15. The Functional Analysis of Sentence Structure

Summary

Sentences can be classified into about 38 functional sentence types, each one characterised by a different combination of functional sentence elements. The same notation is used as for discourse sentence elements, that is each element is represented by a variable of the form {x}, meaning all entities which fulfil the function "x".

Since any functional element of a sentence can be a topic, comment, enquiry, or hypothesis, functional sentence structure is independent of discourse structure (Chapter 13.), of identity, and of the rules of grammar by which discourse structure and identity are realised (Chapter 14.). The order of functional elements is not material, other than to distinguish between an existential sentence and an identification sentence. The discourse elements {not}, {query}, and {infer} remain necessary to express negation, questions, and inference. Certain functional elements are only characterised by their identity, and are denoted {definite}, {select}, {circumstance}, {indefinite}, or {indefinable}.

Since the relation of movement and state is expressed by the aspect function of discourse structure, each functional sentence type describes both a stative condition or relation and the dynamic process whereby the condition or relation came about. In addition, since the functional elements of a sentence are not affected by the relation of that sentence to other sentences, functional sentence structure is independent of the rules of grammar which connect sentences in discourse, and which employ one sentence to identify another. All these discourse purposes are described in Chapter 14.

A creation sentence creates an entity which did not previously exist.
{agent – create – creation – (constituent) – (instrument)}.

A transformation sentence transforms an entity into a new form.
{object – (transform) – attribute – (instrument) – (agent)}.

A locative sentence locates an entity in space.
{object – locative – location}.

A movement sentence moves an entity in space.
{object – (move) – locative$_1$ – location$_1$ – locative$_2$ – location$_2$ – (agent)
– (instrument)}.

A transformation locative sentence transforms and locates an entity in one action.
{object – transform\move – attribute – locative – location – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A time sentence locates an occurrence at a point in time.
{object – time – sequence}.

An attributive sentence describes for an entity a state or condition, called an attribute. A quantity is the attribute of number, which must relate to a countable unit.
{object – attribute}.

A constituent sentence constitutes an entity and assigns to it an attribute or quantity. The entity so constituted may be the attribute of another entity.
{object – constitute – attribute – (agent) – (instrument)}
{object – attribute$_1$} {object$_1$ – constitute – attribute}.

In an effect sentence, an entity is altered or affected by an external cause.
{object – effect – instrument – (agent) – (measure)}.

A freedom sentence relieves an entity of an effect.
{object – free – not – definite – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A dependency sentence subjects an object or person to a risk.
{object – depend – indefinable – (measure) – instrument – (agent)}.

A relief sentences relieves a risk from an object or person.
{object – relief – not – indefinable – (instrument) – (agent)}.

An identification sentence identifies a definite entity with another definite or nonspecific entity.
{object – identification – (agent)}.

A substitution sentence substitutes one entity for another in a function or role.
{object – substitute – original – identification – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A comparison sentence compares a characteristic of two objects, persons, or actions, which may be quantifiable.
{object – compare – base – (agent)/(instrument)}

In a participation sentence, a person participates in a function in relation to a target.
{agent – participate – (participants) – target}.

A role sentence states a function which a person or object fulfils in human society.
{(agent) – object – role – (competence) – target}.

A style sentence states a quality or style which a person exhibits in performing a known action:
{object – style – definite}.

A possession sentence establishes a relationship between a person and an object.
{recipient – possession – object – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A deficiency sentence records that a person has need of an object.
{beneficiary – lack – not – object – (possession) – (agent)}.

An exchange sentence establishes a possession with one person in compensation for another possession with another person.
$\{agent_1 – possession_1 – object_1 – object_2 – recipient_1\}$ $\{agent_1 = recipient_2\}$
$\{agent_2 – possession_2 – object_2 – object_1 – recipient_2\}$ $\{agent_2 = recipient_1\}$.

In a perception sentence, a person receives or does not receive new information concerning an object.
{recipient – perceive – object – select/indefinite/circumstance – (instrument)}.
{recipient – not – perceive – object – select/indefinable – (instrument)}.

In a negative perception sentence, a person perceives that certain information concerning an object is not true.
{recipient – perceive – object – not – definite/indefinable – (instrument)}.

In an opinion sentence, a person has and may communicate a considered mental reaction to known information.
{(agent)\recipient – opinion – definite – (agent)}.
$\{agent\backslash recipient_1 – (instrument) – opinion – definite – recipient_2\}$.

