

**МОВОЗНАВСТВО
ПИТАННЯ ГРАМАТИКИ**

UDC: 811.111'367.334-115''15/20

DOI 10.31494/2412-933X-2018-1-7-9-16

The evolution of an adjoining construction in the 16th – 21st centuries

Еволюція приєднувальної конструкції у XVI – XXI століттях

Valerii Bohdan,

PhD in Philology, Associate
Professor

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0985-5211>
valeriy.bogdan@gmail.com

Валерій Богдан,

кандидат філологічних наук,
доцент

*Berdiansk State Pedagogical
University*
✉ 4 Schmidta St., Berdiansk,
Zaporizhzhia oblast, 71100

*Бердянський державний
педагогічний університет*
✉ вул. Шмідта, 4
м. Бердянськ, Запорізька обл.,
71100

*Original manuscript received October 17, 2018
Revised manuscript accepted December 12, 2018*

ABSTRACT

In linguistic literature, despite the importance of resolving of one of the topical issues of modern linguistics – the detection of means of joining separate sentences and supra-sentence entities to form larger text units, little attention has been paid so far to the problems of text organization and studying language units participating in its formation. With rare exceptions, the majority of research is carried out synchronically. Nevertheless, a careful diachronic study of language phenomena helps to reveal the nature of many innovative processes in modern languages. Thus, a diachronic approach to studying the structure of an utterance allows to interpret the phenomenon of text units in general and an adjoining construction in particular in an absolutely new way. Many researchers qualified these text units mainly as a syntactic tendency of a language of the late 20th century, i.e. as an exclusively modern phenomenon. The conducted research allows to claim that such a point of view is not justified as the analysis of the English literary texts of the 16th – 21st centuries showed that the roots of an adjoining construction go back centuries. However, in different periods of the English language development, the formation and functioning of an adjoining construction was either a more stylistic phenomenon or a syntactic one. Thus, a comparative analysis of the English texts of the 20th – 21st centuries and the texts of the 16th – 19th centuries showed important differences in the functions fulfilled by an adjoining construction. In the works of fiction of the last two centuries, the adjoining constructions are mostly colloquial in their form and give an expressive colouring to the text. In this case, an adjoining construction can be regarded as a stylistic and

syntactic phenomenon, while the adjoining construction s of the previous centuries tended to be the result of purely syntactic transformations of the text by its author.

Keywords: *adjoining construction, base utterance, adjoined part, adjoining conjunction, diachronic approach.*

In linguistic literature, despite the importance of resolving of one of the topical issues of modern linguistics – the detection of means of joining separate sentences and supra-sentence entities (Altmann 2014, Bohdan 2018, Bohdan 2017) to form larger text units, little attention in linguistic literature has been paid so far to the problems of text organization and studying language units participating in its formation. Moreover, the majority of research is carried out synchronically, that is, on the material of modern languages. With rare exceptions, the corresponding issues are not addressed diachronically (Dmitrenko 1994). Nevertheless, a careful diachronic study of language phenomena will help to reveal the nature of many innovative processes in modern languages. Thus, a diachronic approach to studying the structure of an utterance allows to interpret the phenomenon of supra-sentence entities in general and of an adjoining construction (AC) in particular (Bohdan 2011) in an absolutely new way. Many researchers qualified these text units mainly as a syntactic tendency of a language of the late 20th century, i.e. as an exclusively modern phenomenon. The conducted research allows to claim that such a point of view is not justified as the analysis of the English literary dialogic texts of the 16th – 21st centuries showed that the roots of an AC go back centuries. However, in different periods of the English language development, the formation and functioning of an AC was by its very nature either a more stylistic phenomenon or a syntactic one. Thus, a comparative analysis of the English texts of the 20th – 21st centuries and the texts of the 16th – 19th centuries showed important differences in the functions fulfilled by an AC. In the works of fiction of the last and this centuries, the ACs are mostly colloquial in their form and give an expressive colouring to the author's text (giving written language the liveliness and dynamism of spoken one). In this case, an AC can be regarded as a stylistic and syntactic phenomenon, while the ACs of the previous centuries, by their nature, tended to be the result of purely syntactic transformations in the text by its author.

