewing coursebooks and other relevant materials on the English grammar we noticed that in most cases the structure of English clauses was not the object of study of grammarians and linguists. Thus the present qualification is the first attempt to define structural characteristics of clauses in the English language. In addition we reviewed and defined the role of auxiliaries in forming clauses, the types of clause subordination and coordination and the structure of basic clauses of the English language.

Practical value of the qualification work. The materials of the qualification paper is of practical importance in the courses such as Theoretical Grammar of the English Language, Stylistics and Text Interpretation, Comparative Typology of English and other languages. Students may use the materials of the work in doing their project works, writing their course works and synopses.

Theoretical value of the qualification paper can be determined by the systematic overview of theoretical works dedicated to the study of English syntax with special attention to clauses and clause types in the English language.

Structure of the qualification work. The work consists of introduction, the main body, conclusion and the bibliography.

The first chapter reviews opinions of grammarians in defining the notion of clause and presents analysis of these opinions with examples.

The second chapter is on the basic types of English clauses and their structures.

The third chapter is dedicated to the words that help to build clauses and which are of primary importance in clause structures.

Chapter I. Definition of Clause in English Grammar

1.1 Defining the Clause Structure of the English Language

Clause is a group of words that contains a subject and a predicate. Adjective: clausal. A clause may be either a sentence (an independent clause) or a sentence-like construction within another sentence (a dependent or subordinate clause).

What Is a Clause?

Let’s consider the following sentence:

Tom married Amy when he was 19.

The string Tom married Amy could be a complete sentence on its own; the additional string, when he was 19, could not be a complete sentence on its own. It is a clause. A clause is a sentence-like construction contained within a sentence. The construction when he was 19 is 'sentence-like' in the sense that we can analyse it in terms of the major sentence elements (subject, verb, etc. . . .). It has its own subject (he), it has a verb (was), and it has a subject complement [19]. In addition to these major sentence elements, it has the subordinating conjunction when, which tells us that the clause is a subordinate clause."

Types of Clauses and Types of Sentences

- "We cannot walk alone."

(Martin Luther King, Jr., "I Have a Dream")

Note: "We cannot walk alone" is an independent clause--also known as a main clause. This construction is a simple sentence.

- "All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others."

(George Orwell, Animal Farm)

Note: Orwell's sentence contains two independent clauses joined by the conjunction "and." This combination is called a compound sentence.

- "A woman must have money and a room of her own if she is to write fiction."

(Virginia Woolf, "A Room of Her Own")

Note: Woolf's sentence begins with an independent clause--"A woman must have money and a room of her own"--and ends with an adverb clause. This combination is called a complex sentence [13, 221].

- "Life moves pretty fast. If you don't stop and look around once in a while, you could miss it."

(Ferris Bueller's Day Off)

Note: "Life moves pretty fast" and "you could miss it" are independent clauses. "If you don't stop and look around once in a while" is an adverb clause. Therefore, Ferris's first sentence is simple; his second sentence is complex.

- "I was more independent than any farmer in Concord, for I was not anchored to a house or farm, but could follow the bent of my genius, which is a very crooked one, every moment." [12, 23]

(Henry David Thoreau)

Note: Thoreau's sentence contains two independent clauses joined by the conjunction "for"; the second independent clause is interrupted by an adjective clause--"which is a very crooked one." This combination is called a compound-complex sentence.

Clauses and Phrases

"Clause contrasts with sentence. Except in the case of a whole sentence, which is technically said to be also a clause, a clause is always smaller than the sentence that contains it [12, 23].

"Clause also contrasts with phrase. Clauses contain phrases. Clauses are bigger than the simple phrases they contain. The crucial characteristic

of a clause, which is lacking from a phrase, is that a clause normally has its own verb and all or many of the other basic ingredients of a whole sentence. So Billy's brand new bicycle and on Sunday morning at ten o'clock are both phrases but not clauses, because neither contains a verb.. [12, 23]

"Clauses can themselves be contained in complex phrases; such clauses are always, by definition, subordinate clauses." [12, 23]

In English, selecting and grouping in attention can be accomplished by the contrastive use of clause types, as, for example, transitive versus equative:

(1) John saw the dog yesterday.

(2) John is the one who saw the dog yesterday.

Within the clause, subject position may be used to focus material, as in the following equative set:

(3) The ond who saw the dog yesterday is John.

(4) The dog is what John saw yesterday.

(5) Yesterday is when John saw the dog.

(6) The time when John saw the dog was yesterday.

(7) What John saw yesterday was the dog.

(8) Seeing the dog yesterday was what John did [12, 23].

Various changes of detail are involved in this general placement in subject position. In (4), 'the dog* can be placed there without change of that noun phrase, but the substitute 'what' replaces it, in the complement, before 'John saw'. 'Yesterday' as subject is replaced by 'when' in the complement of (5). But when 'yesterday' becomes the total complement in (6), the subject noun phrase must be given a generic head, 'the time' modified by the relativized original clause with the time replaced by 'when'. Other changes can also be seen within the equative. [14, 231]

If, however, the focussed element is moved outside the clause, to a preclause position in the sentence, a different construction results.

(9) As for John, he saw the dog yesterday.

(10) As for the dog, John saw it yesterday.

(11) As for yesterday, that is when John saw the dog.

On the other hand, a multi-level relation can be seen, when a constituent is moved out from the clause into the sentence margin, but with no replacement of pronoun into the emptied slot. This results, according to the present analysis, in a simultaneous function of the focussed constituent in the new sentence function and in the old clause function, as in (12) and (13). [14, 123]

(12) The dog, John saw yesterday.

(13) Yesterday, John saw the dog.

Phonological components, including stress grouping and placement, are also critically involved in attention, emphasis, and sequence coherence. We have not only the subtle [14, 123]:

(14) John is the one who came.

(15) John is the one who came, but the discourse acceptable

(16) Who came? John came.

(17) Who came? John came.

In the grammatical area, however, there is a further subtlety: a constituent can be moved from a marginal (time, degree, location, purpose, result) part of the clause or the sentence directly into the nucleus (subject, predicate, object, indirect object of person or location) of the clause. Compare illusfration (18), where the clause nucleus is in parentheses, and 'water' in the sentence margin, with (19) where 'water' is now the object in the clause nucleus [14, 123].

(18) (She wrung the clothes) yesterday so that water came out.

(19) (She wrung water out of the clothes) yesterday.

In (20) 'John' is object in the clause nucleus, and 'the difficulty' part of a prepositional phrase in the sentence margin. In (21), 'the difficulty* becomes clause object and 'on John' becomes a special variety of indirect object (by criteria not discussed here, but implied in our tree diagram presently) [14, 123].

(20) (Others blamed John) because of the difficulty.

(21) (Others blamed the difficulty on John).

Compare also (22) with (23), where marginal qualiiy-in-time becomes characte- ristic-of-the-subject of an equative clause.

(22) (My sister married) when she was young.

(23) My sister married young.

But in my view a dissatisfaction remains with any treatment, including the one just given, which treats a list (or even a set of lists) of somewhat randomly selected illustrations. Thus I am still dissatisfied even when a large number of interesting structure observations are made or even tight rules proposed. I would like some more systematic method of search and description of the results. Even a large corpus, inductively studied, would not serve my purpose if it in turn led only to lists of rules or structural descriptions [1, 223].

This problem gets vastly more acute as we move higher in the hierarchy to try to find rules concerning discourse invariants and variants, both grammatical and semantic - and phonological. The size of the requisite corpus needed for induction becomes unmanagable for certain of my purposes; and intuition of the native linguist, unguided by an adequate hypothesis, does not, in fact, turn out the systematically related illustrations needed.

The experiment: (a) Take an analysis of English clause types, (b) Choose from the first clause type a typical example containing both nucleus and margin, (c) Paraphrase that same clause repeatedly,

transforming it into the second clause type, then into the third, and then into each of the others (retain the basic semantic content, but allow changes of focus, and changes of meaning introduced by the new clause structure itself), (d) Describe the changes which were required in order to allow for the paraphrase, (e) Choose a new sample, from the second clause iype, and repeat Steps (c) through (d). (f) Continue with further new samples until all types have been explored, (g) Classify the results [1, 112].

In Figure 1, a tree diagram is given classifying clause roots (which fill the nucleus slot of a clause) by presence or absence of participants in an emic actor role (or 'quasi-actor' or 'agent'); as emic undergoer (or 'patient'); or as emic scope (or 'site' or 'target'). When all three are present, the clause is bitransitive (BT); if only one , intransitive (I); if two, including actor and undergoer, transitive (T); if two, including actor and scope, semi transitive (ST). If role is emic item, rather than actor, one has equative (EqJ (without scope) or semi-equative (SEq) (with scope).

For the clause types in Fig. 1 we give a few samples. Notice that in any one set there may be formal subsets (e.g. active versus passive) or semantic subsets (e.g. action versus state) [1, 112].

BT (Bitransitive)

(24) He handed the tools to me.

(25) The tools were handed to me (+) by him. (with subject as undergoer)

(26) I emptied the water out of the tank.

(27) John received the prize (+) from the committee.

(28) The book cost me ten dollars, (with 'me' as scope)

T (Transitive)

(29) He found the dolphin.

(30) The dolphin was found (-f) by him. (with adjunct as actor)

(31) She owns the horses.

(32) The issue transcends politics.

ST (Semitransitive)

(33) His family settled in Corfu.

(34) The play lasted three hours.

(35) The toys are in the box.

I (Intransitive)

(36) I chuckled.

(37) Th e water swirled.

(38) The path forked.

S Eg (Semi-equative)

(39) The food tasted good (+) to me. (with subject as item, complement as characteristic of the subject, and indirect object as scope)

(40) The body lay sprawled on the floor [1, 112].

Eg (Equative)

(41) John became a man.

(42) He became ill.

(43) He is in a hurry.

(44) John is tall.