In a supposition sentence, a person supposes a hypothesis concerning a real or hypothetical object.
{(agent)\recipient – suppose – (object) – indefinable}.

In a communication sentence, a person communicates or fails to communicate new information concerning an object.
{agent – (instrument) – communicate – object – select/indefinite/circumstance – recipient}.

{agent – (instrument) – not – communicate – object – definite/indefinable – recipient}.

In a negative communication sentence, a person asserts that certain information concerning an object is not true.
{agent – (instrument) – communicate – object – not – definite/indefinable – recipient}.

In a proposal sentence, a person proposes a hypothesis concerning an object.
{agent – propose – (instrument) – object – indefinable – recipient}.

An interrogation sentence poses a question concerning an object.
{agent – (instrument) – communicate – query – (recipient) – object – definite/indefinable}.

A representation sentence creates a representation of an object.
{agent – create – (instrument) – object – representation – (recipient)}.

A benefit sentence describes the opportunity or advantage, or misfortune or disadvantage, arising to a beneficiary.
{beneficiary – benefit – definite/indefinable – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A warranty sentence describes a commitment by a guarantor:
{agent – benefit – object – definite/not – indefinable – (beneficiary)}.
{causer\beneficiary – $benefit_1$ – object – not – indefinable – (agent)} {$object_1$ – attribute}.

An ability sentence describes the ability of a person to fulfil an action.
{recipient – able – object – indefinable – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A necessity sentence describes a compulsion upon a person to fulfil an action.
{recipient – not – able – not – object – indefinable – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A responsibility sentence describes an obligation that a person has to complete an action, or his/her guilt or innocence in completing it.
{recipient – ought – object – indefinable – (agent)}
{agent\$recipient_1$ – ought – object – indefinable – $recipient_2$}.
{$agent_1$ – agent\$recipient_2$ – not – ought – not – object – definite/indefinable}.
{agent\$recipient_1$ – agent\$recipient_2$ – not – ought – not – object – definite}.

In a causative sentence, an agent or instrument initiates an action.
{causer – agent/instrument – (definite) – select}
{causer – agent/instrument – (definite) – indefinite – circumstance}.

In a preventive sentence, an agent or instrument stops or prevents an action.
{causer – agent/instrument – ($definite_1$) – not – $definite_2$}
{causer – agent/instrument – (definite) – not – indefinable}.

In an inchoative sentence, an agent or instrument commences or continues an action or state by itself.
{agent\object – inchoate – (definite) – select}
{agent\object – inchoate – (definite) – indefinite – circumstance}
{instrument\object – inchoate – (definite) – select}
{instrument\object – inchoate – (definite) – indefinite – circumstance}.

In a cessative sentence, an agent or instrument ceases an action or state by itself.
{agent\object – inchoate – ($definite_1$) – not – $definite_2$}
{instrument\object – inchoate – ($definite_1$) – not – $definite_2$}.

An error sentence describes an action or state contrary to the intention or expectation of a causer, agent, or recipient.
{definite – error – object – (correct) – (agent)}.

Terms Defined or Introduced

Functional sentence type, functional element, functional sentence structure, transformation, deficiency, supposition, proposal, ability, necessity, error.

Introduction

To illustrate the nature of functional sentence structure, let us consider five sentences already mentioned in the previous chapter: a stative sentence "They were hungry", an intransitive sentence "They sat down to table", a possession sentence "They looked at the menu", a communication sentence "They ordered lunch", and a transitive sentence "They ate lunch". As has been pointed out by Lyons and others[1], language has a bias towards describing the activities and experiences of persons, by placing persons in topic position. However, if the sentences were parts of different narratives, they could have been expressed as "Hunger was felt by them"; "The menu was looked at by them"; "The table was sat down to by them"; "Lunch was ordered by them", or "Lunch was eaten by them", in which "they"/"them" is not the topic but part of the comment. Moreover, in these ten sentences, the verbs "felt", "looked at" "sat", "ordered", and "ate" are part of the comment. If they were constructed as "Hunger was what they felt"; "A menu was what they looked at"; "A table is where they sat"; "Lunch was what they ordered/ate", the same verbs would be part of the topic.

The analysis of a sentence by means of topic and comment is therefore a good guide to its role in discourse but provides no information on the respective functions of its elements. To analyse these, let us represent our sample sentences in an abstract way as a string of words not connected by grammar:

> "they – hunger"; "they – sit – table"; "they – see – menu"; "they – order – lunch";
> "they – eat – lunch".