The development of an AC has not always been is in the ascendant. Thus, in the plays of the 16th – 17th century authors its average frequency of occurrence is one to three pieces per one page of a printed text whereas in the works by dramatists of the 18th – 19th centuries – three to four pieces, and finally, in the plays by authors of the 20th – 21st centuries – from one to six pieces, which depends largely on authors' individual styles.

The flourishing of dramaturgic genre fell on the 16th century and is generally attributed to the appearance of works of William Shakespeare, the great English dramatist of the Renaissance, and his predecessors. What is characteristic of the ACs in the works of the 16th-century dramatists is that they had a complicated structural and syntactic model. This can be probably explained by the fact that the dialogues in these works took the form of

alternating monologue statements, sometimes as long as one and a half pages of the text with quite difficult thematic content. An AC is understood to be a two-component text unit divided by an external punctuation mark (usually by a full stop) into two parts that have a strictly fixed position – an autosemantic base utterance (BU) is followed by a synsemantic adjoined part (AP). The AP is formalized as a separate sentence that is joined with the BU by a CW that facilitates singling out an AC in a text (Bohdan 2011: 32, Bohdan 2018: 10, Bohdan 2017: 22). Moreover, a BU and an AP can be represented by the sequences of several phrases that follow each other, as in (1).

(1) FAUSTUS. Please it your grace, the year is divided into two circles over the whole world; so that, when it is winter with us, in the contrary circle it is likewise summer with them, as in India, Saba, and such countries that lie far east, where they have fruit twice a-year; from whence, by means of a swift spirit that I have, I had these grapes brought, as you see.^{BU}

DUCHESS. And, trust me, they are the sweetest grapes that e'er I tasted.^{AP} (Christopher Marlowe)

Another characteristic feature of the ACs of that period is a small number of adjoining conjunctions that were used to connect a BU to an AP (mainly homonymous to coordinating conjunctions *and*, *but* and virtually no those homonymous to subordinating ones).

As far as a semantic aspect is concerned, in the works of that period it is possible to single out such ACs, the APs of which are characterized by the semantics of additional information, generalization, enumeration, completion of a thought, more precise definition, and a complete change from one thought to another (Dmitrenko 1994: 37).

In the drama works of the 17th century, it is possible to observe a gradual simplification of an AC structure. There appear some new characteristic features of this construction though, at the same time, many distinctive features of the 16th-century AC remain (for example, either a very long BU or an AP, or sometimes both of them). There quite often occur ACs with a partitioned structure, and they are very peculiar in terms of their structure, at that. For example, the partition of an AP (belonging to the speech of one interlocutor) can be explicitly expressed by broken phrases of another interlocutor which can be complicated by syntactic repetition, as in (2).

(2) NURSE [Within] Madam!

JULIET I come, anon^{BU}.—But if thou mean'st not well,

I do beseech thee—

NURSE [Within] Madam!

JULIET **By and by, I come**^{AP} (W. Shakespeare)

The peculiarity of the dialogues of the 18th-century dramatists is the increasing number of ACs (sometimes up to five in a row) and the greater variety of conjunctions homonymous to not only coordinating but to

subordinating ones either (for example, *so, that, if*). The perfection of phrases, fancifulness and an affected manner of characters' speech is reflected in the structure and semantic features of the ACs. Thus, the chain character of the adjoined phrases, which are marked by polyfunctional conjunctions in the anteposition to them, profoundly influences the semantic orientation of the construction under study. In many studied examples of that period, such phenomena as an overlap between the adjoined phrases, the partition of an AC structure, syntactic repetitions, etc. are observed (as in, for example, (3).

(3) SIR OLIVER. True—but he would not sell my Picture—^{BU}
 MOSES. And loves wine and women so much—^{AP1}
 SIR OLIVER. But He wouldn't sell my Picture^{AP2}.
 MOSES. And game so deep—^{AP3}
 SIR OLIVER. But He wouldn't sell my Picture. O—here's Rowley!^{AP4}
 Enter ROWLEY
 ROWLEY. So—Sir Oliver—I find you have made a Purchase—^{AP5}
 SIR OLIVER. Yes—yes—our young Rake has parted with his
 Ancestors like old Tapestry—sold Judges and Generals by the foot—and
 maiden Aunts as cheap as broken China^{BU}.—

ROWLEY. And here has he commissioned me to re-deliver you Part
 of the purchase-money—I mean tho' in your necessitous character of old
 Stanley—^{AP}

MOSES. Ah! there is the Pity of all! He is so damned charitable^{BU}.