Given such an analysis (not discussed as such here), as fulfilling Step (a) of the experiment as indicated above, we perform the first part of Step (b) by taking the bitrarisitive clause (24), calling it the basic form, arbitrarily (basic in reference to experimental departures from it). For the moment, we omit the second part of Step (b) - that is, we do not add margins to the basic sentence or to its internal components.

Step (c) is fulfilled by the paraphrases of this basic sentence into each of the other clause types of the list given. We repeat (24) as here (45). By paraphrase we mean, in this usage, that we wish to retain the cognitive content; but we explicitly cause that kind of change of focus which the

change of clause type introduces; and we explicitly add that kind of meaning which is inherent in the new clause type itself. The loss of original focus, and the loss of original construction meaning, leaves the paraphrase valid, within our usage of that term here. After each of the paraphrases, a comment will be given for Step (d).

(45 Basic BT) John handed the tools to me.

(46 T) John performed the act of handing me the tools.

Note the dummy verb 'performed', as a generic abstraction of the meaning of an action transitive verb (with the generic term 'the act', which fills the object slot, as that which was performed). Thus, the meaning of the transitive construction as a whole may be 'X performed Y' (or 'X "verbed" Y'). The original cognitive content (the specific act of giving by hand, the tools as that given, and the indication of actor and recipient) is retained, but it is treated within a prepositional phrase as a modifier of the dummy head 'the act [2, 127].

(47 ST) John reached his goal of handing me the tools.

Here, again, note in this semitransitive clause the use of a dummy verb 'reached1, which carries the semitransitive meaning of movement toward a target, plus an implication of the necessity for their being such a target - an obligatory indirect object of scope. Similarly, the indirect object requirement is met by the generic term 'goal1 which carries the rest of the cognitive paraphrased meaning realized as the prepositional modifier 'of handing me the tools'. In general, then, our aim is reached: nothing is changed but th*6se semantic features inherent in the construction meanings of transitive and semitransitive themselves; and these meanings are added by as small an increment of lexico-constructional apparatus as possible, i.e. by the lexical items 'reached1 and 'goal' which come close to labelling the semi-transitive constructional meanings themselves[2, 127].

(48 I) John's action of handing me the tools occurred.

Here the problem was to find an intransitive verb which would serve to carry the requisite constructional meaning and the requisite lask of requirement for object. We chose 'occurred', which serves the purpose when combined with the noun 'action* as a dummy head subject noun. If we had chosen “ended” and “task”, the paraphrase would have accomplished the constructional aims, but would have gone beyond our desired criteria for paraphrase, by highlighting (more than necessary) both the time element and the energy involvement [2, 127].

(49 SEq) The action of John's handing me the tools seemed complete (to this observer).

For the semi-equative, an observer must be implicit or explicit. The implication of implicitness is here accomplished by the use of the lexical item 'seemed'; the parentheses show the optional use of explicit observer, in a generic form as a dummy (instead of such a phrase as the cognitively more expanded *to the boss').

(50 EqX The action of John's handing me the fools was a completed fact.

For this equative clause we needed some characteristic-of-the-subject as a role of complement, but did not want to invent characteristics outside of those already present in the given basic form. This was a bit awkward, since the basic form is not qualified. So we settled for the dummy word 'fact1, reflecting the initial action, and a modifier 'completed1 reflecting the initial tense. The action itself was moved to the subject slot of the equative clause. If, however, we had been willing to add cognitive characteristics, we might have said that 'The action of John's handing me the tools was good* - but this is unwarranted: he may have been annoyed. Or we could have said that “The action of handing me the tools was complete”. We wanted to avoid, however, 'John's action of handing me the tools was completed, since that would have forced it into the passive

subset of a transitive clause. On the other hand, 'John's action of handing me the tools was complete' meets the requirement of being an equative clause type, but does not have quite the same emphasis; it puts more attention on the aspect of completion, and less on the original total assertion [3, 139].

For Step (e) we should now choose the next clause in our list - the transitive - and repeat Steps (c-*d). Then for Step (f), we should choose the further clause types successively. In order to save space, however, we move directly to the semiequative clause type, with its basic form (and, again, without marginal elements) [3, 139].

(51 Basic SEq cf. 39). The food tasted good to John.

(52 BT) Someone gave good-tasting food to John.

Here the typical word 'give' is used to establish the bitransitive framework. This would be acceptable if it did not at the same time add a cognitive element beyond that of the purely abstract bitransitive relation. Specifically, it would be in error if the context showed that John had gathered and prepared the food for himself directly. Either, then, one must find a dummy verb which is bitransitive but which lacks the added cognitive content, or one seems to be in trouble here. We will solve the problem, for this experiment, by returning to the second part of Step (b) and adding a marginal element (as provided for there) to the basic form.

1.2 Subordination and Coordination in Clause Structures

The classification of subordinate clauses offers special difficulties and remains the area of syntax where we find different linguistic approaches with some important disputable points open to thought and discussion. Much still remains to be done in this field of grammar learning. This is one

of many ranges of linguistic structure in which we find borderline cases where the lexico-grammatical organisation of complex syntactic units presents special difficulties [24, 148].

Contexts are of extreme importance in understanding syntax.

Various kinds of contextual indication, linguistic or situational, and intonation in actual speech resolve structural ambiguity in homonymic patterns on the syntactic level.

As we shall further see, the significant order of sentence elements, as an important factor of syntax, will also merit due consideration in describing the distributional value of various kind of subordinate clauses.

It is to be noted that disagreement over the classification of sub-clauses is based not on conflicting observations in language learning but rather on different linguistic approaches to the study of syntax [24, 148].

There are obvious reasons for describing sub-clauses proceeding from the similarity of their functions with those of parts of the sentence. Analysis of clause patterns from this angle of view seems most helpful and instructive [24, 148].

The traditional distinction between the main and the subordinate clause is familiar in grammar learning, but students of language should be pre-pared to meet it under other names. Emphasising the structural position of sub-clauses, Ch. Fries, for instance, adopted the term included sentence as a compromise between Ch. Fries's included sentence and the term of traditional grammar, W. N. Francis offered the name included clause. Logically, the term clause itself would be a sufficiently distinct term, because it is not used here for any larger class of forms of which included clauses are a subclass [24, 148].

To express subordination of one syntactic unit to another in a complex sentence English uses the following means: a) conjunctions; b) conjunc-

tive words; c) asyndeton; d) sentence-order, i. e. the position of syntac-tic structures relative to one another; e) correlative words [24, 148].

The process of coordination, simply stated, involves the linking of structures of equal grammatical rank — single words and phrases in elementary compound groups or independent clauses in compound sentences. The coordinative conjunctions and the correlatives serve to produce this coordination by joining the grammatically equivalent elements in question. Two or more clauses equal in rank can together be given the status of a single sentence. Such co-ordinated units make up a compound sentence [24, 149].

It is overtly simple to describe the conjunctions as coordinators without certain qualifications. Even *and* is not purely a coordinator. Whatever the units it combines, and usually indicates an additive relationship, and sometimes it intensifies, or indicates continuous and repeated action, as in: *She waited and waited. She talked and talked and talked. They went around and around.* The words *but* and *yet* indicate contrast, opposition, or negation; *so* and *for* show several relationships, among them purpose, cause, result, or inference *or* and *nor* indicate what might be described as alternation, choice or opposition. Obviously conjunctions cannot be considered as empty connecting words, and there is always selection in their use in terms of style and purpose [24, 149].

There is usually a sense of grammatical balance that characterises coordination, even if there is a logical inequality between the coordinated elements [24, 149].

As a matter of fact, the only situations in which the process of coordination seems to combine elements of both grammatically and logically equal rank with significant frequency is at the level of single words and short phrases.

The traditional trichotomy — the classification of sentences into simple, compound and complex — arose in English prescriptive grammar in the middle of the nineteenth century on the basis of a simple-compound dichotomy, which can be

traced to at least two non-grammatical sources. The first was the concept of the period (as a rhetorical unit expressing complete sense) and its parts, colons and commas, evolved by classical and medieval rhetoric. This concept was the guiding principle of English punctuation not only in the sixteenth century, before the appearance of the earliest English grammars, but also later, when the notion of the sentence came to be included into syntax proper (since the beginning of the eight-eenth century) [24, 149].

The second non-grammatical source of this classification was the logi-cal concept of simple and compound axioms or propositions, which fur-nished the basis for classifying punctuation units (periods) into simple and compound sentences, according to the number of "nouns" and "verbs", that is, subjects and predicates, contained within these punctuation units (in the grammars of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century) [24, 149].

Some English grammarians have abandoned the trichotomic classifica-tion introducing new descriptive terms such as "double" and "multiple" sentences (beginning with Nesfie1d's grammar in 1924), or later — the "duplication" and "combination" of the patterns (by J. Hook and Mathews and P. Roberts) [24, 149].

The concept of the trichotomic classification was also rejected in C. O n i o n' s and E. Kruisinga's scientific grammars. In O. Jespersen's works such syntactic structures are treated in terms of his theory of three ranks.

Following Ch. Fries, some structural grammarians introduce the terms "included sentences" and "sequence sentences".

Interesting observations in this part of syntax have been made by Soviet linguists. In L. Iofik's monograph1 we find a strictly formal analysis with a new dichotomic structural classification based on purely grammatical criteria of the syntactic relations between the predicative constituents of Early Modern English texts of the pre-Shakespearian period (compared with the corresponding constructions in present-day English). Our investigation, in which we have not followed traditional concepts and punctuation too closely, has led to the following

results: of the four syntac-tic modes of connecting subject-predicate units (or clauses) in English I—coordination, II — relative annexation (cf. the German term "relativische Anknupfung"), III — subordination and IV — insertion (parenthesis), two are predominant in forming multi-clause sentences (which are opposed to single-clause sentences, according to the new dichotomic classification of sentences advanced by the author). These are subordination and insertion. These syntactic devices are particularly important because they serve to introduce clauses functioning only as parts of other sentences (unable to "standalone"), which is a relevant factor for a multi-clause sentence [14, 169].

