# Theoretical english grammar

Linguistics

1 Vilnius Pedagogical University Department of English Philology Laimutis Valeika Janina Buitkiene An Introductory Course in Theoretical English Grammar Metodine mokymo priemone aukÑ™tuju mokyklu studentams 2003 2 © Vilnius Pedagogical University, 2003 Leidinys svarstytas ir rekomenduotas spaudai UÑ›sienio kalbu fakulteto Anglu filologijos katedros posedyje 2003 03 12, protokolo Nr. 5 Leidinys svarstytas ir rekomenduotas spaudai UÑ›sienio kalbu fakulteto Tarybos posedyje 2003 03 13, protokolo Nr. 4 Recenzentai: doc. dr. GraÑ›ina Rosiniene, doc. dr. Daiva Verikaite. 3 Contents Preface Introductory Traditional Grammar Traditional Grammar in Ancient Greece Traditional Grammar in Ancient Rome Prescriptive Grammar Non-Structural Descriptive Grammar Structural Descriptive Grammar Transformational — Generative Grammar The Explanatory Power of Non-Structural Descriptive, Structural Descriptive and Transformational-Generative Grammar (by way of summing up) Structural Features of Present — Day English Grammatical Classes of Words The Principles of Classification as Used by Prescriptive Grammarians The Principles of Classification as Used by Non-Structural Descriptive Grammarians The Principles of Classification as Used by Structural Descriptive Grammarians The Classification of Words in Post-Structural Traditional Grammar The Noun The Semantic Classification of Nouns The Grammatical Category of Number The Grammatical Category of Case The Category of Gender The Category of Determination The Verb Semantic Features of the Verb Finite Forms of the Verb The Category of Person The Category of Number The Category of Tense 4 Introductory Present Tense Past Tense The Problem of Future Tense Absolute and Relative Tenses The Category of Aspect The Category of Mood The Category of Voice The Category of Order (the Perfect) The Function of the Category of Order

The Perfective Form and the Pefective Aspect Non-Finite Forms of the Verb Introductory The Infinitive The Verbal Features of the Infinitive. . The Nounal Features of the Infinitive . The Gerund . The Participle . The Adjective . The Adverb . The Pronoun . The Preposition . References . 5 Preface This book is intended for university-level students of English who have taken a practical grammar course and are now ready to take a course in theoretical grammar. Our aim is to provide the students with a brief survey of English morphological problems in the light of present-day linguistics. We want to express our gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Algimantas Martinkenas, Dean of the Faculty of Foreign Languages, for the congenial atmosphere and encouragement, to the staff of the Department of English Philology, to Assoc. Prof. GraÑ›ina Rosiniene and Assoc. Prof. Daiva Verikaite for reading the manuscript and contributing valuable suggestions. Laimutis Valeika Janina Buitkiene 7 Introductory For a start, let us try and answer the question " what is grammar? " The term grammar is derived from the Greek word grammatike, where gram meant something written. The part tike derives from techne and meant art. Hence grammatike is the art of writing. Since its appearance in ancient Greece the term has undergone considerable modifications. In ancient Greece and ancient Rome the terms grammatike and grammatica respectively denoted the whole apparatus of literary study. In the middle ages, grammar was the study of Latin. In England, this conception of grammar continued until the end of the 16th century. Latin grammar was the only grammar learned in schools. Until then there were no grammars of English. The first grammar of English, Bref Grammar for English, written by William Bullokar, was published in 1585. The most influential grammar of English (published in 1762) was R. Lowth's Short

Introduction to English Grammar. It started the age of prescriptive grammar. To a prescriptive grammarian, grammar is rules of correct usage; its aim was to prescribe what is judged to be correct rather than to describe actual usage. A new, modern understanding of grammar appeared only by the end of the 19th century, when the period of scientific (descriptive) grammar began. To descriptivists, grammar is a systematic description of the structure of a language. With the appearance of structural descriptive linguistics, grammar came to mean the system of word structures and word arrangements of a given language at a given time. To transformational-generative grammarians, who are an offshoot of structural descriptive linguistics, grammar is a mechanism for producing sentences. Thus the actual definition of grammar is determined by pragmatic factors. If we wish to learn to speak and write, we will focus on the system of rules that underlie a given language, and if we wish to describe the structure of a language, we will focus on the units that make up the language and their relations, and if we wish to understand how speakers of a given language produce and understand sentences, we will focus on the nature of the rules used. Hence we can speak of two types of grammar: practical and theoretical. Practical grammar gives practical rules of the use of the linguistic structures while theoretical grammar gives an analysis of the structures in the light of general principles of linguistics and the existing schools and approaches. Historically, English grammars, according to their general aims and objectives, can be divided into: a) traditional (prescriptive and non-structural descriptive): b) structural descriptive and c) transformational-generative. 8 Traditional Grammar Traditional Grammar in Ancient Greece Formally, traditional grammar is the type of grammar as it was before the advent of

structural linguistics. Two periods of traditional grammar could be distinguished: 1) prescriptive (pre-scientific) and 2) descriptive (scientific). Traditional grammar has its origins in the principles formulated by the scholars of Ancient Greece and Rome — in the works of Dionysius Thrax, Protagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Varro, and Priscian. Dionysius Thrax (c. 100 B. C.) was the first to present a comprehensive grammar of Greek. His grammar remained a standard work for thirteen centuries. Thrax distinguishes two basic units of description — the sentence (logos), which is the upper limit of grammatical description, and the word, which is the minimal unit of grammatical description. The sentence is defined notionally as " expressing a complete thought". The constituents of the sentence were called meros logos, i. e. parts of the sentence. Thrax distinguished onoma (noun) class words, rhema (verb), metoche (participle), arthron (article), antÑ...nymia (pronoun), prÑ̃fthesis (preposition), epirrhema (adverb), and syndesmos (conjunction). He reunited the Stoic common and proper nouns into the single Ñ̃fnoma (noun) class; he separated the participle from the verb. The adjective was classed with the noun, as its morphology and syntax were similar to those of nouns. The noun was defined as a part of the sentence inflected for case and signifying a person or a thing; the verb as a part of the sentence without case inflection, but inflected for tense, person, and number, signifying an activity or process performed or undergone; the participle as a part of the sentence sharing the features of the verb and the noun; the article as a part of the sentence inflected for case and preposed or postposed to nouns; the pronoun as a part of the sentence substitutable for the noun and marked for person; the preposition as a part of the sentence placed before other words; the adverb as a part of the sentence without