ROWLEY. And I left a Hosier and two Tailors in the Hall—who I'm
 sure won't be paid, and this hundred would satisfy 'em^{AP} (R. B. Sheridan).

In this example, there are three ACs in a row, and the first one has five APs that overlap each other belonging to three different interlocutors. The syntactic and lexical parallelism (literal repetitions even of the whole sentences in the APs) help to express a wide variety of meanings (from additional information, generalization, reason, and conclusion to hidden sneer or even heavy sarcasm).

In the drama works of the 19th century, significant changes occurred in the style and language. Interestingly enough, the cases of structural and semantic partitioning of the base utterance were registered for the first time. Conjunctions are by their very nature semantically insufficient, therefore they are semanticized within the framework of an AC and, without increasing its volume, they provide additional information, expanding, at the same time, the content of the context surrounding the AC. In the ACs of the example given below (4), the BU of interlocutor one is partitioned by the objection attempt of interlocutor two (by the AP of AC 1). Interlocutor one in his turn partitions the AP of interlocutor two (who managed to pronounce only *But*) and continues his thought (BU+). After three sentences, the statement of interlocutor one (the BU of AC 2) is interrupted again by the impatient remark of interlocutor two (the AP of AC 2).

(4) SARTORIUS. My daughter, perhaps foolishly, has taken you quite
 seriously; and—^{BU}

TRENCH. But^{AP}

SARTORIUS. One moment, if you will be so good^{BU+}. I have been a young man myself— younger, perhaps, than you would suppose from my present appearance. I mean, of course, in character. If you were not serious—^{BU}

TRENCH [ingenuously] But I was perfectly serious^{AP}. I want to marry your daughter, Mr Sartorius. I hope you don't object (B. Shaw).

These syntactic and other stylistic devices mentioned above highlight the heat of the moment of conversation.

The style of works of literature of the 20th and 21st centuries is notable for its conciseness, abruptness, and dynamism of formal expression. The most preferable linguistic units are small in volume statements both simple and complex ones. Composite sentences of the complicated syntactic model almost completely disappeared from the language, but on the other hand, the number of nominative sentences increased significantly. The ACs, the APs of which convey the meaning of emotional development of an action, became a widespread phenomenon (we attribute to this category the constructions with the semantics of enumeration and more precise definition) as in, for example, (5).

(5) It was of the many skills he wouldn't have acquired had he been a better shot at a sixteen^{BU}. If his shaft hadn't missed the deer and pierced Wolf's shoulder...^{AP1} If Cicatrice's band hadn't chosen to lay waste the von Mecklenberg estate...^{AP2} If old Baron had employed more men like Vukotish, and less like Schunzel, his then-steward...^{AP3} If...^{AP4} (J. Yeovil).

One of the most characteristic features of the works of literature of that period is the use of such paraspeech means as stage directions (Dmitrenko, Soloshchuk (1991). According to our study (Bohdan 2003: 101, Bohdan 2011: 168), author's stage directions become a structural component of an AC, an explicit means of partition of its parts, and a convincing proof that an AC represents formal separation and, at the same time, semantic adjoining of a sentence that follows a BU, as in the example given below.

(6) BABY DOLL: Yes, otherwise I can't get out of the car...

SILVIA: Okay.

[He raises his legs so she can get out^{BU}. Which she does, and continues...^{AP}]

BABY DOLL: Yes, I would cry and cry...Well... soon after that I left school (T. Williams).

Stage directions of various semantic types (action ones, those containing sound characteristics of the process of a dialogue in a drama work, introductory ones or stage directions emphasizing pauses) express the moment of pause very clearly which is so characteristic of an AC. Moreover, if there is a stage direction next to an AC (or even inside it) as an additional marker of a pause (e.g. *Silence as the line goes dead; Silence, after a*

moment; (There is / after a long) pause; She pauses, etc.), then its significance as a whole (or the significance of its parts) becomes even greater. At the same time, a stage direction is often an indicator of a change of semantic meaning and pragmatic orientation of an AC structure.