Coordination within a multi-clause sentence is a means of joining a series of parallel subordinate clauses in joint dependence upon a subordination centre in the leading clause, or a means of connecting two or more independent main clauses, which jointly subordinate, a common member, mostly expressed by a dependent clause. In other words, coordination in this monograph is recognised as a syntactic means of connecting the constituent parts of multi-clause sentences only when it is made use of in the same way as in single-clause sentences, which contain a member in common subordinating or subordinated by coordinated syntactic elements. In all other cases independent coordinated subject predicate units are viewed as syntactically independent though contextually related sentences, regardless of the marks of punctuation which divide them [14, 169].

Relative annexation is described by L. Iofik as a mode of connection which has no parallel in the single-clause sentence. Such connectives introduce sentences which are not subordinated to any part of the preceding sentence and are therefore viewed as semi-dependent contextually related sentences [14, 169].

The patterns of multi-clause sentences containing more than two clauses (from three to twelve or thirteen) are based upon two fundamental principles of connection. The first is the principle of consecutive (step-wise) subordination, according to which in each clause (except the last one) there is a single subordination centre, nominal or verbal. It subordinates only one dependent clause.

According to L. Iofik the resulting sentence pattern may be described as a chain of clauses, in which there is one absolute principal clause, one absolute dependent clause (the last in the chain) and one or more clauses both subordinating and subordinated. The number of clauses corresponds to the number of syntactic levels in the multi-clause sentence [14, 169].

The second principle is that of parallel (or homogeneous) and non-parallel con-subordination (i. e. dependence of two or more parallel or non-parallel clauses upon one, two or more subordination centres within the main clause). In the second sentence-pattern (represented by several variant patterns) there are only two syntactic levels as all dependent clauses are of the same level of subordination.

When both these principles are combined within one and the same sen-tence, the most complicated structures of multi-clause sentences arise. These structures represent combined or "mixed" patterns displaying fea-tures characteristic of both basic patterns — they contain more than two syntactic levels, with two or more subordinate clauses on different levels of subordination [14, 169].

There is certain interdependence between the number of clauses in a multclause sentence and the patterns employed to arrange these clauses within the sentence. These two basic patterns described arise on the level of three-clause sentences. On the level of four-clause sentences, the simplest combination, of two basic patterns, becomes possible. When the pat-terns are combined, there is always a common link between them — a clause belonging to both patterns.

The new assumptions and acute observations made in L. Iofik's investigation are of considerable linguistic interest as a distinctively progressive step in the development of syntactic theory. Some points of her significant and original argumentation are however open to thought and questioning. This concerns primarily the view advocated by the author in discussing the linguistic status of compound sentences, the existence of which in English can hardly be denied.

It seems more in accord with the nature of language to recognise coordination as a grammatical category organised as a complex system with many variant and

borderline cases, where the role of conjunctions serving to unite certain syntactic units into a larger whole is extremely important and must never be lost sight of.

There is also little justification to dispense with the terms "principal" and "subordinate" clause introducing the term "predicative unit" instead. The latter seems to be ambiguous as commonly used with reference to the so-called secondary predication as well. Little is gained by this.

The formative words linking the parts of a compound sentence fall into clearly distinct types: 1) coordinative conjunctions, 2) conjunctive adverbs, 3) fixed prepositional phrases [3, 45].

It is important to remember that sometimes there is no formal link binding the members together since the logical connection forms a sufficient tie and makes it abundantly clear. Upon close investigation, however, it will become clear that such apparently independent sentences are not absolutely independent and one of them implicitly stands in some grammatical relation to the other [3, 45].

It will be helpful to identify linking words in co-ordination as follows:

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

b) Disjunctive, connecting two members but disconnecting their meaning, the meaning in the second member excluding that in the first: *or,* in older English also *either* or *outher(-or)* and in questions *whether... or* with the force of simple *or; or... either; either...* or, etc., the disjunctive adverbs *else, otherwise, or... or, or... else,* in older English *other else.*

c) Adversative, connecting two members, but contrasting their meaning: *but, but then, only, still, yet, and yet, however, on the other hand, again, on the contrary,* etc.

d) Causal, adding an independent proposition explaining the preceding statement, represented only by the single conjunction *for: The brook was very high, for a great deal of rain had fallen over night.*

e) Illative, introducing an inference, conclusion, consequence, result: *namely, therefore, on that account, consequently, accordingly, for that reason, so, then, hence,* etc [3, 45].

f) Explanatory, connecting words, phrases or sentences and introducing an explanation or a particularisation: *namely, to wit, that is, that is to say, or, such as, as, like, for example, for instance, say, let us say,* etc.

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

Sentence-linking words, called conjunctive advebs are: *consequently, furthermore, hence, however, moreover, nevertheless, therefore* [3, 45].

Some typical fixed prepositional phrases functioning as sentence linkers are: *at least, as a result, after a while, in addition, in contrast, in the next place, on the other hand, for example, for instance.*

It comes quite natural that the semantic relations between the coordinate clauses depend to a considerable degree on the lexical meaning of the linking words.

The functional meaning of some of them is quite definite and unambiguous. Such is, for instance, the conjunction ***but*** implying contrast or dissociation between the related items; its meaning is so distinct that there can hardly be any item in the sentence to change the adversative signification as made explicit by this linking word.

Things are different however with copulative conjunctions, which are known to be synsemantic in character and may lead to structural ambiguity if the necessary meaning is not signalled by the meaning of other words in the sentence. This may be well illustrated by the functional use of the conjunction *and* which may imply various shades of meaning, such as result or consequence, cause or contrast [3, 45].

Compare the following:

(a) *They really fitted him, — it was his first made-to-order suit,— and he seemed slimmer and better modelled.* (London)

(b) *But he, who for the first time was becoming conscious of himself, was in no condition to judge, and he burned with shame as he stared at the vision of his infamy.* (London)

(c) *The act was done quietly, and the awkward young man appreciated it.* (London)

(d) *She thought she was merely interested in him as an unusual type possessing various potential excellences and she even felt philanthropic about it.* (London)

In examples (a), (b), (c), (d) the co-ordinated sentences are suggestive of causal or resultative meaning.

A prominent suggestion of contrast or adversative meaning may be observed in cases like the following:

He frightened her, and at the same time it was strangely pleasant to be looked upon. (London)

As a matter of fact most sentences are dependent on the context of preceding sentences or of situation for some of their meaning.

Chapter II. Structure of the English Clauses

2.1 The Structure of Subject Predicative Clauses

There are two types of sub-clauses that function as one of the essential elements of a two-member sentence: subject clauses and predicate clauses.

A subject clause may contain either a statement or a question. In the former case it is preceded by that: in the latter it is introduced by the same words as interrogative object clauses [3, 45].

(a) That he will help us leaves no doubt.

That he had not received your letter was true.

(b) What you say is true.

Whether he will stay here is another question.

Commoner that the patterns with the initial that are sentences introduced by it, with the that-clause in end-position. This type also occurs in interrogative composite sentences [16].

It seemed utterly grotesque to him that he should be standing there facing a charge of murder in a court where the register, the shorthand writer and other officials were all known personally to him. (Gordon)

It was true that he had assisted Dr. Munro at the operation. (Gordon)

And it suddenly sprang into James' mind that he ought to go and see for himself. (Galsworthy) [16]

It is manifest to me that in his letter of May 20 he assented to a very clear proposition. (Galsworthy) [16]

Subject sub-clauses at the given type are, in fact, used as delayed appositives to the initial it. Sentence patterning of this kind permits postponement of the subordinate clause while it represents them in the positions which would otherwise be normal for them.

Some grammarians prefer another angle of view, according to which the pronoun it at the beginning of the main clause is referred to as a

"formal subject" (sometimes called a "sham subject"), and the sub-clause following the main clause — the real subject.

The choice of either alternative remains, in fact, a matter of subjective angle of view.

Note. It is to be noted, in passing, that it can represent not only this type of sub-clauses, but is similarly used with great frequency in other types of composite sentences [16].

Familiar examples are:

I'll leave it to you which route we take.

In main interrogatives this it is sometimes inserted directly in front of clausal appositives, as in Why is it that we can't get together?

Sometimes even in declaratives it precedes declarative-clause appositives directly, and acts as a kind of buffer for them — after predicators and prepositions that do not accept them as completers.

I resent it that such a thing is done.

I'll see to it that a good typewriter is available.

You can rely on it that he will do this work without delay.

It often represents subordinate clauses, or nucleuses of subordinate clauses, which are hardly in apposition with it.

He says he's been mistreated, but he shouldn't take it out on you.

It might help if we did it [16].

He can't help it if he likes company.

It makes him unhappy when people think he's unfriendly.

It is to be noted that the grammatical organisation of subject-clauses sometimes offers certain difficulties of analysis.

If, for instance, the order of the two members of a composite sentence is inverted they do not only change places but functions as well. Compare the following:

(a) That he did not come to speak with you was what surprised me most. (a subject sub-clause)

(b) What surprised me most was that he did not come to speak with you. (a predicate sub-clause) [16]

In other cases subject sub-clauses will hardly offer any difficulties of syntactic analysis, e. g.:

Not her fault that she had loved this boy, that she couldn't get him out of her head — no more her fault that it had been his own for loving that boy's mother. (Galsworthy)

No satisfaction to Fleur now, that the young man and his wife, too, very likely, were suffering as well. (Galsworthy)

Predicate sub-clauses function as the nominal predicate of a composite sentence. They are introduced by the same words as subject clauses; they may also be introduced by as. Variation in their grammatical organisation may be illustrated by the following examples:

This was what had happened to himself! (Galsworthy)

The chief hope was that the defense would not find it necessary to subpoena Jean. That would be too much. (Galsworthy).

The question for me to decide is whether or not the defendant is liable to refund to the plaintiff this sum. (Galsworthy).

„The principle of this house", said the architect, „was that you should have room to breathe — like a gentleman". (Galsworthy)

Some grammarians are inclined to include here patterns with it is... that of the following type:

It's because that he's busy that he can't help you.