We can now focus on the functional structure of the sentences without reference to their role in discourse. The first observation is that "they" has five distinct roles. If we may use the terms "subject" to refer to "they", "they – hunger" is a state or condition that the subject is in; "they – sit – table" is a state or condition that the subject has entered into through a voluntary action on itself, that of sitting; "they – see – menu" is a mental state that the subject possesses in relation to an external object, a menu, though a voluntary action it has taken, that of looking; "they – order – lunch" is a communication by the subject to an unknown person about an object, lunch, and "they – eat – lunch" is a voluntary action that the subject engages in which affects the same object.

The second observation is that the elements of each abstracted sentence are sufficient to guess at its core meaning. They each perform a function which differs between each sentence, and which can be called the *functional elements*. We can guess that the second sentence means "They sat down to table", or something like that, and no further element is needed for the sentence to be meaningful. The term "argument" is sometimes used by linguists with the same meaning. Of course, further elements can and often should be present; if the location and time of the event are significant, five elements are present: "They sat down to table in a restaurant at 1 o'clock" and can be represented abstractly as "they – sitting – table – restaurant – 1 o'clock". But the location and time can be omitted, while "they", "sitting", and "table" cannot.

In this chapter, we examine these five sentence structures and others, amounting in number to about 37, which we identified and described in Chapters 6. to 11. Each structure is uniquely characterised by its functional sentence elements; if examination shows that two structures have the same elements, they are considered the same for the purpose of this analysis. For example, we show that "They sat down to table" has the elements {agent\object – move – locative – location}. We may say that each structure of elements is a *functional sentence type*. The number of functional sentence types is not determined precisely, but estimated to be "about" 37, since we recognise that a different analysis might reach a different conclusion. Neither language nor the world that it describes are a closed intellectual system. The sentence types are composed of functional elements, such as {agent}, {object}, {move}, {locative}, and {location}, which are different from those of the discourse sentence structure. An {agent} can be definite, indefinite, or indefinable. However, as we shall see, in some functional sentence types, in particular dependency, identification, perception, communication, ability, necessity,

[1] Lyons, 502, 511.

and responsibility, certain elements are characterised as {definite}, {indefinite}, or {indefinable}, and those discourse elements appear in those functional sentence structures.

The same notation is used as in the previous chapter. In a sentence {x – y – z…}, each of the elements {x}, {y}, {z}, etc perform a different function. Optional elements are placed in brackets: {x – y – (z)…}. Some elements can be combined, that is their function can be performed by a single word, and these are separated by "\": {x\y – z…}. If a function is repeated, it is only represented once. For example, in "We had bread and jam for tea", and "She hopped and skipped down the road", "bread and jam" and "hopped" and "skipped" are each one function and therefore one element. Some sentence types contain the same functional class in two different capacities, and these are represented by different elements $\{x_1\}$, $\{x_2\}$, etc. All the functional classes to which the notation applies are defined in the Glossary at the end of this book.

The sequence of elements with which a function are expressed in a particular language do not affect that function, except that in many languages an identification sentence can only be distinguished by word order from an existential sentence.

The Creation Sentence

Creation is a human act, and is therefore not distinguishable from the {agent} who performs it:

> "Philip built the house." "Anne wrote the letter."
> "Henry cooked lunch." "Joan painted the picture."

The means of creation cannot be inferred from the object created. Alternatives could be "Philip designed the house"; "Anne typed the letter"; "Henry prepared lunch.". The object created is not the thing affected by the act of creation, but the outcome of it. Using {create} as the element for the act of creation and {creation} for the thing created, the elements are therefore:

> {agent – create – creation}.

If there is no need to state the constituents from the which the object was created, or the means whereby it was done, the meaning of these sentences is complete. Alternatively, the {constituent} and the means employed may be included. The means are the {instrument} which works on the {constituent}. Including these optional elements, the elements are:

> {agent – create – creation – (constituent) – (instrument)}.

The resultant sentence expresses the constituents out which the creation was created, the agent and instrument being optional:

> "The house was built in brick (by Philip)." "The letter was by Anne."
> "The family's lunch was chicken." "The picture was in oils."

The stative creation sentence is therefore:

> {creation – constituent – (create) – (instrument) – agent}.

The Transformation Sentence

Destruction has a different functional description than creation. A patient, or {object}, is destroyed. If the act is unintentional, an {instrument} is often stated:

> "The earthquake destroyed the houses." "The blow broke the vase."
> "Fire burnt the woodland." "The illness killed him."