inflection, in modification of or in addition to the verb; the conjunction as a part of the sentence binding together the discourse and filling gaps in its interpretation. Each defined class of words is followed by a statement of the categories applicable to it. Thrax refers to them as parepÑƒmena. By parepÑƒmena he means grammatically relevant differences in the forms of words which include both inflexional and derivational categories. To illustrate this, consider the noun. Thrax distinguishes five such categories of the noun: 9 1) GÐ¹nos (gender): masculine, feminine, neuter; 2) Eidos (type): primary or derived; 3) Schema (form): simple or compound; 4) ArithmÑƒs (number): singular, dual, or plural; 5) Ptosis (case): nominative, vocative, objective, genitive, dative. The parepÑƒmena of the verb included mood, voice, type, form, number, person, tense, and conjugation. Three basic time references are distinguished: present, past, and future. Phrax's set of parts of speech has undergone only minor modifications and is still very much in use today. The main omission in this grammar is the absence of any section on syntax. Syntax was dealt with, rather extensively, by Appolonius Dyscolus. Appolonius based his syntactic description on the relations of the noun and the verb to each other and of the remaining word classes to these two. The achievements of the Greek scholars lie in devising and systematizing a formal terminology for the description of the classical Greek language, a terminology which, through adaptation to Latin and later on adopted from Latin by other languages, has become part and parcel of the grammatical equipment of the linguistics of our day. Traditional Grammar in Ancient Rome Roman linguistics was largely the application of Greek thought to the Latin language. The relatively similar basic structures of the two languages facilitated the process of this metalinguistic transfer. The first Latin grammar

was written by Varro (116—27 B. C.). His De Lingua Latina comprised 25 volumes. One of Varro's merits is the distinction between derivation and inflection. Inflectional formations are characterized by great generality; they do not vary in use and acceptability from person to person and from one word root to another. The former part of morphology Varro called declinatio naturalis (natural word variation) and the latter, declinatio voluntaria (spontaneous word form variation). Varro set up the following system of four inflexionally contrasting classes: 1) those with case inflexion (nouns including adjectives); 2) those with tense inflexion (verbs); 3) those with case and tense inflexion (participles); 4) those with neither (adverb). The Latin grammars of the present day are the direct descendants of the works written by late grammarians, Priscian (c. A. D. 500) in particular. His aim, like theirs, was to transfer as far as he could the grammatical system of Thrax's grammar, as well as the writings of Appolonius, to Latin. He uses the classical system of eight word classes laid down by Thrax and Appolonius, 10 with the omission of the article and the inclusion of the interjection. Priscian's work is based on the language of the best writers (e. g. Cicero, Virgil), i. e. not on the language of his own day. Priscian's work marks the bridge between Antiquity and the Middle Ages in linguistic scholarship. Prescriptive Grammar As already known, until the end of the sixteenth century, the only grammars used in English schools were Latin grammars. The aim was to teach Englishmen to read, write and sometimes converse in this lingua franca of Western Europe. One of the earliest and most popular Latin grammars written in English was William Lily's grammar, published in the first half of the 16th century. It was an aid to learning Latin, and it rigorously followed Latin models. The Renaissance saw the birth of the

modern world. It widened linguistic horizons. Scholars turned their attention to the living languages of Europe. Although the study of Greek and Latin grammar continued, they were not the only languages scholars were interested in. As can be expected, the first grammars of English were closely related to Latin grammars. Latin had been used in England for centuries, scholars had treated it as an ideal language. They were struck by its rigor and order. English, which replaced Latin, had to appear as perfect as Latin. As a result, some English scholars were greatly concerned with refining their language. Through the use of logic they hoped to improve English. The first grammars of English were prescriptive, not descriptive. The most influential grammar of this period was R. Lowth's Short Introduction to English Grammar (1762). The aim of this grammar was " to teach us to express ourselves with propriety... and to enable us to judge of every phrase and form of construction, whether it be right or not". Unfortunately, the criterion for the discrimination between right and wrong constructions was Latin. As Latin appeared to conform best to their concept of ideal grammar, they described English in terms of Latin forms and imposed the same grammatical constraints. For instance, a noun was presented in the form of the Latin noun paradigm: Nominative: the house Genitive: of the house Dative: to the house Accusative: the house Ablative: in, at, from the house Vocative: house 11 Prescriptivists promoted those grammatical variants which corresponded, in one way or another, to equivalents in Latin. Anxious to do it, they prescribed and proscribed many of the constructions used in English from time immemorial. They condemned the use of a preposition in sentence-final position, e. g. who are you looking at? or who are you talking to? The reason for the condemnation was that sentences do not end with a

preposition in Latin. But even in Old English we could find sentences ending with prepositions. The rule ' It is incorrect to end a sentence with a preposition' was repeated in prestigious grammars towards the end of the eighteenth century, and from the nineteenth century on it was widely taught in schools. To quote Geoffrey K. Pullum and Rodney Huddleston (2002: 627), " The result is that older people with traditional educations and outlooks still tend to believe that stranding (i. e. the use of prepositions in sentence-final position — L. Valeika, J. Buitkiene) is always some kind of mistake. " Another restriction that the prescriptivists applied to English was the Latin constraint on the use of the accusative form of a noun after the verb esse (to be). Since me is historically the accusative form of the person (nom.: I; gen.: my; dat.: to me; acc.: me; abl.: by me; voc.: o me), it was considered wrong to say it's me. Instead we must say It's I. The pattern It's me, which had been common for centuries and still is, was thought incorrect since the Latin construction ego sum made use of the nominative form of the pronoun. Another prescription was not to use the construction better than him. Writers of Lowth's era used both better than he and better than him. His preference for the former he explained by the fact that better than he can be followed by the verb is and better than him cannot. His decision and his reasons continue to be observed today. Prescriptivists disliked variation and change. Correctness was associated with what used to be the case. Different from was preferable to different to, or different than, because the di-part of the word in Latin indicated division or separateness, and therefore from suits the etymological argument better. Prescriptivists condemned constructions on account of logic as well. For instance, had rather and had better, double comparatives (lesser, worser) were regarded as contradicting the laws of