There are such patterns of complex sentences as consist of a subject clause and a predicative, the only element outside these clauses being the link verb, e. g.:

What I prefer now is that you should not leave at all.

Predicative sub-clauses have sometimes a mixed or overlapping meaning. In some cases there is a clear suggestion of temporal relations, in others the meaning of comparison.

Relations of time, for instance, are generally observed in clauses introduced by when. This is often the case when the subject of the principal clause is expressed by nouns denoting time, e. g.:

Time had been when he had seen her wearing nothing. (Galsworthy)

Predicative sub-clauses introduced by as if and as are suggestive of , the secondary meaning of comparison, e. g.:

My horses are young, and when they get on the grass they are as if they were mad. (Thackeray)

2.2 The Structure of Object Clauses and Attributive Clauses

Object clauses present a great variety of patterns but less difficulty on the point of their grammatical analysis [20, 239].

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

We could buy what she liked.

You may do whatever you choose.

Did the accused mention who this girl friend of his was... (Gordon)

He suggested that Bosnian seemed unduly zealous in calling for paper for the statement to be taken down. (Gordon)

He was anxious that they should realise he was an English-man. (Gordon) [20, 239]

Antony wondered whether they would ever meet again. (Gordon)

He remembered that the waltz was in three-time, remembered the waltz of olden days — too well — That dance at Rodger's, and Irene, his own wife, waltzing in the arms of young Bosinney. (Galsworthy) [20, 239]

And later, on a sleepless pillow, she puzzled, as she had puzzled of late, as to how it was that she loved so strange a man, and loved him despite the disapproval of her people. (London) [20, 239]

Synonymic alternatives of object clauses are:

a) Gerundive nominals:

They all approved of his not being beaten by that cousin of his, (Galsworthy)

Soames had ever resented having had to sell the house at Robin Hill; never forgiven his uncle for having bought it, or his cousin for living in it. (Galsworthy)

He's going to begin farming, you know, he' ll make an excuse. Men hate being painted. (Galsworthy)

...he could not see Irene shivering, as though some garment had been torn from her, nor her eyes, black and mournful like the eyes of a beaten child. He could not hear Bosinney entreating, entreating, always entreating; could not hear her sudden, soft weeping, nor see that poor, hungry looking devil, awed and trembling, humbly touching her hand. (Galsworthy)

I looked in the door of the big room and saw the major sitting at the desk, and the window open and the sunlight coming into the room. (Hemingway) [20, 239]

b) Infinitival nominals:

He saw the squirrel's eyes, small and bright and watched his tail jerk in excitement. (Hemingway)

The Darties saw Bosinney spring out, and Irene follow, and hasten up the steps with bent head. (Galsworthy) [20, 239]

Instances are not few when infinitival and gerundive nominals go in one sentence in close proximity, e. g.:

Only vaguely did he see the judge shake his head in disagreement and hear Turner mumbling something. (Gordon)

Attributive Clauses

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

It has been customary to make distinction between two types of attributive sub-clauses: restrictive and continuative or amplifying clauses1. This division is however too absolute to cover all patterns.

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

It may also be pointed out that a sentence with a restrictive clause contains a single statement, and a sentence with a continuative clause contains two statements.

Compare the following:

I. a) *There was a machine in the kitchen* ***which could extract the juice of two hundred oranges in half an hour.*** (Fitzgerald)

b)*The room was long with windows on the right-hand side and a door*

at the far end ***that went into the dressing-room.*** (Hemingway)

c)*He made frequent references to the plan* ***that had already been*** *put in.* (Gordon) [24, 186]

d)*And to think of it, I dreamed in my innocence that the persons* ***who*** *sat* ***in the high places, who lived in fine houses and had educations and bank accounts, were worth while!*** (London)

II. a) *A sensation of comfort would pass through Winton,* ***which would last quite twenty minutes after the crunching of the wheels*** *and the mingled perfumes had died away.* (Galsworthy)

b) *Soames,* ***who had never studied the question and was hampered by not knowing whether he wanted an Englishman to do it,*** *was hesitating.* (Galsworthy)

c)*And he only stared at Michael,* ***who was gazing out of the*** *window.* (Galsworthy) [24, 186]

d)*Up on the lawn above the fernery he could see his old dog Balthazar. The animal,* ***whose dim eyes took his master for a stranger,*** *was warning the world against him.* (Galsworthy) [24, 186]

Continuative clauses may well illustrate the statement that it is impossible to draw a rigid line of demarcation between subordination and coordination. The relative *which* may refer to a preceding sentence or part of a sentence.

The conference was postponed, ***which was exactly what we wanted.***

A word should be said about attributive clauses introduced by relative adverbs functioning as conjunctions: *when, where, why.* This is the case when the antecedent meaning time, place, reason.

We *met* ***where the roads crossed.*** [24, 186]

I remember the day ***when the war broke out.*** [24, 186]

We understand the reason ***why you did not want to come.***

These clauses are commonly referred to as attributive qualifying a noun in the main clause.

We cannot fail to see, however, that the above sentences are suggestive of adverbial relations. This is especially prominent when the clause is -continuative:

In those days, ***when she lived with us...*** [24, 186]

Overlapping relations will be observed in clauses introduced by *as,* after an antecedent qualified by *same* or *such:*

We found such things ***as you never saw.*** [24, 186]

In literary English a noun in a negative sentence may be defined by a clause introduced by *but:* When a *but*-clause has a subject of its own, adverbial relations are quite prominent, e. g.:

Not a day went by ***but some news came from our correspondent.***

Synonymic alternatives of attributive clauses are following.

a) Infinitival nominals:

Cowperwood was not the man ***to loose a chance of this kind.*** (Dreiser)

There is nothing ***to prevent you from making as great a success as Mr. Butler has made.*** (London)

But ***I*** *had no thought. I didn't even have the words* ***with which to think.*** (London)

Brian wished they could eat breakfast there, but saw nothing on the table except a, mug of tea ***to be drunk by*** *his* ***father.*** (Sillitoe)

b) Gerundive nominals:

The idea of ***its being barbarous*** *to confine wild animals had probably never ever occurred to his father, for instance.* (Galsworthy)

He doesn't know very much about Tom, though he says he's read a Chicago paper for years ***just on the chance of catching a glimpse of*** *Daisy's name.* (Fitzgerald) [24, 186]

c) Participial nominals:

A look of effort marked everyone: they came down ***with kukris no longer used,*** *and* ***loads bearing no resemblance to the neat shape of*** *a pack.* (Sillitoe)

It *was warm, and frightening if he thought too much, but he went on a few feet until reaching drifts of* ***hot dust piled almost to the top bricks.*** (Sillitoe)

2.3 Adverbial Clauses and Their Structures

Introduced by the conjunction *because* sub-clauses of cause indicate purely causal relations.

And ***because they were all laughing*** *it seemed to Leila that they were all lovely.* (Mansfield) [24, 186]

... You remember the other time I was here I said I couldn't talk about books and things ***because I didn't know how?*** (London)

Clauses introduced by *as* and *since* have sometimes overlapping relationships of cause and time. The necessary meaning is signalled by the context.

Pouring out a pot he drank it neat and, ***as its warm glow spread through him,*** *he felt he could face the evening more easily.* (Gordon)

Later when they had managed to compose themselves they went to the theatre. ***Since he gave her free choice*** *she selected* "Saint Joan". (Cronin)

I could not stay as it ***was late.***

Causal relations may find their expression in clauses introduced by the conjunction *for.* Patterns of this kind are on the borderline between co-

ordination and subordination. Only in some contexts of their use *for*-clauses come to be synonymous and go quite parallel with causal clauses included by because.

He had to be cautious, ***for he was so rapidly coming to be influential and a distinguished man.*** (Dreiser)

Soames was alone again. How long, alone, he didn't know ***for he was tired,*** *and in spite of his concern, he dozed.* (Galsworthy)

In most cases clause-patterns with *for* differ essentially from clauses introduced by *because.* They generally give an additional thought to the completed part of sentence to extend the meaning of the utterance; they often come after a full stop and seem to function as separate sentences having much in common with clauses introduced by the conjunctions *but* and *and.*

Subordinate clauses of cause have their synonymic alternatives:

a) Infinitival nominals:

She was angry now ***to think her father would make a public spectacle of her.*** *Cowperwood started to follow.* (Dreiser) [24, 186]

He was proud ***to*** *have* ***been privileged to publish a poem*** *which in psychological content, quality of workmanship, and direct human interest, was by far the most striking of this generation.* (Galsworthy) [24, 186]

b) Gerundive nominals:

Cursed was the day he had met her, and his eyes ***for seeing in her anything but the cruel Venus she*** *was.* (Galsworthy)

c) Participial nominals:

The afternoon being grey and cold, *we did not go anywhere.* ***This being the case,*** *they had to change their plan.*

d) reduced sub-clauses of cause (verbless predicatives):

... The lines at the sides of the eyes were deepened. ***Naturally dark of skin,*** *gloom made him look slightly sinister.* (Dreiser)

Would they like him? They would not — ***too unshackled, too fitful, and too bitter;*** *all that was best in him he hid away, as if ashamed of it; and his yearning for beauty they would not understand!* (Galsworthy)

Not much give and take about Desert ***restless, disharmonic, and a poet! And proud — with that inner self-depreciative pride which never let upon a man!*** (Galsworthy) [24, 186]

Clauses of Place

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

They passed alongside the Royal Enclosure ***where book-makers did not seem to be admitted.*** (Galsworthy) [24, 186]

The sun-blinds were down, for the sun was streaming on its front, past the old oak, ***where was now no swing.*** (Galsworthy)

Where there's a will, *there's a way.* (Proverb) [24, 186]

... „Show me", he said, and moved in the tail-light of the car to ***where the chauffeur stood pointing.*** (Galsworthy)

Like in other types of complex sentences, clauses introduced by the adverb *where* are sometimes on the borderline between subordination and co-ordination, meant to continue the narrative associated with the previous statement rather than indicate the place where action took place, e. g.:

... And a sob that shook him from head to foot burst from Soames' chest. Then all was still in the dark, ***where the houses seemed to stare at him, each to each with a master and mistress of its own, and a secret story of happiness or sorrow.*** (Galsworthy)

Temporal clauses cover a wide and varied range of meanings.