It should be noted that stage directions are found not only in the texts of dramatic works. Both in prose fiction and in journalism author's speech is used regularly (collocations that perform the same functions as different types of stage directions in a play). The only difference is that they are not formally singled out in a text (square brackets are not put around them), as in (7).

(7) "I agree," Jeffrey said^{BU}. "Before there are any more deaths and any more convicted physicians^{AP1}."

Kelly said her next words so softly that Jeffrey could barely hear. "Before there are any more suicides^{AP2}" (R. Cook).

Addressing the works of literature of the 16th – 21st centuries allowed us to trace the regularities of an AC use and reveal the peculiarities of its functioning in diachrony. Diachronically, the research of structural, semantic and pragmatic characteristics of an AC in literary texts promotes further study of this phenomenon in linguistics.

Література

1. Богдан В. В. Роль екстралінгвальних чинників у складі приєднувальних конструкцій з підрядним зв'язком і складнопідрядних речень у прагматичній орієнтації тексту / В.В. Богдан // Матеріали Міжнар. наук.-практ. конференції "Наука і освіта '2003". – Том 13. Філологія/ За заг. ред. Шепеля Ю.О. – Дніпропетровськ : Наука і освіта, 2003. – С. 100-102.

2. Богдан В. В. Синтактика, семантика, прагматика англomовних приєднувальних конструкцій і складних речень з підрядним зв'язком : монографія / В. В. Богдан. – Донецьк : "ЛАНДОН-XXI", 2011. – 263 с.

3. Дмитренко В. А. Присоединительная конструкция в диахроническом аспекте (на материале английских драматургических произведений XVI – XX вв.) / В. А. Дмитренко, Т. В. Захарова // Вестник Харьков. ун-та. Сер. Романогерманська філологія. – 1994. – Вып. 382. – С. 36-40.

4. Дмитренко В. А. Участие паралингвистических факторов в формировании присоединительной конструкции / Дмитренко В. А., Солощук Л. В. // Потенция – исследователь славянских взаимосвязей : Тез. Всесоюз. науч. конференции. – Харьков, 1991 г. – Ч 1. – С. 204 – 206.

5. Altmann G. Supra-sentence levels / Gabriel Altmann [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/glot.2014.5.issue-1/glot-2014-0002/glot-2014-0002.xml>

6. Valerii Bohdan. The Development of an Adjoining Construction through Time / Bohdan Valerii // Збірник тез доповідей [Електронний ресурс] II Міжнародної науково-практичної інтернет-конференції "Іноземна мова у професійній підготовці спеціалістів: проблеми та стратегії". – Кропивницький : РВВ ЦДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2018. – С. 9–11.

7. Bohdan Valerii. Supra-Sentence Units from the Standpoint of the Theory of Speech Acts Act / Valerii Bohdan // Наукові записки Бердянського державного педагогічного університету. Серія : Філологічні науки : [зб. наук. ст.] / [гол. ред. В. А. Зарва]. – Бердянськ : БДПУ, 2017. – Вип. XIII. – С. 21–26.