If the act involves intent, the {agent} must be stated, and in that case the instrument may be unnecessary:

> "The friends ate lunch". "The vandal broke the window (with a stone)".

"She shredded the documents".

However, in some cases neither agent not instrument may be required:

"The building collapsed." "The crowd broke up." "The clouds dispersed."

The resultant state or {attribute} of the patient may be described by the act of destruction, with the option of the {instrument} which effected it:

"The houses in ruins (from the earthquake)."
"The vase was in pieces (from the blow)."
"The woodland was burnt to ashes." "He was dead (from the illness)."
"The lunch was eaten." "The documents were shredded."

Both the act of destruction and the resultant state can be described by:

{object – attribute – (instrument) – (agent)}.

In addition, the act of destruction may not be adequately described by the resultant {attribute}:

"The earthquake shook the houses to ruins." "The blow broke the vase to pieces."
"Fire burnt the woodland to ashes."

We may therefore use the element {transform} for the act of destruction, so that the sentence becomes:

{object – (transform) – attribute – (instrument) – (agent)}.

Many transitive sentences describe a change which neither creates something new nor destroys something, but transforms an {object}. The *transformation* can be due to deliberate action by an {agent} by means of an {instrument}:

"James chopped up the logs with an axe." "John preserved the fence with creosote."
"The garage serviced the car." "Sheila mowed the grass short."

Alternatively, a transformation may be due to natural forces, expressed as an {instrument}:

"Rain softened the ground." "The sun melted the snow."

or to a deliberate action effected by an {instrument} but for which no agent is stated:

"The paintstripper melted the paint." "The computer printed the figures".

The result of the transformation is an {attribute} which may be adequately described by the act of transformation, with the option of the {instrument} which effected it:

"The logs were chopped (with an axe)." "The fence was preserved (with creosote)."
"The car was roadworthy (from the service)." "The grass was short."
"The ground was soft (with rain)." "The snow was melted (by the sun)."
"The paint was melted (by the paintstripper)." "The figures were printed (by the computer)."

This resultant state of a transformation action can be described by the elements:

{object – attribute – (instrument)}.

In addition, the transformation action may not be adequately described by the resultant {attribute}:

"Sheila mowed the grass short." "The garage serviced the car."

The transformation action may therefore by described by a further element. If this is {transform}, the transform sentence has the same structure as the destruction sentence described above:

{object – (transform) – attribute – (instrument) – (agent)}.

Most transformations are to the advantage or disadvantage of a {beneficiary}, expressed directly or by a genitive link:

"James chopped up our logs with an axe"; "John preserved their fence with creosote";
"The garage serviced my car"; "The computer calculated the result for us";
"Mary washed her friend's hair"; "The knife cut him on the hand".

German: "Er hat uns das Leben gerettet." "He saved our lives."
[He has to-us the life saved.][2]

Italian: "Morde la mano al professore." "He bites the teacher's hand."
[He-bites the hand to-the teacher.][3]

Irish: "Dhóigh sé an fraoch orm." "He burned my heather."
[Burned-he the heather on-me.][4]

Japanese:
"Tarō wa Haruko ni tabako o suwareta."
"Taro had a cigarette smoked by Haruko on him."
[Taro $_{(topic)}$ Haruko-by cigarette $_{(object)}$ smoked $_{(passive)}$.][5]

The {beneficiary} appears also in the resultant state:

"Our logs were chopped"; "My car was serviced"; "His hand was cut".

In Italian, for instance, the beneficiary is marked by the by the preposition "a" ("to"):

"Ho rifatto il letto a Paolo." "I've remade Paolo's bed for him."
[I've remade the bed to Paolo.][6]

In these sentences, the {beneficiary} is generally a restrictive qualifier to the {object}, as discussed further below (The Benefit Sentence).

An agent may effect a transformation to his own advantage or disadvantage, often when the patient is his/her own possession:

"James chopped up his (own) logs"; "Mary washed her (own) hair";
"He's cut his hand on the knife".

German: "Er hat sich eine Verletzung zugezogen." "He has incurred an injury."
[He has to-himself an injury sustained.]

In that case, the {agent} is stated and combined with the {beneficiary}:

{agent\beneficiary – transform\benefit – object – attribute – (instrument)}.

An agent may also effect a transformation on him/herself:

"Lloyd George resigned from office." "Henry shaved with his electric razor."