Relations of time between the action of the main clause and that of the subordinate may differ: the two actions or states may be simultaneous, one

may precede or follow the other, or, say, one may last until the other begins, etc.

When she moved to put a chair for him, *she swayed in a curious, subtle way, as if she had been, put together by some one with a special secret skill.* (Galsworthy)

As ***he passed through the stray groups of couples,*** *he was conscious of a pair of pale grey eyes peering at him through a cloud of blue tobacco smoke.* (Gordon)

Sit down, ***when I've taken off my things*** *we shall go into the next room and have tea and be cosy.* (Mansfield)

When he had finished his tea *Andrew withdrew.* (Cronin)

Reduced sub-clauses of time will be illustrated by such patterns as:

When at Rome, *do as the Romans do.* (Proverb)

When angry *count a hundred.* (Proverb)

Back in his *study, he sat in thought.* (Galsworthy)

Back with her accounts, *she could not settle to them, and pushing them into a drawer, went to find her husband.* (Galsworthy)

Synsemantic in their character, temporal clauses have often a mixed meaning. In some patterns there is only a suggestion of the secondary meaning, in others it is fairly prominent.

In different contexts of their use sub-clauses of time may change their primary meaning. In some patterns there is a suggestion of conditional relations, as in:

Women did strange things ***when they were driven into corners.*** (Galsworthy)

When the pinch *comes, you remember the old shoe.* (Proverb)

Instances are not few when temporal clauses are suggestive of causal relations, e. g.:

She made a little curtsy ***as he bowed.*** (Mitchell)

It is to be noted that secondary meanings are generally signalled not so much by the grammatical organisation of the sentence as by the lexical context which is the first to be considered relevant.

Studying syntax in relation to vocabulary presents here its own point of interest.

Not less characteristic are the secondary meanings implied in a sub-clause of time in such contexts when it comes to indicate an action or state as contrasted to that of the main clause.

Examples of such sentences may be found in numbers.

She neared her father's house, driven this way and that, ***while all the time the Forsyte undertow was drawing her to deep conclusion that after all he was her property.*** (Galsworthy)

"So you came, didn't you?" he went on, looking at her steadily, ***while she fronted his gaze boldly for a moment;*** *only* ***to*** *look evasively down.* (Dreiser)

While Mackenty meditated as to how in two years he should be able to undo this temporary victory, and Cowperwood was deciding that conciliation was the best policy for him, *Schryhart, Hand and Arneel, joining hands with young Macdonald, were wondering how they could make sure that this party victory would cripple Cowperwood and permanently prevent him from returning to power.* (Dreiser)

Why should he be put to the shifts and the sordid disgraces and the lurking defeats of the Divorce Court, ***when there was she like an empty house only waiting to be retaken into use and possession by him who legally owned*** *her.* (Galsworthy) [24, 186]

He turned about again, and there stood with his back against the door, ***as hers was against the wall opposite, quite unconscious of anything ridiculous in this separation by the whole width of the room.***

The implication of contrast is often clear in reduced clauses of time, e. g.:

His manner, ***while warmly generous at times,*** *was also easily distant except when he wished it to be otherwise.* (Dreiser)

Synonymic alternatives of sub-clauses of time:

a) Gerundive Nominals:

Dartie, ***on being told,*** *was pleased enough.* (Galsworthy)

The crime seems to have been committed late in the evening, and the

body was found by a gamekeeper about eleven o'clock, when it was examined

by the police and by a doctor ***before being carried up to the house.***

(Doyle)

Then ***after having Kathleen tighten her corsets a little more,***

she gathered the train over her arm by its train-band and looked again.

(Dreiser)

b) Infinitival Nominals:

The door was not fastened within, and yielded smoothly to her hesitating hand. She was surprised ***to find a bright light burning;*** *still more surprised, on looking in, to see that her Mama, but partially undressed was sitting near...* (Dickens)

His head, now grey, was encircled by her arm, and he frowned to think that never, never had it rested so before. (Dickens)

c) Participial Nominals:

Arrived, however, ***at this*** *other white* ***house,*** *also desirable, situated on the slope above the river, he almost had a fit while waiting for them in the car.* (Galsworthy)

Being *released, his face discovered to be very hot, and red, and damp; and Miss Tox took him on her lap, much exhausted.* (Galsworthy)

Clauses of Condition

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

If you ask him he will stay here, (real condition) [24, 186]

If you asked him, he would stay here, (unreal condition)

In real condition, both the main clause and the dependent clause are truth-neutral; in *If you ask him, he will stay here,* we cannot judge whether either the request or his staying here will take place.

Although the most common type of real condition refers to the future, there are no special restrictions on the time reference of conditions or on the tense forms used to express them. The following examples may illustrate the variety of time relations and tense forms expressing them:

If you re happy, you make others happy.

(Simple Present + Simple Present)

If he told you that yesterday, he was lying. [24, 186]

(Simple Past + Simple Past)

If she left so early, she will certainly be here tonight.

(Simple Past + *will* "future").

The truth-neutrality of an *if*-clause is reflected in the possibility of using such constructions as:

If you should hear news of them, please let me know.

(Should + Infinitive in place of the Simple Present)

The effect of predication with *"should"* is to make the condition slightly more tentative and "academic" than it would be with the ordinary Present Tense.

A more formal expression of a tentative real condition is achieved by omitting *if* and inverting the subject and the auxiliary *"should":*

Should you remain I'll help you with pleasure.

Unreal conditions are normally formed by the use of the Past Tense (Indicative or Subjunctive) in the conditional clause, and *would* + V_{inf} in the principal clause, e. g.:

If you left in the morning, you would be at home at night.

If you had come, he would have changed his mind.

The precise grammatical and semantic nature of the switch from real to unreal conditions is obviously relevant to overlapping relations in such types of sentence-patterning [24, 188]

Clauses of this type are generally introduced by such connectives as: ***if, unless, provided, on condition that, in case, suppose (supposing), but that, once.***

What has immediate relevance here is the grammatical organisation of the conditional sentence, the verb-forms of its predicate, in particular.

If it hadn't been for his blunders, *he would have finished the article in three days.* (London)

If he doesn't comply *we can't bring proceedings for six months. I want to get on with the matter, Bellby.* (Galsworthy)

And if Holly had not insisted on following her example, and being trained too, she must inevitably have cried off.

Suppose he talked to Michael? No! Worse than useless. Besides, he couldn't talk about Fleur and that boy to anyone — thereby hung too long a tale. (Galsworthy)

Mr. Pinch stood rooted to the spot on hearing this, and might have stood there until dark, but that the old cathedral bell began to ring for vesper service, on which he tore himself away. (Dickens) [24, 188]

Synonymic alternatives of conditional clauses:

a) Infinitival Nominals:

To have followed their meal in detail *would have given him some indication of their states of mind.* (Galsworthy)

(Syn. ***If she had followed their meal...*** *it would have given him...).*

To record of Mr. Dombey that he was not in his way affected by this intelligence, *would be to do him an injustice.* (Dickens) *(Syn.* ***If we record of Mr. Dombey*** *that...)*

No one would believe, ***to look at her,*** *that she was over thirty.* (Huxley)

(Syn. ***if one looked at her...)***

b) Gerundial Nominals:

But for his having helped us *we should not have been successful in this work.*

c) Participial Nominals:

Living in London *you know what fogs mean.*

Weather permitting, we shall start tomorrow.

Consider also reduced sub-clauses of condition. Examples are commonplace.

What would one of her own people do ***if called a coward and a cad*** *— her father, her brother, uncle Adrian? What could they do?* (Galsworthy)

It was clear to him that she could not take her Dartie seriously, and would go back on the whole thing if ***given half a chance.*** (Galsworthy)

And, ***if*** *true, what was the director's responsibility?* (Galsworthy) [24, 188]

She was seldom or never at a loss; or ***if*** *at* ***a loss,*** *was always able to convert it into again.* (Galsworthy)

Once in, *you couldn't get out.* (Galsworthy) [24, 188]

A word must be said about stylistic transposition of imperatives co-ordinated with following declaratives to which they have the meaning relationship that clauses of condition or cause would have.

Scarcity of linguistic units with inherent expressivity is often counterbalanced by effective stylistic transpositions of the Imperative Mood.

In terms of stylistic value and purpose, it is most essential to observe how different patterns of grammatical organisation come to correlate as identical in denotative value but different in expressive connotation. Contextual nuances are sometimes very elusive.

Here are a few examples of the Imperative Mood in transposition:

a) ***Tell him of a quality innate in some women*** *— a seductive power beyond their own control! He would but answer: Humbug!*

She was dangerous, and there was an end of it. (Galsworthy) *(Syn.* ***If you told him of a quality innate in some women...)***

b) *He would have fought for this man as determinedly as for himself, and yet only so far as commanded.* ***Strip him of his uniform,*** *and he would have soon picked his side.* (Dreiser)

(Syn. ***If you stripped him of his uniform...)***

(c) ***Make me do such things, make me like those other men, doing the work they do, breathing the air they breathe, developing the point of view they have developed,*** *and you have destroyed the difference, destroyed me, destroyed the thing you love.* **(London)**

(Syn. If you make me do such things...)

(d) ***Walk among the magnificent residences,*** *the splendid equipages, the gilded shops, restaurants, resorts of all kinds; scent the flowers, the silks, the wines;* ***drink of the laughter springing from the soul of luxurious content,*** *of the glances which gleam like light from defiant spears:* ***feel the quality of the smiles*** *which cut like glistening swords and of strides born of place, and you shall know of what is the atmosphere of the high and mighty.* (Dreiser) *(Syn.* ***If you walk...; if you drink of the laughter...;***

if you feel the quality of the smiles... *you shall know...)*

Deep grammar analysis will always show the difference between the patterns given above.