reason. Logic was used to stigmatise some constructions and promote others. The most notorious example concerns double negation, e. g. I don't know nothing. Such patterns were traditional. Shakespeare used double negation. However, they were condemned as incorrect. Last but not least, prescriptivists disregarded English of their day: they would rather draw their examples from the past. Even the English of the best 12 writers of the past was sometimes regarded as wrong if it did not correspond to their conception of correct English. Prescriptivists are conservative linguists: when there is a competition between an older form and a more recent alternative, they dislike change which is identified with corruption: the language of their ancestors had beauty, but the Language of his contemporares is always diminished (Randal L. Whitman, 1975: 6). Latinization of English grammar was also reflected in the system of parts of speech. Patterning after Latin, prescriptivists set up a classification of eight parts of speech: noun, pronoun, verb, adjective, adverb, preposition, conjunction, and interjection. The English articles a(n) and the, having no Latin counterparts, were not given the status of a part of speech, but merely referred to as signs before nouns to identify them as nouns. Some prescriptivists treated the articles as a subclass of adjectives. Only Ben Jonson assigned them to a class of their own. Similar to Latin grammarians, prescriptivists, in defining word classes or syntactic structures, relied either on meaning or function. E. g. a noun is the name of a person, place or thing; an adjective is a word that modifies a noun; a sentence is a group of words expressing a complete thought; the subject is that of which something is said; the predicate is that which is said of the subject. To sum up, prescriptive grammar could be characterized by the following features: 1) Patterning after Latin in classifying words into word

classes and establishing grammatical categories; 2) Reliance on meaning and function in definitions; 3) Approach to correctness: the standards of correctness are logic, which was identified with Latin, and the past. 4) Emphasis on writing rather than speech. As prescriptive grammarians were concerned with the rules for the correct use of English, they could be called the first standardizers of English. Unfortunately, their ' standardization' work was often based on subjective criteria and other languages. However, not all works written in the prescriptive era ignored actual usage. Those which did not paved the way to Standard English, which has today become an objective standard for correct English. Those grammarians who adhere to the norms of Standard English (the English of government, education, broadcasting, news publishing, and other public discourse) are also prescriptivists — prescriptivists in a good sense. 13 Non-Structural Descriptive Grammar In the second half of the 19th century the development of prescriptive grammar was completed. The best prescriptive grammars of the period, C. P. Mason's English Grammar, 1858 and A. Bain's Higher English Grammar, 1863, paved the way for the appearance of a new type of grammar, viz. descriptive, or scientific grammar: a need was felt for a grammar which could give a scientific explanation of the actually occurring structures without assessing the correctness of the structures. Henry Sweet (1845—1912), the father of a new approach to linguistic studies, described it in the preface to his work, New English Grammar, Logical and Historical (1891) as follows: " As my exposition claims to be scientific, I confine myself to the statement of facts, without attempting to settle the relative correctness of divergent usages. If an ' ungrammatical' expression such as it is me is in general use among educated people, I accept it as such, simply

adding that it is avoided in the literary language" (H. Sweet, 1891: XI). Similar to prescriptive grammarians, Sweet mostly concerned himself with the written language, the language of the best writers of his time1 . Sweet also adopted the grammatical system of his predecessors, but in classifying words into word classes he was more explicit as regards the criteria, or principles, of classification than prescriptivists. The scholar seemed to adhere to the same conception of parts of speech as his ancient colleagues, viz. parts of speech are syntactic categories — they manifest themselves in the sentence as relational categories: the noun is related to the verb, the adverb is related to the verb, the preposition is related to the noun, the adjective is related to the noun. This approach can be clearly seen in his description of the noun: " As regards their function in the sentence, words fall under certain classes called parts of speech, all the members of each of these classes having certain formal characteristics in common which distinguish them from the members of the other classes. Each of these classes has a name of its own — noun, adjective, verb, etc. " (H. Sweet: 1891, 35). " If we examine the meanings of the words belonging to the different parts of speech, we shall find that such nouns as tree, snow, man, are all substance-words... " (ibid.). The term scientific grammar means reliance on facts and the use of the inductive method. Henry Sweet was the first to undermine the old tradition in linguistic studies where the function of grammar was to prescribe what is 1 Being interested in phonetics, Sweet could not ignore the spoken language: " The first requisite is a knowledge of phonetics of the form of language. We must learn to regard language solely as consisting of groups of sounds, independently of the written symbols... " (Words, Logic and Meaning, p. 471). This is in fact the recognition of the

priority of oral speech over written. 14 judged to be correct rather than describe actual usage. Among his followers we can mention Poutsma, Kruisinga, Zandvoort, Curme, and Jesperson. However, of all the descriptivists, special mention should be given to Otto Jespersen (1860—1943), a Danish linguist whose most enduring work is in the theory of grammar and the grammar of English. Like Sweet, he proposes three principles of classification — meaning, form, and function. He is much more original in syntactic studies. His theory is set out in The Philosophy of Grammar (1924). It is based on the concepts of ranks distinguished in nexus (predication) and junction (subordination). The term rank is used of successive levels of subordination, or dependency. E. g. in the junction very cold water, water has the highest rank and is a primary; cold has the next highest rank and is a secondary; very has the lowest and is a tertiary. The ranks are also distinguished in nexus, e. g. He (primary) writes (secondary) a letter (primary) every day (tertiary). This sentence contradicts his theory of ranks since a letter is subordinate to writes. If the scholar had been more consistent, he would have had to apply the same principle of subordination to both junction and nexus structure, as he did in his analysis of a furiously barking dog and a dog barks furiously. Despite this inconsistency, the theory of ranks undoubtedly served as an impulse to transformational-generative grammarians who saw transformational relations between predicative and non-predicative structures. Non-predicative structures were treated as transformationally derived from the corresponding predicative ones — both were built on the same type of subordination. Non-Structural Descriptive Grammar in Summary 1. Unlike prescriptivists, descriptivists focus their attention on actual usage without trying " to settle the relative correctness