The same elements apply as previously, but those for {agent} and {object} are combined:

[2] Durrell, 194.
[3] Maiden & Robustelli, 166.
[4] Dillon & Ó Crónín, 83.
[5] Makino & Tsutsui, 33.
[6] Maiden & Robustelli, 179.

{agent\object – (transform) – attribute – (instrument)}.

Sentences such as "She shredded the documents" and "John creosoted their fence" describe a transformation by means of a human appliance intended for that purpose, in which the verb is derived from the appliance. Other examples are:

"He brushed their yard clean." "She sawed the log in half."
"The judge imprisoned the convict." "He hoovered the carpets."

German: "Ich verband dem Kind die Hand." "I bandaged the child's hand."
[I bandaged to-the child the hand.][7]

These transformations have the same element, but the transformation action and {instrument} are combined. The agent is usually stated:

{agent – transform\instrument – object – attribute}.

The English word "use", or its equivalent, is an auxiliary word for a transformation action by means of an appliance:

"He used the brush to clean the yard." "She used the saw to cut the log in half."

An appliance intended for one purpose may be used for another:

"He used a shoebox as his card file."

The structure of this is:

{agent\beneficiary – transform\instrument$_1$\benefit – instrument$_2$}.

The same elements describe the resultant state of the patient:

"Their yard was brushed clean." "The convict was imprisoned." "The log was sawn in half."

An agent can again employ the appliance to his/her dis/advantage or upon him/herself:

"Mary shampooed her hair"; "He brushed his clothes";
"He brushed himself down";

as indicated by the sentence structures:

{agent\beneficiary – transform\instrument\benefit – object – attribute}
{agent\object\beneficiary – transform\instrument\benefit – attribute}.

The Locative and Movement Sentences

A *locative sentence* describes the physical {location} of an {object} (animate or inanimate) in space:

"The chair is in the hall." "The book is on the table." "The pot was on the stove."
"The newspaper is through the letter-box." "The picture is hanging on the hook."
"He was seated on the chair." "She was wearing her new outfit."

Because space has three dimensions, the relationship between the {object} and the {location} can be expressed in many different ways, called a {locative}. The sentence is therefore:

{object – locative – location}.

[7] Durrell, 194.

An individual {location} often includes its own {locative}, so the sentence is {object – locative\location}:

"We were at home." "They were in the garden." "She is at Cambridge."

Many {locative} can be measured:

"The lion was 10 metres away from them." "The aircraft was 5 miles up."

The measure consists of a unit and quantity. As we shall see in a later section (The Constituent Sentence), a unit is a constituent of {locative} and a quantity is an attribute of the constituent:

$\{object – locative_1 – location\}$ $\{object_1 – constitute – attribute\}$.

The transitive sentence of which these sentences are the resultant is a *movement sentence*. Some movement sentences (underlined) are a dynamic form of the locative, with an {agent}, giving the structure {agent – object – locative – location}:

"He put the pot on the stove." → "The pot was on the stove."

Other movements include a movement action and a direction of movement (underlined in these examples):

"She fetched the chair into the hall." "He put the book down onto the table."
"The newspaper was pushed through the letter-box." "She put the picture up onto the hook."

If we call this movement action and direction of movement {move}, the movement sentence has the structure:

{agent – object – (move) – locative – location }.

In the movement sentence, the {location} can be omitted:

"She fetched the chair in." "He laid the book down." "He put the pot on."
"The newspaper was pushed through." "She put the picture up."

However, the {location} is usually understood, and since the function of the sentence is to alter the physical relation between two objects, it can be argued that it is not an optional element.

The movement action may appear in the resultant stative locative sentence. These again have the elements {object – move – locative – location}:

"The chair was fetched in." "The book was laid on the table." "The picture was put up."
"The pot was put on the stove."

In some movement actions, the {agent} acts on him/herself, in which case the {agent} and {object} are the same:

"He sat in the chair." "She put on her new outfit."

{agent\object – (move) – locative – location}.

Many movement actions transfer an $\{object\}$ from one $\{location_1\}$ to another $\{location_2\}$, or remove an {object} from a {location}. The movement action is underlined in these examples:

"He took the pot off the stove." "He levered the nail out of the wood."
"The book was taken from the bookshelf to the table."

Both {location$_1$} and {location$_2$} have a {locative}, since the {object} is being moved from a spatial relation with one location to a spatial relation with another location. For example, the last example means:

"The book was taken from being on the bookshelf to being on the table."

The element {move} includes the direction of movement from {location$_2$}. The sentence is therefore:

{object – (move) – (agent) – locative$_1$ – location$_1$ – locative$_2$ – location$_2$}.