In (a) and (b) the verb-forms of the Imperative Mood function as stylistic alternatives of the Oblique Mood;

in (c) and (d) the verb-forms of the Imperative Mood are used as stylistic alternatives of the Indicative Mood.

As can be seen from the above examples, the use of the Imperative Mood in such transpositions can imply conditional, causal or resultative meaning.

Clauses of Result

Clauses of result or consequence will also exemplify the synsemantic character of syntactic structures. Their formal arrangement is characterised by two patterns:

1)clauses included by the conjunction *that* correlated with the pronoun *such* or the pronoun so in the main clause;

2)clauses included by phrasal connective so *that*. [24, 188]

Her misery was so terrible ***that she pinned on her hat, put on her jacket and walked out of the flat like a person in a dream.*** (Mansfield)

He did not however neglect to leave certain matters to future considerations, which had necessitated further visits, ***so that the little back room had become quite accustomed to his spare not unsolid but unobtrusive*** *figure*... (Galsworthy)

Variation in the lexico-grammatical organisation of such clauses is generally associated with variation in their meaning.

Instances are not few, for instance, when a clause of result is suggestive of the degree or the state of things indicated by the main

clause. The moaning of such clauses is always made clear by contextual indication.

Examples of such clauses of result are:

The moon had passed behind the oak-tree now, endowing it with uncanny life, ***so that it seemed watching him — the oak-tree his boy had been so fond of climbing, out of which he had once fallen and hurt himself, and hadn't cried!*** (Galsworthy)

When he told her that he would take care of her so that nothing evil should befall, she believed him fully. (Dreiser)

Structural synonyms of sub-clauses of result presented by infinitival phrases may be illustrated by such patterns as:

It was too wonderful to be anything but a delirium. (London)

{Syn. It was so wonderful that it could be anything but a delirium).

A woodpecker's constant tap was the only sound, for the rain was not heavy enough for leaf-dripping to have started. (Galsworthy)

(Syn. ... the rain was not so heavy that ...).

Then, just when they were old enough to go to school, her husband's sister came to stop with them to help things along... (Mansfield)

(Syn. Then, just when they were so old ***that they could go to school****,..).*

Clauses of Purpose

The grammatical organisation of sub-clauses of purpose does not take long to explain.

What merits consideration here is the syntactic organisation of the constituents of the complex sentence and the verb-forms in the structure of predication.

Clauses expressing purpose are known to be introduced by the conjunction *that* or *lest* and by the phrase *in order that.* [24, 188]

That has, perhaps, no rivals among connectives. It is well known to have a particularly wide range of structural meanings, but no ambiguity arises in actual usage. As always in language, the context will remove in each case all the other significations, as potentially implicit in *that* which in subordination may do the duty of a relative pronoun and a conjunction.

Purpose clauses introduced by *that* may be illustrated by the following examples:

... she had softly moved her chair into its present place: partly as it seemed from an instinctive consciousness that he desired to avoid observation: and partly that she might, unseen by him, give some vent to the natural feelings she had hitherto suppressed. (Dickens)

And lest the sun should break this charm too eagerly, there moved between him and the ground a mist like that which waits upon the moon on summer nights... (Dickens)

Infinitival phrases implying purpose relations are commonplace. Familiar examples are:

This action has been brought by the plaintiff to recover from the defendant the sum of three hundred and fifty pounds, alleged by the plaintiff to have been fixed by this correspondence... (Galsworthy)

She made a movement to cross into the traffic.

Clauses of Concession

Sub-clauses of concession with all their grammatical complexity and variety of syntactic patterning as well as their synsemantic character will engage our attention next. The component grammatical meanings in sentence-patterns of this kind are often not so clear-cut as it might be suggested.

It is very important to distinguish between the following types of concessive sub-clauses:

a) clauses giving the information about the circumstances despite or against which what is said in the principal clause is carried out:

Though she did not know it, *she had a feeling in him of proprietary right.* (London)

I always understood you did so as a form of expiation, ***even though you had asked Dinny to marry you.*** (Galsworthy)

b) clauses which give some additional information associated with the content of the principal clause, the idea of concession in such patterns is somewhat weakened.

He mopped his forehead dry and glanced about him with a controlled face, ***though in the eyes there was an expression such as wild animals betray when they fear the trap.*** (London)

c) clauses with overlapping relationship. In patterns of this type there is a suggestion of the secondary adversative meaning:

He extracted great happiness from squelching her, and she squelched easily these days, ***though it had been different in the first years of their married life.*** **(London)**

Complex sentences of this kind are on the borderline between subordination and coordination; *though* might be easily replaced by the adversative conjunction *but.* [24, 188]

d) inserted and parenthetical concessive clauses are more or less independent syntactic units and are generally set off by a comma, colon or semi-colon, e. g.:

Shannon was not a financier, neither was Steger. They had to believe in away, ***though they*** *doubted* ***it,*** *partly — particularly Shannon.* (Dreiser)

... but being a Forsyte, ***though not yet quite eight years old,*** *he made no mention of the thing at the moment dearest to his heart...* (Galsworthy)

The conjunction *though* may introduce independent sentences.

I've got a father; I kept him by alive during the war, so he's bound to keep me now. ***Though, of course, there's the question whether he ought to be allowed to hang on to his property.*** (Galsworthy)

It will be observed, in passing, that concessive relations are, in point of fact, logically associated with causal and resultative meaning, the latter being to some extent inseparably present in any sub-clause of this type.

The implication of pure concession is fairly prominent in prepositive sub-clauses included by *although, though* (often intensified by *nevertheless* in the principal clause). [11, 188]

Although he was dealing privately for Edward Butler as an agent, and with the same plan in mind, and although he had never met either Mollemhauer or Simpson, *he nevertheless felt that in so far as the manipulation of the city loan was concerned he was acting for them.* (Dreiser)

Clauses of concession introduced by *though* and *even though* have much in common with sub-clauses introduced by *if* and *even if.*

The ***more*** *cautious members of Chicago society,* ***even if they did not attend,*** *then, would hear, and then would come ultimate comment and decision.* (Dreiser)

If all the world hated you, and believed you wicked, *while your own conscience approved you, and absolved you from guilt, you would not be without* ***friends***. (Brontë)

Intensity of concessive meaning is generally produced by putting the nominal parts or the adverbial adjunct at the head of the sentence.

Young though she will always seem to me, *she* ***is...***

Similarly, in sentence-patterns with the conjunction *as:*

Taking his glass from the table, he held it away from him to scrutinise the colour; ***thirsty as he was,*** *it was not likely that he was going to drink thrush.* (Galsworthy)

Crafty and cruel as his face was at the best of times, *though it was a sufficiently fair face as to form and regularity of feature, it was at its worst when he set forth on this errand.* (Dickens)

Harmless as this speech appeared to be, *it acted on the traveller's distrust, like oil on fire.* (Dickens)

Much as I admire the film, *I'll not go to see it again.*

Note. The conjunction *though* may stand at the end of a simple sentence, following another simple sentence, closely connected in sense. In such end-position *though* will be synonymous with *nevertheless, nonetheless, all the same,* e. g.: [11, 188]

He did not tell me where he had been, but I knew ***though*** *(= but I knew* ***all the same).***

In sentences introduced by the conjunction *as* there is sometimes a fairly prominent suggestion of causal relations.

Uncommunicative as he was, *some time elapsed before I had an opportunity of changing his mind.* (Brontë)

Concessive clauses may be introduced by the phrasal conjunction *for all that:*

And Jon could not help knowing too, that she was still deeply in love with him ***for all that they had been married two years.*** (Galsworthy)

A special type of complex sentences is presented by patterns with concessive sub-clauses suggestive of the secondary alternative meaning. Here belong clauses introduced by *however, whoever, whatever, whenever, wherever* and such phrasal conjunctions as *no matter what, no matter how.*

Examples are:

"I *doubt if Wilfred will go before the Committee", said Michael, gloomily. "Fleur confirmed him".*

"Of course he won't, Michael".

"Then what will happen?"

"Almost certainly he'll be expelled under rule ***whatever it is.*** (Galsworthy)

The public would never hear his name, ***no matter how big the case*** *was.* (Carter)

No matter what the others *may* ***say, I*** *shall have my own way.*

The secondary alternative meaning in clauses of this kind is so prominent that some grammarians are inclined to identify them as a special type of subordination. Such is, for instance, Jespersen's point of view in *Essentials of English Grammar* where these clauses are classified as "clauses of indifference"[1].

Mention must also be made of reduced sub-clauses of concession that 'are not infrequent both in informal spoken English and literary prose.

Their abode, ***though poor and miserable,*** *was not so utterly wretched as in the days when only good Mrs. Brown inhabited it.* (Dickens)

His wife, ***whatever her conduct,*** *had clear eyes and an almost depressing amount of common sense.* (Galsworthy)

...His case was different from that of the ordinary Englishman as chalk from cheese. ***But whatever his case,*** *he was not a man* ***to*** *live with.* (Galsworthy)

Concessive relations overlapping with alternative meaning find their linguistic expression in syntactic patterns with functional transpositions of the Imperative Mood forms, e. g.:

Say what you may (might) *I shall have my own way.*

Try what you will (would) *there is no helping here.*

Say what one will, *to take the love of a man like Cowperwood away from a woman like Aileen was to leave her high and dry on land, as a fish out of its native element...* (Dreiser)

Economise as he would, *the earnings from hack-work did not balance expenses.* (London)

Attention must also be drawn to the use of verb-forms in concessive sub-clauses, which naturally vary depending on the context. The Indicative Mood is fairly common in all types of clauses implying concession, Present and Past tense-forms, in particular. The Subjunctive Mood is common in complex sentences with hypothetical concession.