References

1. Bohdan, V. (2003). *Rol ekstralinhvalnykh chynnykiv u skladi pryednuvalnykh konstruksii z pidriadnym zviazkom i skladnopidriadnykh rechen u prahmatychnii orientatsii tekstu* [The role of extralingual factors as part of adjoining constructions with subordinate connection and complex sentences in the pragmatic orientation of a text] *Materialy Mizhnar. nauk.-prakt. konferentsii "Nauka i osvita '2003"*. – Tom 13. Filolohiia/ Za zah. red. Shepelia Yu.O. – Dnipropetrovsk : Nauka i osvita. – S. 100-102 [in Ukrainian].
2. Bohdan, V. (2011). *Syntaktyka, semantyka, prahmatyka anhlomovnykh pryednuvalnykh konstruksii i skladnykh rechen z pidriadnym zviazkom* [Syntaxtics, semantics and pragmatics of English language adjoining constructions and composite sentences with subordinate connection]: monohrafiia. – Donetsk : 'LANDON-XXI'. – 263 s [in Ukrainian].
3. Dmitrenko, V. (1994). *Prysoedinitelnaia konstruksiiia v diakhronicheskom aspekte (na materiale anhliyskykh dramaturhicheskikh proizvedeniy XVI – XX vv.)* [Adjoining construction in the diachronic aspect (on the material of English dramatic works of the 20th – 21st centuries)] *Vestnyk Kharkov. un-ta. Ser. Romano-hermanska filolohiia*. – Vyp. 382. – S. 36-40 [in Russian].
4. Dmitrenko, V., Soloshchuk L. (1991). *Uchastie paralinhvistycheskikh faktorov v formirovanii prisoedinitelnoy konstruksii* [Participation of paralinguistic factors in the formation of an adjoining construction] *Potebnia – issledovatel slavianskykh vzaimosvizei* : Tez. Vsesoiuz. nauch. konferentsii. – Kharkov. – Ch 1. – S. 204 – 206 [in Russian].
5. Altmann G. *Supra-sentence levels* / Gabriel Altmann [Electronic resource]. – Mode of access : <https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/glot.2014.5.issue-1/glot-2014-0002/glot-2014-0002.xml>
6. Valerii Bohdan (2018). *The Development of an Adjoining Construction through Time*. Bohdan Valerii // *Zbirnyk tez dopovidei [Elektronnyi resurs] II Mizhnarodnoi naukovo-praktychnoi internet-konferentsii "Inozemna mova u profesiinii pidhotovtsi spetsialistiv: problemy ta stratehii"*. – Kropyvnytskyi : RVV TsDPU im. V. Vynnychenka. – S. 9–11.
7. Bohdan Valerii (2017). *Supra-Sentence Units from the Standpoint of the Theory of Speech Acts Act*. *Naukovi zapysky Berdianskoho derzhavnoho pedahohichnoho universytetu*. Seria : Filolohichni nauky : [zb. nauk. st.] / [hol. red. V. A. Zarva]. – Berdiansk : BDPU. – Vyp. XIII. – S. 21–26.

АНОТАЦІЯ

У лінгвістичній літературі, незважаючи на важливість вирішення одного з актуальних питань сучасної лінгвістики – виявлення засобів поєднання окремих речень та надреченневих одиниць у текстові одиниці більшого розміру, дотепер недостатньо уваги приділяється проблемам організації текста та вивченню мовних одиниць, що беруть участь у його формуванні. За нечисленними винятками практично всі досліджень здійснюються в синхронному плані. Тим не менш, ґрунтовне діахронічне цієї проблеми сприятиме виявленню сутності багатьох інноваційних процесів у сучасних мовах. Таким чином, діахронічний підхід до вивчення структури висловлювання дозволяє інтерпретувати феномен текстових одиниць взагалі та приєднувальних конструкцій зокрема абсолютно по-новому. Більшість синтаксистів характеризують такі текстові одиниці переважно як синтаксичну тенденцію мови кінця минулого й теперішнього століття,

тобто як виключно сучасне явище. Проведене дослідження дозволяє стверджувати, що така точка зору не є виправданою, оскільки аналіз англійських літературних текстів XVI – XXI століть показав, що традиція вживання приєднувальної конструкції має багатовікову історію. Проте в різні періоди розвитку англійської мови в формуванні та функціонуванні приєднувальних конструкцій переважали або більш стилістичні, або більш синтаксичні тенденції. Таким чином, порівняльний аналіз англійських текстів XVI – XIX століть та XX – XXI століть продемонстрував значні відмінності у структурі приєднувальних конструкцій та виконуваних ними функціях. У прозових творах останніх двох століть приєднувальні конструкції зближують живе розмовне мовлення (у якому вони переважно вживаються) і авторський діалогічний або (рідше) монологічний текст, надаючи останньому стислість, жвавість, виразність, динаміку й експресивне забарвлення. У цьому випадку приєднувальна конструкція може розглядатися як стилістичне та синтаксичне явище, тоді як приєднувальні конструкції попередніх століть мали тенденцію бути результатом чисто синтаксичних перетворень тексту його автором.

Ключові слова: приєднувальна конструкція, базове висловлення, приєднувана частина, приєднувальний сполучник, діахронічний підхід.