of divergent usages"; 2. Descriptivists rely on the English of the best authors of their day as well as the English of the past. To them, change in language is not associated with corruption; 3. Similar to prescriptivists, descriptivists use meaning and function in their definition of parts of speech. Structural Descriptive Grammar The non-structural descriptive approach to language had its heyday between 1900 and 1930, when it was replaced by structuralism. The father of American structuralism is generally called Leonard Bloomfield, who in his book Language presented the new approach as follows: " The study of language can be conducted... only so long as we pay no attention to the meaning of what is spoken" (1933: 75). 15 Followers of this approach sought to study the structure of a language as objectively as possible, without reference to meaning and other languages. By other languages they, first and foremost, meant Latin and Greek, the languages prescriptive and, to a lesser degree, descriptive grammarians modelled their analysis on. English was regarded as a language having its specific structure, and the task of a linguist was to reveal it by using scientific (i. e. formal) methods of analysis. Meaning as a criterion was not reliable since, being unobservable, it could be interpreted differently by different linguists. Therefore the linguist was to devise formal methods of analysis and replace meaning by form; the linguist must be interested in what he observes, i. e. objective data. The structuralists based their conclusions on the analysis of sentences that they had collected from native speakers of English, giving priority to Spoken English. To structuralists, language is a highly organized affair, where the smaller units are built into larger units, which in turn are built into larger ones, until the largest unit is reached. Such building-blocks are phonemes and morphemes. The structures that we build out of the '

bricks' are lexemes. Lexemes, in their own turn, serve to build the largest unit, the sentence, i. e. the predicative unit. Structural linguists ignored meaning not because they were not interested in it. Meaning was ignored on the grounds that it was not observable and could not be described objectively by using formal methods. The description of meaning had to wait until appropriate methods were devised. Such being the case, they focused their attention on structural, i. e. grammatical, meaning1. How are structural meanings conveyed in English? Structural grammarians have pointed out four devices used in English to indicate structural meaning: 1) word form; 2) function words; 3) word order; 4) intonation and accent patterns (prosodic patterns). Present-day English depends strongly on word order to convey meaning. Charles Fries (1956 ) argues that " certain positions in the English sentence have become to be felt as subject territory, others as object territory, and the forms of the words in each territory are pressed to adjust themselves to the character of that territory". Function words are another device. Having little or no lexical meaning of their own, they serve to vary the functions of the lexical words. Consider: The mother of the boy will arrive tomorrow. The words mother, boy, arrive, and tomorrow have meaning in themselves quite apart from their grammatical relation, or meaning, in the sentence. They 1 By structural meaning is meant meaning expressed morphologically or syntactically; it can be simply described as meaning formed within a structure. So, for instance, when morphemes are organized into lexemes or predicative units, a new kind of meaning emerges which is not associated with the individual morphemes or individual lexemes. 16 are full, or notional, words. But the words the, of, and will express primarily a grammatical idea and have little or no meaning apart from the grammatical

function they indicate: the functions as a determiner of mother telling us that a particular member of the class is meant; of relates the boy to the mother or, in other words, of makes the word boy an attribute, or modifier, of the word mother; it is equivalent to a genitive inflection (cf. the boy's mother); will indicates that the process of arriving will occur in the future1 . The role of intonation is obvious when we have to differentiate between statements and questions, between the theme and the rheme. Stress, or accent, helps to distinguish nouns from verbs (e. g. ´suspect vs. suspect), juncture-pause in speech distinguishes between such structures as night-rate and nitrate or phrases, clauses and sentences. As already mentioned, anxious to be objective, structural grammarians used formal methods of linguistic analysis, such as immediate constituent, distribution, substitution, transformation (deletion, permutation, etc.). The term immediate constituents (IC) was introduced by L. Bloomfield as follows: " Any English-speaking person who concerns himself with this matter is sure to tell us that the immediate constituents of Poor John ran away are the two forms Poor John and ran away; that each of these is, in turn, a complex form; that the immediate constituents of ran away are ran and away, and that the constituents of Poor John are poor and John". To put it in more simple language, the constituents Poor John and ran away belong together, for they stand side by side. They are the most important constituents since they constitute the core of the sentence. The same principle of togetherness underlies the constituents Poor and John, ran and away. However, as compared to Poor John and ran away, they are constituents of a lower level: they are subconstituents of the higher level — Poor John and ran away. Hence two levels of analysis: higher and lower where the lower level is subordinated to the higher level. According to

D. Bolinger (1968: 195), the principle of togetherness is very pervasive in language. It manifests itself in " our resistance to putting something between two things that are more closely related to each other than they are to what is inserted. Teachers find it hard to enforce the rule of interior plurals in forms like mothers-in-law and postmasters general — speakers want to put the —s at the end. They are even more reluctant to say hardest-working person, inserting the —est between the members of the compound hard-working; and though some might manage it there, probably no one would say *farthestfetched story for most far-fetched story". 1 Linguists are not agreed on the status of shall and will: some linguists treat the words as grammatical word-morphemes, others as lexical words. For a fuller discussion of the status of shall and will, see p p. 81—3. 17 S(= sentence) a b Poor John ran away The aim of IC analysis is to discover and demonstrate the interrelationships of the words in a linguistic structure — the sentence or the word-combination. It is not difficult to see a similarity between immediate constituent analysis and the traditional procedure of ' parsing' sentences into subject and predicate, attribute, object and adverbial. Thus L. Bloomfield's sentence could be described by a traditional grammarian as a simple sentence whose subject is a nounphrase, made up of the noun John modified by the adjective poor, and whose predicate is a verb-phrase consisting of the verb ran modified by the adverb away. Both the traditional procedure and the IC method view the sentence not as just a linear sequence of elements but as made up of " layers" of immediate constituents, each lower-level constituent being part of a higher-level constituent. The analysis of the sentence Poor John ran away can be represented graphically in a number of ways: a) we may use brackets: (Poor/John) (ran/away) b) we

may construct a tree diagram: The tree-diagram given below is to be read as follows: the ultimate constituents of the sentence are poor, John, ran, away; the words poor and John are the immediate constituents of one construction (layer) indicated by ' node' (a); the words ran and away are the immediate constituents of another construction (layer) indicated by ' node' (b). The two constructions Poor John and ran away are the immediate constituents of the highest-level construction, the sentence itself. As can be seen, in analyzing the sentence into ICs we do not class the ICs into speech parts, nor do we say that Poor John is a noun-phrase. Neither do we call Poor John subject, and ran away predicate. In this respect IC analysis differs from, and is poorer than the traditional analysis. Its merit is that it does not use the traditional concepts, concepts which are not defined clearly. However, " it tells us nothing about the nature of the elements nor the manner in which they are related" (D. Bolinger, op. cit., 196). Bloomfied's followers, Wells and Harris, formulated the principles of IC 18 analysis in greater detail. We will not go into them but will only add that the nodes were replaced by the terms noun phrase and verb phrase; the noun phrase was analyzed into the Adjective (Adj) and the Noun (N); the verb phrase was analyzed into the Verb (V) and the adverb (Adv). These symbols were then replaced by the ultimate constituents — poor, John, ran, away. Consider now the new tree-diagram: As already mentioned, the aim of IC analysis is to show the syntagmatic interrelations between the sentence constituents. Structuralists would agree that if we have described these interrelationships, we have described the syntax of the sentence in its entirety. 1 The shortcoming of the IC method lies in its extreme formality: the analyst, using this method, is not interested in the content of the interrelationships. Such syntactic notions as subject,