Concessive clauses may be included by the conjunction *while* which in such patterns comes to function parallel with *though (although).*

While he was yet in unspeakable agonies, *the dwarf renewed* ***their*** *conversation.* (Dickens)

Concessive relations may also be expressed by such patterns with verbless predicatives as:

How could you behave like that, ***and your mother present there?*** *(→ though your mother was present there).*

Moist as was his brow, tremble as did his hand once after the nameless fright, *he was still flushed with fumes of liquor.* (Dreiser)

Intensity and emphasis can also be produced by inversion in such patterns as:

Wait as he did, *however, Carrie did not come.* **(Dreiser)**

Chapter III. The Role of Connectives in the Clause Structure

3.1 Structural Auxiliaries in Clause Structure

Clauses as well as word-groups and sentences are composite units in which the constituting parts are structured and related. Special devices are used in languages to derive the construction forms of syntactic units, to compensate their structural uniformity by substituting for the constituent positions, to relate the constituting parts of the unit and, lastly, to form up the unit grammatically in different parameters of its grammaticality [11, 188].

Auxiliaries for syntactic units are not exceptions among the auxiliary grammatical words. Some of syntactic auxiliaries are of unit- derivational or form-derivational value and can be identified as structural auxiliaries. Others share both formatory and operatory functions due to their ability to form up syntactic units in their internal organization or in their relatedness to the matters of extralingual realities. And at last, there is a group of grammatical words whose auxiliarian function is very weak, they are forming-up elements and must be qualified as operators [11, 238].

Structural auxiliaries in English are widely employed because of its analytical structure. The decay of morphology resulted in the standardization of syntactical positions of syntactical construction-patterns. The distribution of their constituents is nowadays fixed and the con- struction-types are standard formations whose structural body must be represented, this way or another, in any case of its lingual realization. The elements which are employed for the purpose make up a group of really form-auxiliaries (formals) which are devoid of any semantic characteristics, nominative or significative, and occur as formal compensators of the structure of a syntactical construction-type. They

manifest absolutely formal substitution in comparison with the cases of meaningful structural substitution where the replacers are meaningful syntactically [11, 238]:

1. The formal substitution is characteristic of the structure-word it in the pattern o I the impersonal seiilencc-type. This clement is not a pronoun, it has no pronominal features because it does not replace anything. It occupies the initial position in the impersonal sentence-pattern and compensates its structural uniformity. The question remains disputable whether or not the element "it" in the impersonal sentences as the following can be identified as "grammatical subject", though of formal character: It is raining. It snows hard in February. It is cold tonight [9, 8, 10].

The standard initial position of the existential and presentative sen-tence-types is substituted formally by the elements which look like pronominals but they arc not. They do not represent any antecedent contextual elements but form up structurally the sentence-pattern by substituting for its standard initial position and indicate that the object denoted by the notional constituent (N) is stated as existing or presented as the subject of the speaker's thought [9, 8, 10].

The formal substitutors "there" and "here" of the existential-locative sentences: "there is N" and "here is N" are characterized traditionally as "formal subjects" but the arguments posed seem inconvin- cing. The elements are structure-words and the constructions ''there is N" and "here is N" are too specific to be analyzed traditionally according to the "parts-of-the-sentence" model which pjroved inadequate for the analysis of anomalous constructions.

The construction of the presentative sentence is ancient. It was normal at the early stages of the English language. In the course of time it has developed into a device of topicalization but the syntactic significance of

the structural elements Tillable into the initial position of the presentative sentence-pattern remained the same.

The elements “it” and "there” arc completely desemanticized whereas “here” and some deictics which sometimes occur in the given position seem to retain their etymological deictic features.

Compare:

“Well, Г11 do what I can for you”, he said. "Here is one of the main scholars’ dormitories .” (Murdoch). “Here is the lunch,’’ said Wilson. "You’re very merry, aren’t you?” (Hemingway).

The formal structural substitution of the phrasc-pattern positions can be illustrated by the occurrence of the formal "it” in the position of the N-constituent of the verb-phrase where this formal substitutor is designed to compensate the structure of the verb-phrase with the verb of objective valency as its head.

In the expression "Take it easy” the element it is the formal substitutor for the nominal complement position. It is more formal in its features than pronominal and it does not function as any part of the sentence. It is a mere structure-word here which is part of this phraseological expression, it is not a part of the sentence.

2. The meaningful structural substitution is observed at the sentence and the phrase levels. И is important that in such cases the formal auxiliaries take upon themselves the syntactic significance of the standard positions they substitute for and the meanings of the elements they are supposed to replace [9, 8, 10].

In some syntactic constructions the element “it” occupies the position of this or that constituting part of the sentence-type and takes upon itself the grammatical function of the fillers for the substituted position. For instance, according to the rules of English grammar, the subject of the sentence if it is expressed by rather extended units, by infinitival or

gerundial phrases and even by clauses, should be drawn to the post-predicate position, The subject position is being substituted by “it” which is identified accordingly as provisional or anticipatory.

Compare:

Jt is necessary to outline the perspectives of the analysis.

It is worth outlining the perspectives of the analysis.

It is necessary that you outline the perspectives of the analysis.

The formal subject “it” is surely meaningful as it replaces the real subject of the sentence and represents the latter in its grammatical function. The relations between the formal “it” and the clause or the non-finite phrase which it represents grammatically are appositive in character because we can admit that the content of "it” is equivalent to the content of the element it replaces. The admission remains refutable because the variants of such sentences with "it” and without it are not always convertible.

The same function is characteristic of "it” in the sentences with complex objects expressed by rather extended predicative complexes. The extended N-constituent is drawn backwards and its position before the objective predicative is replaced by the formal "it”.

Compare:

We found it strange that such a valuable remark was ignored by those present. I would rather make it my task to clarify the points most conir aver sal.

3.2 Connective Auxiliaries in Clause Structure

Syntactic units are composite formations of related elements. They are constructive relational units the syntactical form of which is represented by a construction-pattern. The structural uniformity and connectivity of syntactic units are provided by the grammatical devices of special design,

the employment of grammatical auxiliarian words for the purpose is not the least in English [9, 8, 10].

Such grammatical words must be qualified as auxiliaries on the ground that they are designed to serve for the formation of the construction-pattern of syntactic units. They belong to the structural auxiliaries as faT as they compensate the uniformity of the construction- pattern. But they make it in a different way than the formal sub- stitutors for the constituent positions. They are connective auxiliaries which help io derive the construction-form of a syntactic unit by connecting the constituents and marking their relations.

There is certain correlation between the linguistic status of the syntactic unit and the nature of the connective auxiliary which is used to connect the constituents: prepositions are the connective auxiliaries for the formation of word-groups, conjunctions, on the contrary, provide linkage of clauses.

Connective auxiliaries are different in nature. With some of them the connective function prevails. For instance, grammatical prepositions are pure connecting devices in word-groups. They are lexically meaningless and serve for providing grammatical connection only. Their equivalence to case-inflections in rendering different case meaning was upheld by some scholars as an argumentation for the recognition of the combination ''prep + N" to be an analytical case.

Among conjunctions the coordinators exemplify the connective design of grammatical words. They represent the group of connective auxiliaries the auxiliarian function of which is prevailing over their operatory design, if any they have. Coordinators refer to both the constituents they connect and form up the structure of a syntactic unit of phrasal or sentential status. Despite the prevailment of their connective design the coordinating grammatical words can display operatory ability to signify paratactic

relations of different kinds between the constituents of a compound syntactic unit: a compound phrase and a compound sentence, e. g.:

She brought him some steamed apple dumpling, and he began to attack it wolfishly, whilst she stood like some bedraggled flunkey at the other end of the table. (Cronin). They both kissed her with unexpected warmth, and sat down sideways, one on each side of her bed. (Galsworthy). We went and had ices together, all three, at Florian's, and then Hopkins went off to get something, and left us together for half an hour. (Aldington) [9, 8, 10].

The connective “that” is also very specific. It is said to be absolutely grammatical. This grammatical word is the connective auxiliary which signifies hypotactic relations between the constituents of a complex syntactic unit. The subordinated "that” signifies the dependence of the clause it refers to and links it to the governing element. It possesses certain significative ability at least because it signifies hypotaxis. Its operatory function remains general and unspecified, e. g.:

He could detect in her the least shade of criticism and he perceived very easily that she was not prepared to say that he was quite free from a certain egotism. (Cary). It struck him suddenly that Davidson knew of his visit to the governor and of its ill success. (Maugham). He saw that the quiet girl was screaming and pointing to the ladder. (Sanson). [9, 8, 10]

A connective auxiliary may tend to contract more closer relations with one of the constituents making with it together a unity. The tendency is traced with both prepositions and conjunctions but obligatorily with those having rather strong significative meanings: prep 4- N and conj + Clause.

Most of English prepositions have quite definite significative meanings of adverbial types, spatial and temporal, as a rule. In such cases their connective function seems to be secondary in comparison with their signification of particular conceptual categories. With this point in view,

we would regard the combination “prep + N” as a unity attributed with a particular significative function in relation to the matters of concept.

The unity prep + N satisfies the requirements to be an analytical formation in which the “prep” is an auxiliary with rather strong significative force. It is a word and a grammatical one. Its word-status makes us treat the combination as a unit in syntax though not a constructive one because of the grammatical nature of the “prep”. The syntaxeme “prep 4- N” is an analytical functional unity performing one function in a word-group or sentence. Its significative function is well-observed in its relatedness to the conceptual categories of Spati- ality and Temporality which can be represented alongside other devices by the given combination due to the significative ability of the element “prep”.

The adverbial prepositions, i. e. prepositions signifying adverbial meanings, function as adverbial operators forming up the syntaxeme prep + N grammatically in its syntactical function of an adverbial. It is notable that the semantics of the elements of the unity prep + N is in concord: with temporal prepositions the N position is filled by the nominals of temporal meanings; with spatial prepositions the position of N is occupied by the nominals of spatiai meanings. [9, 8, 10]

The relationships between the elements of the combination are of specificative character especially if the elements share common semantic features. The filling in the position “N” has some limitations as far as the combinations with temporal prepositions are concerned.