predicate, object, complement, attribute, adverbial, which constitute the basis of traditional analysis, practically were never used by structuralists. In this way, content was separated from form. And language is a dialectical unity of content and form. Besides, the method of IC analysis is only capable of revealing word relationships within the sentence. But, to quote D. Bolinger (op. cit., 201), " How could a frame so confined as that of immediate constituents be expected to fit comfortably around the whole of syntax, when there are many important relationships that escape it? The classic example is the relationship between the active and the passive voice: George sees Mary; Mary is seen by George. An immediate-constituent analysis of these two sentences tells nothing about their underlying kinship. " Let us now turn to distribution. Distribution is the set of contexts, or environments, within sentences in which a unit can appear. So, for instance, the distribution of hair in written English is the set of the following contexts: S(= sentence) NP VP Adj N V Adv Poor John ran away 1 For a more detailed analysis of the IC method, see J. Skarulis (1987: 24-30). 19 I combed my hair. Give me the hair spray. My hair is too long, etc. The distribution of the word hair can be described as follows: 1) it can follow the word my; 2) it can precede the word spray; 3) it can precede the verb be. If we analyze other words, we shall find other positions they occupy, or other environments in which they are used. Words that have the same distribution are words of the same class. We test their distribution by substituting them for other words. Consider the sentence I combed my hair. The word hair can be formally substituted for other words, such as place, town, wood, etc. Distribution and substitution were used by structuralists for the classification of linguistic units. Like the IC method, the method of distribution was treated as a

method that enables the analyst to classify words into classes objectively, i. e. without having recourse to meaning. The transformational method was developed by Zellig Harris in the 1950s. The aim of a transformational operation was to reveal similarities and differences in the structure of the units being examined or to reveal the structural potential of the unit. 1 To understand it, let us examine the following structures: 1) Mary has a new car. 2) Mary has a good time. Superficially, the two sentences are identical in structure. However, they present two distinct structures. Sentence (1) cannot be turned into the passive while sentence (2) can: Mary has a new car. _ *A new car is had by Mary. Mary has a good time. _ A good time is had by Mary. The structural potential of a linguistic unit can also be tested by this method: a) my dog _ the dog of mine; b) Susan's dog _ the dog of Susan _ the Susan dog; c) John gave the book to me. _ John gave me the book _ The book was given to me. d) John bought the book for me _ John bought me the book _ The book was bought for me _ *I was bought the book. e) A number of people came _ People came _ *A number came _ *The number of people came. f) Bill fixed up a drink for John _ Bill fixed a drink up for John _ Bill fixed a drink for John up _ Bill fixed up John a drink. 1 No matter whish aim is pursued, transformations help to reveal the existing relations between linguistic structures. 20 g) John resides in New York _ *John resides. h) John is my best friend _ John is. i) John is walking in the park _ John is walking. j) Mary put the flowers in the vase _* Mary put the flowers. k) Mary is writing a letter. _ Mary is writing. 1) The door was closed _ the door was closed by the janitor. m) The door closed _ *The door closed by the janitor. n) The woman looked angry _ *The woman looked angrily. o) The woman appeared angry _ *The woman appeared angrily. p) We do not allow smoking in the lecture hall _ It

is not allowed to smoke in the lecture hall _ Smoking is not allowed in the lecture hall. q) The student arrived late. _ The student's late arrival. Through the transformational method we can show the structural potential of a linguistic unit as compared to units exhibiting superficially similar structure. If linguistic units can be subjected to the same transformation, we can say that they are identically structured. But if they cannot, their structure is different. To sum up, the merit of the transformational method can be stated as follows: 1) it enables the analyst to diagnose linguistic structures; 2) it reveals the structural potential of linguistic structures. The emergence of this method practically marks the end of post-Bloomfieldian linguistics and the beginning of a new stage of structural linguistics. 1 Transformational — Generative Grammar From the transformational method there was only one step to the creation of a new type of grammar, viz. transformational-generative grammar. This method and the method of ICs had paved the way for the emergence of a grammar that could account for the generation of the sentence. Unlike the structural grammarian, the transformational-generative grammarian is not content with describing what he finds in a corpus of sentences collected from native speakers. He is interested in possible sentences, i. e. the speaker's-hearer's knowledge of a language (competence), rather than in his actual use of it (performance). There are two types of transformational-generative grammar: 1) the Harris — Chomsky grammar and 2) the Chomsky grammar. The first type of transformational-generative grammar (TG) was developed by Harris (1951) in concert with his pupil Chomsky, in the 1950s. By the end of the decade their 1 A fuller analysis of the use of the transformational method in syntax can be found in J. Skarulis (op. cit.). 21 paths had separated. But first let us discuss the

model of TG as worked out by Harris in association with Chomsky. According to this model, a language consists of a limited number of kernel sentences (i. e. structurally the most simple sentences)1 , and their transforms, i. e. structures derived from them. Kernel sentences are generated by the use of the IC model. The set of rules showing how a sentence is generated is called rewrite rules, or rewriting rules. Consider the kernel sentence The man hit the ball. This sentence is generated by the application of the following rules: 1) Sentence _ NP + VP 2) NP _ T (a determiner) + N 3) T_ the 4) N _ man 5) VP _V + NP 6) V_ hit 7) NP _T + N 8) T _ the 9) N _ ball This sentence is derived by the use of 6 rules (rules 7, 8, 9 are recursive, i. e. they have already been used before). From this sentence, applying transformational rules, we can derive other sentences, such as The ball was hit by the man; Did the man hit the ball?; The man did not hit the ball; What the man did was hit the ball; It was the man who hit the ball, etc. The principal transformational rules that can be applied to kernel sentences include: 1) expansion of the verb phrase and the noun phrase, e. g. John is at home. _ John must be at home. We like him. _ We came to like him. John is walking. _ John is walking in the park. The verb in the kernel sentence can be expanded by using modal and aspective verbs; the noun by restrictors (articles, pronouns), e. g. John is at home _ The John (i. e. our John) is at home. _ Poor John is at home. _ Mary's John is at home. 2) permutation — change of the word-order, e. g. He is a student. _ Is he a student? 1 Harris gives the following list of kernels: 1) The team went there; 2) We'll take it; 3) The teacher looked at him; 4) He's an architect; 5) The girl is pretty; 6) The paper is of importance; 7) The man is here. 22 Jane sent me a letter. _ Jane sent a letter to me. 3) introduction of functional words, e. g. He arrived tonight. _

Did he arrive tonight? Ted is clever _ How clever Ted is! 4) use of introducers (there, it), e. g. A bell rang. _ There rang a bell. 5) deletion of an element, e. g. Would you like a cup of tea? _ A cup of tea? 6) use of negation words, e. g. The evening was warm. _ The evening was not warm. 7) passivisation, e. g. The teacher praised the boy. _ The boy was praised by the teacher. Kernel sentences can be nominalized, i. e. they can be transformed into noun-phrases (NP) which preserve the semantic relations of the kernel sentence, e. g. The bird sings _ 1) the singing of the bird; 2) the song of the bird; 3) the bird's song; 4) a singing bird. To sum up, this model of TG is divided into three parts: 1) phrase-structure rules, 2) lexicon, and 3) transformational rules. First we begin with the phrasestructure rule which says: S _ NP + VP. Then we select the rules that are used to generate NP and VP. Then we turn to the lexicon and substitute words for the symbols. Having thus generated a kernel sentence, we can now derive other structures by using appropriate transformations. This model of TG is rather ' democratic': it does not require that the transformations should fully preserve the meaning of the kernels — they may or may not preserve it. Besides, it is very simple. Hence its great popularity among teachers of English. As already mentioned, the second type of TG was worked out by N. Chomsky (1962), who radically moved away from the first type by distinguishing two levels of the sentence — surface and deep. Besides, Chomsky gave up the concept of kernel sentence — his model aimed to show how all sentences (simple and composite) are generated in English. So what is surface structure and what is deep structure? We will begin with deep structure. A deep structure is a structure generated only by phrase-structure rules and lexical rules, e. g. not John past can sing well. A deep structure that has been transformed into a

grammatical English sentence is called a surface structure, e. g. John could not sing well. All grammatical English sentences are surface structures; underlying each one is a deep structure. The deep structure of 23 A. 1) Planes + present fly Flying planes can be dangerous. 2) Planes + present can + be + dangerous. B. 1) X + pres. fly + planes Flying planes can be dangerous. 2) Flying + pres. can be + dangerous a sentence is a kind of ' springboard' for other structures which are generated by the application of transformational rules. As compared to the first type of TG, the Chomskyan TG imposes one important restriction on the transformations applicable to a deep structure, viz. the transformations must not change the meaning of the deep structure. In the first type of TG, Harris and Chomsky would derive, for instance, yes/no questions from related declaratives: Tom is sick. _ Is Tom sick? He heard us. _ Did he hear us? But as the transformation would change the meaning of the sentences, questions are not derived from declaratives. The idea of interrogation must be presented in the deep structure of a question, e. g. Q (question) + Tom + present be + sick. This goes to say that declaratives and questions are based on different deep underlying structures. What is especially new and useful in this type of TG is the observation that grammar is a device for generating grammatical sentences1 . The rules comprising this grammar are limited in number, but the sentences we generate by means of those rules are infinite. Although most of the sentences we encounter every day are totally new to us, we have no difficulty understanding them because the rules they are based on are very well known to us. A good knowledge of the rules enables the speaker to ' create' new sentences every time he speaks a language. Special mention should be made of the importance of the concept deep structure.

TG grammarians would agree that this concept helps us to account for ambiguity and predict it, e. g. Flying planes can be dangerous. The sentence Flying planes can be dangerous is ambiguous because it can be related to different deep structures: 1 The term grammatical means two things: 1) generated by the application of phrasestructure and transformational rules; 2) generated by the application of lexical, or semantic rules. Thus the sentence Green ideas sleep furiously is not grammatical because it violates the rule of semantic compatibility (Lith. suderinamumo principas) 24 That the sentence Flying planes can be dangerous realizes both types of deep structure (A and B) can only be accounted for by the structural peculiarities of English. Cf. Lith.: Skraidantys lektuvai yra pavojingi (deep structure A) and Skristi lektuvu yra pavojinga (deep structure B). Generative grammar allows us to predict that deep structures such as represented by A and B will produce ambiguous sentences when they are combined. 1 Other deep structures will not produce ambiguous sentences, e. g. Planes + pres. be + dangerous + planes + pres. fly _ Flying planes are dangerous. Nor will the deep structure X + pres. + fly + planes + Flying+ pres. be + dangerous produce an ambiguous sentence — Flying planes is dangerous. It will be obvious that the ambiguity of the sentence Flying planes can be dangerous as well as the ambiguity of other sentences can also be accounted for using the first type of TG, viz. using the concept of kernel sentences. Consider, for a change, the sentence Hunting tigers can be dangerous: The sentence Hunting tigers can be dangerous is ambiguous because it can be treated as deriving from two types of kernel sentences (A and B). Harris' model is more in keeping with the principles of structural grammar (the emphasis is on structure) than Chomsky's (the emphasis is on the rules used to generate

linguistic structures). Other transformational-generative grammarians, such as Charles Fillmore, soon came to see a major inadequacy of the Chomskyan model when they had to account for such sentences as John bought the book from Mary and Mary sold the book to John. Semantically, the two sentencesdescribe the same situation, but since they do not contain the same content words (i. e. nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs), we cannot derive them from the same deep structure. Therefore, A. Hunting tigers can be dangerous _ 1. Tigers hunt. 2. Tigers can be dangerous. B. 1. X hunts tigers. 2. Hunting can be dangerous. 1 A transformation which combines two separate structures is called generalized transformation, or a double-base transformation. In the mid-1960s the concept of generalized transformation was rejected: the type of structures came to be derived in a base component, i. e. by phrase-structure rules. 25 they suggested abandoning the Chomskyan deep structure for a more abstract deep, or semantic, structure, which could allow us to generate the said structures. Such a deep structure is Agent + Process + Affected + Recipient. Mary is the Agent, sold is the Process, the book is the Affected, and John is the Recipient. Given this semantic structure, we can derive either John bought the book from Mary or Mary sold the book to John. The use of one or the other construction is the speaker's choice: if the speaker wishes to use John as the Theme (or the point of departure), he will give preference to the first pattern, and if the speaker wishes to use Mary as the Theme, he will give preference to the second pattern. The type of grammar which is concerned with the generation of semantic structure and derives linguistic structures from it is called generative semantics. 1 The era of structural and transformational-generative grammar has already come to an end. However, their