Spatial prepositions in English are specialized on signifying Spa-tiality in its main aspects of Directionality and Locality. They are sub-classified accordingly into the directional and local prepositional operators of Spatiality. The spatial preposition is of greater significance in the combination prep -f N itself because the class of elements which can occur in the position of N is practically infinite. Spatiality is associated with

substantiality since everything substantial is universally assumed to be spatial. Cases of spatial metaphorization are traceable with N denoting unsubstantial phenomena: to have smth. in one’s mind, to come to one's head, to find oneself in a difficulty.

For another thing, there are conjunctions which reveal their conjunctive design to the utmost because their primary and differential function is to relate and connect the constituting clauses in a syntactical period, i. e. in a construction with the interrelated predicative constituents. The relations between the constituents of a syntactical period are always marked syndetically by a conjunction. There are four types of complex syntactical constructions (periods), each having its own relators. Accordingly, the causal, concessive, conditional conjunctions and the conjunctions marking the relations of purpose should be defined as conjunctive auxiliaries proper. They are likely to form up the clausal construction as a whole, making it structurally complete and uniform, regardless their position, initial or middle one. At the same time, the conjunctive auxiliaries may possess operatory functional features. They function as relational operators which can signify and thus render essential objective relations.

To illustrate the peculiarities of English conjunctive auxiliaries the following examples are suggested:

There’s nothing certain, of course, because it all depended on the way they were to export Hubert. (Galsworthy). From that moment on she was lost to them, though the car was a closed saloon. (Galsworthy). Although they were accostomed to it his family inevitably became depressed under the tyranny of this cold stare... (Cronin). If mother had lived, might they have married? (Mansfield). If he had found me out, he would have taken my head off. (Cronin).

There are conjunctions which tend to refer to one of the constituting clauses. As a result, the conjunction appears weakened in its conjunctive function, with its operatory features becoming evidently prominent: conj + Clause. The combination should probably be treated in a similar way as the prep -f- N was. It seems justified because the combinations have too much in common. To begin with, the combinations, in which temporal and spatial conjunctions occur in the position “conj”, are very much alike the “prep + N” unity. Their differences lie in the nature of the governing element: clause versus N. Notwithstanding the fact that the N-position can be occupied by a clausal unit, it is different from the “Clause” in the combination “conj 4- -b Clause”. First of all, the N-clause is a descriptive designation of an object or phenomenon. It seems to be an internally expanded N-word. This is proved by its combinability with the preposition, the latter being commonly identified as the word-connector, e. g.:

“There aren’t enough troops here for a real attack”.— "It is probably to draw attention from where the real attack will be”. (Hemingway). She went over to where Josephine was standing. (Mansfield). [9, 8, 10]

The “Clause” in the combination with the conjunction is a predicative unit expressing certain situation and this very situation is accounted for as the point which is being formed up by the conjunction. The combinations prep + N and conj -f Clause are very much analogous, The element "conj” also makes up a functional unity with the clause it refers to. It looks like a clause-particle which serves as a kind of categorizer of the clause, relating it to a particular category. The element “conj” resembles functional bound morphemes (affixes) in their categorizing function and has much of an operator, its conjunctive function being secondary. The combination conj + Clause functions as one part of the sentence. Rather considerable similarity, if not functional identity, is traceable in case the positions of “prep” and “conj” in the combinations compared are occupied by the

temporal and spatial elements. The design of such an operatory conjunction is to signify Spatiality or Temporality in general, although some of the conjunctions exemplify their variability in the limits of the given significative meanings.

Compare: when, as, while, as soon as, after, before, etc. The conjunctions “when” and “where” are unspecified, that is why they are usually used with specifying particles and prepositions; only when, just, where, to where, from where, ctc.

There are some specified temporal and spatial conjunctions such as to where, from where, about when, only when, etc., which have weakened conjunctive power. They probably function as adverbial operators of a clause and make up with the clause they refer to a functional complex which resembles an analytical formation. The complex itself seems to be of auxiliarian character. It refers to another clausal unit and forms it up as a temporal or spatial operator of higher status. It is not occasional that some adverbial clauses are regularly used before the clause they refer to because adverbial clauses like when- clause, of/zm?-clausc, as-clause tend to occupy the regular posftion of the auxiliary element in an analytical formation, e. g.:

When she came to a neat restaurant she entered it and consumed a fish. (Coppard). As soon as I got to the dressing station Ma- nera brought a medical sergeant and put bandages on both my legs. (Hemingway). As she dressed there was no need for her to be timorously silent for fear of disturbing her husband. (Cronin). The conjunctive adverbs “when” and “where” which are found in specifying clauses have greater operatory force than the conjunctions due to their functioning in the structure of the clause as its adverbial constituent.

Compare:

We went to the cellar of the house where we lived: (Hemingway). She entered the scullery and plunged her hand into the box where old copies of newspapers and periodicals were kept for household purposes. (Cronin). It was nearly half past nine when she went out with the pendant in her vanity bag, and her best hat on. (Galsworthy). Then the day came when I had to go back to school. (Maugham).

In the same way, the conjunctions ‘'that", “if” and "whether’’ which introduce nominal clauses (N-clauses) do not evidently connect the two clauses one of which is dependent. They refer to the clause rendering information and form it up in its oblique communicative design. The conjunction "that” marks indirect assertion or statement which is conveyed or is registered in the mind of the speaker. It is not occasional that such complex functional unities as that -f clause occur with assertive predicates in the position either of the subject or of the object. The assertive verbs in English can be

a) of strong assertiveness — to admit, to answer, to affirm, to explain, to claim, to argue, to remark, to insist, to presume, etc.;

b) of weak assertiveness — to think, to believe, to suppose, to guess, to expect, to seem, etc.

The conjunction ‘‘that” can be omitted in those cases where the verb with which the that-clause is used is of transparent semantics. Compare:

I wanted to say to you that our name goes back very far and very honourably. (Galsworthy), He had never dreamed that this would be the end, that she would be the first to break away. (Cop- pard). He knew she had always wanted an established position... (Cronin).

The conjunctions "if” and "whether” mark indirect questions, when used with the interrogative verbs like "to ask”, "to Jnquire”, or indicate the fact of mental registration of the information rendered in the 'clause, when

used with the verbs of the "to know” type. The conjunction "whether” sometimes renders additional shades of uncertainty or supposition, e. g.}

When people come and ask if I can rent them a room alt I want to know is if they've the money to pay for it. (Maugham). The whole point is whether or not the Authorities are going to take any notice of that attack in the House. (Galsworthy). He did not want to go down, but he wondered if they expected him to. (Maugham). 1 understand ail that, but what I want to know is whether or not you have lost faith in me. (London).

The wh-&lements which are useable under the same distributional conditions function as the operators of special questions or as the markers of certainty/uncertainty when they are used with the verb "to know’\ e. g,:

But at that moment they entered the portals of the bank, and in the excitement of the business, Miss Burns forgot to ask the dark how he would use the legacy... (Coppard). They did not know where they were, and where they were going. (Aldington). And he realized now what the words meant — someone had removed the painter’s ladder. (Sansom).

The elements "as if”, "as though” and their functional equivalents are also of greatly weakened connective ability. They refer to a subordinate clause and form it up. They manifest epistemic or estimating operations of comparison and particularization on the part of the speaker, e. g.:

But why does he speak so kindly — so awfully kindly — and as though they had known each other for years and years and knew everything about each other. (Mansfield). I feel as if I had no eyes. (Galsworthy). Every now and then his hands would go up to his head, as if to clear away something that entangled it. (Galsworthy). [9, 8, 10] We would like to conclude so-far that there are connective auxiliaries of rather weak operatory ability. They arc the matters of form and serve as means of syntactical connection. Their operatory function consists in signifying parataxis and hypotaxis between the constituents. The grammatical prepositions, the copulative

“and” and the unspecified subordinator "that” represent the groups of connective auxiliaries. But each of the groups comprises elements which possess operatory ability due to the character of their significative meanings. They tend to form up the unit they refer to, their connective function becoming secondary.

III. CONCLUSION

Our qualification paper was on one of the most important and interesting points of English syntax – clause types and their structures.

In the course of doing the research and writing the qualification paper I was assigned to review and analyze materials devoted to the study of English syntax. The works we analyzesd and reviewed suggest that clause is A group of words that contains a subject and a predicate. A clause may be either a sentence (an independent clause) or a sentence-like construction within another sentence (a dependent or subordinate clause).

The function of clause in a sentence is a complicated topic and hard to explain. Clauses play several roles in a language and the most widely used function is its ability to give broader information to the receiver of the information.

Concerning the difference between a clause and a sentence we learned that clause contrasts with sentence. Except in the case of a whole sentence, which is technically said to be also a clause, a clause is always smaller than the sentence that contains it. Besides, clause also contrasts with phrase. Clauses contain phrases. Clauses are bigger than the simple phrases they contain. The crucial characteristic of a clause, which is lacking from a phrase, is that a clause normally has its own verb and all or many of the other basic ingredients of a whole sentence.

In the second chapter of our qualification paper we studied the basic structural characteristics of clauses. We took clause types as subject predicative clauses, object clauses, attributive clauses and adverbial clauses as our main objects of study as they represent primary importance for language learners.

According to our research subject clauses are introduced either by a relative or interrogative pronoun or adverb or by the conjunction that. The

reason for calling these clauses subject clauses would seem to be clear: if the clause is dropped, the subject is missing.

Predicative clause are clauses that if they are dropped the sentence will be unfinished: there will be the link verb, but the predicative, which should come after the link verb, will be missing. Object clause is 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.

We must discuss 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.

Adverbial clauses belongs to a certain type (for example, if the conjunction is because", there is no doubt that the adverbial clause is a clause of case), 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 conjunction "while". With these conjunctions, other words in the sentence prove decisive in determining the type of adverbial clause introduced by the conjunction.

Some adverbial clauses can be easily grouped under types more or less corresponding to the types of adverbial modifiers in a simple sentence, which have been considered in the qualification paper.

IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY

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.