achievements have not vanished without trace: they have been incorporated into present-day traditional grammar. The Explanatory Power of Non-Structural Descriptive, Structural Descriptive and Transformational-Generative Grammar (by way of summing up) Grammar should seek to explain how language is structured, what functions its structures perform, what rules are used to form sentences or wordcombinations. Different grammars solve these problems with a different degree of success. We will test the explanatory power of each type of grammar by considering the sentence, the largest unit of grammar over which a rule of grammar can operate. 1. Non-Structural Descriptive Grammar Traditionally, the sentence is a group of words that expresses a complete thought or a group of words that contains a Subject and a Predicate. The first definition, which is a notional one, is rather subjective since there are no criteria by which we can judge the completeness of a thought. The second definition is not satisfactory either because it rules out verbless sentences. The sentence is a unit of communication, which suggests that any structure that can perform this function is a sentence2 . To be more precise, any structure that can express new information is a sentence. 1 For more information on semantic syntax and the application of its principles to English syntax, see Laimutis Valeika (1998). 2 This interpretation of the sentence is also traditional in the sense that it is neither structural nor transformational-generative; it is present-day, or contemporary, traditional. 26 Traditional grammarians devote a great deal of time and energy to sentence analysis. According to the traditional method, the sentence is analyzed in terms of the parts of the sentence: Subject, Predicate (principle parts), Object, Attribute, Adverbial Modifier (secondary parts). Having identified the parts, traditional

grammarians proceed to characterize them morphologically: What part of speech is it? In what form, tense, aspect, mood, voice, etc. is it expressed? The main shortcoming of the traditional method is that sentence analysis is based on syntactic notions which are not defined clearly. Such being the case, syntactic analysis turns into an art: one and the same constituent is often given more than one analysis. Consider the sentence: John wants to go there. There being no clear criteria for distinguishing parts of the sentence, we cannot say for certain whether the infinitive is part of the verbal predicate or the object. Consider another sentence: He was known to like her. It is not clear whether the Subject is only he or he + to like her. Both analyses can be found in traditional grammar. A similar situation can be observed when we analyze secondary parts of the sentence, e. g. He swam across the river. vs. He swam the river. The word the river is often given the same analysis despite a difference in pattern. The same indeterminacy concerns the analysis of a key in He opened the door with a key: is it an Adverbial Modifier of Manner or a Prepositional Object? All this suggests that traditional sentence analysis is endowed with serious problems. Traditional grammarians cannot adequately cope with ambiguity in language, e. g. He is a man to watch. They are aware of the ambiguity and say that the sentence is ambiguous because a man may be given two interpretations: subjective and objective — He is a man who watches or He is a man who is watched. Although it is a correct account, we cannot say it is adequate: it does not say what is " responsible" for the ambiguity. A similar problem arises when we analyze the sentence He fed her dog biscuits. The traditionalist will be forced to say that the sentence is ambiguous, or that it is a trick sentence. He/ she will say that her may be treated as the Indirect Object of fed (fed her) or the

possessive restrictor (determiner) of the noun dog (her dog). But he/she will not be in a position to answer the question what makes it ambiguous. Also, in treating the structure the love of God, the traditionalist will admit that it is ambiguous, for the constituent God may be given a subjective and an objective interpretation. Although the traditional analysis is correct, it is not adequate. Traditional grammarians treat syntactic structures as independent units, although they are aware of existing derivational relationships between them. For instance, such relationships are assumed to exist between active and passive sentences, between simple and composite (compound and complex) sentences, 27 between declarative, negative, interrogative, and exclamatory sentences. However, the existing relationships are not formalized in terms of paradigmatic relations. Traditional grammarians do not see such relationships between predicative structures and non-predicative ones, e. g. John arrived vs. John's arrival. It will be obvious that what has been said about traditional grammar so far is only true of the type of traditional grammar which existed before the advent of structural descriptive grammar. These days traditional grammar, which continues to be based on meaning and function, incorporates the achievements of the past and the present, and, as in the past, is used as a reference source by teachers of English and as a point of departure by scholars. The adoption of new methods of analysis (structural, statistical) greatly enhances its explanatory power. 2. Structural Descriptive Grammar Structural grammarians prided themselves on being true linguists: they based their analysis on actual English, giving preference to spoken English; they used ' discovery procedures' such as distribution and substitution tests, transformations of various sorts, etc. As compared to traditionalists, they

were more analytic: their attention was on segmentation and categorization (i. e. labeling structures). Rejecting traditional concepts and methods as unscientific, structural grammarians focused on the development of a grammar which would be devoid of ' old illnesses', a grammar not influenced by Latin or Greek. It was in the field of syntax that Latinization was the most obvious. As already indicated, structural grammarians put forward a new method of sentence analysis, viz. the immediate constituent (IC) method. The essence of the method is that the sentence is viewed as being composed of layers, or levels — higher and lower. The layers are subordinate to each other. By means of this method we can identify the syntactic relations between constituents that are adjacent (next) to each other. The term immediate means that there is no other syntactic element in between. Consider: Mary married John. Graphically, the IC structure of the sentence can be presented as follows: As can be seen, the sentence is divided into two immediate constituents Mary married John. 28 The difference between the two sentences concerns the relationship between the man and the adverbial constructions in the red cap and in the right arm with respect to the verb shot: in the first sentence the second cut is between shot and the man while in the second sentence it is between the man and the right arm. In traditional terms, in the first sentence in the red cap is an Attribute to the man while in the second sentence in the right arm is an Adverbial of Place. So far so good. But how can we show different structure in the case of the love of God? Traditionalists would say that God may be treated in two ways: it may have a subjective and an objective function. The structuralists' immediate constituent method is powerless here. However, the transformational method copes with the ambiguity easily: The love of God _

1. X loves God. 2. God loves X. Returning to IC analysis, we must say that it only identifies syntactic relations, or dependencies: it does not fill the relations with content. Traditional sentence analysis into sentence parts, or into the syntactic functions of the sentence constituents, seems to be more acceptable since it does not ignore syntactic function. Structuralists rejected the traditional method of the classification of words into word-classes and replaced it by the distributional method, or, roughly speaking, the positional method. As there are few forms in English, the behavior of a word in the context becomes a crucial factor in classifying words. But the The second sentence is structured differently: The police shot the man in the right arm. Mary and married John subordinated to the sentence as a whole: married John is divided into married and John which are subordinated to married John. The highest level is represented by the sentence: the first unit represents a lower level and the second unit, the lowest. Is this method an improvement on the traditional one? Yes and No. This method makes it possible to demonstrate that sentences having identical grammar may have different structure. Consider: The police shot the man in the red cap. The police shot the man in the right arm. The first sentence has the following IC structure: The police shot the man in the red cap. 29 distribution of a word is practically the same as the function of a word in a sentence. This suggests that the traditionalist also makes use of the same principle as the structuralist. Despite the similarities, structural grammar has an advantage over traditional grammar in being more rigorous as concerns linguistic analysis. Giving an overall evaluation of structural grammar, it is necessary to point out that it pays special attention to analysis, to the distinction of structural units (phonemes, morphemes, lexemes, sentences). Structuralists were too

preoccupied with the sequence of phoneme-to-sentence and failed to see the interrelationships outside the sentence. Last but not least, structural grammarians spent all the energies in gathering more and more examples without trying to create an allencompassing theory of language that " would, as theories must, see first the whole and then the parts" (D. Bolinger, op. cit., 201). 3. Transformational-Generative Grammar Transformational-generative grammar does not teach us how to analyse sentences; it teaches us how sentences are generated in a language. Neither traditional nor structural grammar was interested in the generation of sentences. What is more, the recognition of two types of structure — surface and deep — makes it possible to relate all the sentences of a language and even different languages: sentences and languages which are quite different on the surface often show many similar features in their deep structures. Transformational-generative grammar can account for any structural ambiguity by relating ambiguous constructions to two (or more than two) deep structures. Ambiguity is the result of the neutralization of the deep, or underlying, relations. Consider: Hunting tigers can be dangerous. This sentence can be related to two different deep structures: DS (1) Tigers + pres. hunt + X + Tigers pres. can be + dangerous; DS (1) X pres. hunt + tigers + It + pres. can be + dangerous. As already mentioned, TG makes it possible to relate one sentence to another: sentences are related if they derive from the same deep structure: DS The manager + past write + the letter_ The manager wrote the letter. The letter was written by the manager. Besides, TG can relate sentences to other structures: the structures The letter written by the manager and the manager's having written the letter are related through the same deep structure — The manager past write + the letter. However, if we

apply the Harris model, we shall be able to derive more structures 30 from the same deep structure, for the Harris model, in contrast to the Chomskyan model, is ' more democratic' — it is not bound by the requirement that transformations should not change the meaning of the transforms. Thus the Harris model will derive all the structures derived by the Chomskyan model and others: Did the manager write the letter? The manager did not write the letter. Who wrote the letter? What did the manager write? The writing of the letter by the manager. For the manager to write the letter. Because the manager wrote the letter, etc. In view of this, the Harris model is more powerful: it can derive more structures from the kernel sentence. Besides, it is more simple. Being more simple, it is easier to use in the classroom. Transformations demonstrate the cohesiveness of language where simpler constructions are built into more and more intricate ones. The shortcoming of TG lies in its complexity. Besides, language is more complex than transformational grammarians thought it was: it contains structures that can only be described by a very sophisticated (intricate) formal apparatus which would render it useless in the classroom. Transformational grammar concentrates on competence and ignores performance, i. e. the actual use of linguistic structures, which suggests that the picture of a language presented by TG is one-sided. Structural Features of Present — Day English In the course of its development, English, as compared to Anglo-Saxon, its parent language, has changed beyond recognition: it has lost, with the exception of a few remains, most of its inflections. What used to be expressed by inflected noun forms is now expressed either by means of prepositions, i. e. lexically, or by a special position in the sentence or the word-combination, i. e. syntactically. The greatest changes of all can be seen in the adjective and

the verb. The elaborate declension system of the adjective has completely disintegrated, and the adjective is now an invariable part of speech (not mentioning degrees of comparison). To quote B. Ilyish (1973: 307), " the simplification of adjective morphology had to be ' paid for' by limitation of freedom in word order". The verb has undergone radical changes as well: personal inflexions, with the exception of the singular 3rd person present tense inflexion, have been lost; new tense forms have come into being: present-day English now boasts of 16 31 tense forms against two in Anglo-Saxon. To innovations we should attribute the passive forms, the analytic forms of the subjunctive mood, and others. All these modifications have changed the structure of English: present-day English is generally described as an analytic language. This statement is not precise, for English is still in the process of development. We can still observe the struggle between the old and the new, i. e. between synthetic and analytic forms. At this stage, English is a predominantly analytic language. The struggle between the old and the new can be seen in many areas of English. Consider, for instance, the formation of feminine nouns. Since the beginning of the 13th century, together with the decay of grammatical gender, English has gradually lost the unrestricted power of forming feminines by inflections and has replaced the morphological process by the syntactic, or analytic, process, i. e. by the addition of words denoting sex to the noun: A visitor _ a gentleman visitor A servant _ a woman servant An employee _ a female employee A teacher _ a male teacher A cat _ a she (lady) cat; a Tom-cat The process of the replacement of old synthetic forms is also seen in the use of the forms who/whom. The inflected, or old, form whom is disappearing from the spoken language and being replaced by who. It is quite normal to say I don't know

who to invite, though in the written language we still find whom. Whom seems to be unshakable in one position, viz. after a preposition. Cf. To whom shall I give it? vs. *To who shall I give it? I don' t know for whom it is intended. vs. *I don't know for who it is intended. In the spoken language, sentences with whom are not usually used; they occur with who and the prepositions to, for, with in sentence final position: Who shall I give it to? I don't know who it is intended for. Analytic processes are also seen in the formation of the comparative and the superlative of adj