A sentence in which a person moves him/herself is commonly called a verb of motion:

"Mary went from London to Cambridge."
→ "Mary was at Cambridge."
"John is coming from London." → "John is arrived from London."
"Bernard drove back home." → "Bernard was back home."
"James flew back from America." → "James was back from America."

In addition, a movement sentence may have an {instrument}:

"The wind blew the chair across the lawn." "The lorry knocked Henry off his bicycle."
"He levered the nail out of the wood with pliers."
"Mary took the train from Cambridge to London."

Movement actions, being physical actions in space, can be measured:

"She pulled the chair one metre away from the wall."
→ "The chair was one metre from the wall."
"Bernard drove five miles back home."
→ "Bernard was back home."

The measure consists of a unit and quantity, which qualify {move}. The notation is described below (The Constituent Sentence):

{object – move$_1$ – locative – location – agent – instrument} {object$_1$ – constituent - attribute}.

Many movement sentences are to the advantage or disadvantage of a {beneficiary}, who may be the possessor of the {object}:

English: "The newspaper was pushed through our letter-box".

Spanish: "Te he dejado la camisa en el otro cuarto." "I've left your shirt in the other room."
[To-you I've left the shirt in the other room.][8]

Italian: "Stringiamo la mano al presidente." "We shake the president's hand."
[We-shake the hand to-the president.]
"La pentola le scivolò tra le mani." "The saucepan slipped through her hands."
[The saucepan to-her slipped through the hands.][9]

Russian: "On po-druzheski pozhal mne ruku." "He shook my hand in a friendly manner."
[He in-friendly shook to-me hand.]

Including these elements, the movement sentence is:

{object – move\benefit – locative$_1$ – location$_1$ – locative$_2$ – location$_2$ – (agent) – (instrument) – beneficiary}.

[8] Butt & Benjamin, 76.
[9] Maiden & Robustelli, 166.

The {object} moved may be the possession of the {agent}, in which case the {agent} is also the {beneficiary}:

"He spread out his arms." "He opened his mouth." "Sheila changed into new clothes."

Italian: "Lui si mette il capotto." "He puts on his overcoat."
[He to-himself puts the overcoat.][10]

In such sentences, the element {agent} is combined with the {beneficiary}:

{agent\beneficiary – object – move\benefit – locative – location – (instrument)}.

A movement may be effected by means of an appliance designed for the purpose:

"He levered the nail out." "She bicycled round the track."

In that case, the elements for the movement action and instrument are combined:

{object – move\instrument – locative – location – (agent)}
{agent\object – move\instrument – locative – location }.

The English word "use", or its equivalent, is an auxiliary word for a movement action by means of an appliance:

"He used a lever to extract the nail." "She used the bicycle to go round the track."

The Transformation Locative Sentence

Some movement actions result directly in a change to the object moved:

"He cleaned the leaves out of the drain." "She sawed the branch off the tree."
"She nailed the planks together with a hammer." "They attached the bicycles to the railings."

The patient of these sentences has two resultants: the changed state, and the altered location:

"The drain was cleaned out of leaves." "The branch was sawed off the tree."
"The planks were nailed together." "The bicycles were attached to the railings."

As with the transformation and movement sentences, the action can have a beneficiary:

"He cleaned the leaves from our drain." "They attached our bicycles to the railings."

These sentences therefore combine the elements of the transformation and movement sentences:

{object – transform\move\benefit – (attribute) – locative – location – (agent) – (instrument) – beneficiary}.

The sentence may state the location from which the movement took place:

"He cleaned the leaves out of the drain into a bucket."

The elements then include both the original and the destination location:

{object – transform\move\benefit – (attribute) – (agent) – (instrument) – beneficiary – $locative_1$ – $location_1$ – $locative_2$ – $location_2$}.

As with other transformation sentences, the {agent} can be the same as the {beneficiary}:

[10] Speight, 81.

"He cleaned the leaves from his drain." "They attached their bicycles to the railings."

{agent\beneficiary – transform\move\benefit – object – (attribute) – locative – location – (instrument)}.

The transformation action can be the same as the instrument:

"She sawed the branch off the tree." "She locked her bicycle to the railings."

{agent – transform\move\instrument\benefit – object – (attribute) – beneficiary – locative$_1$ – location$_1$ – locative$_2$ – location$_2$}.

Transformation locative sentences can in principle have two patients, since both the patient which is moved and the location to which it is moved may be affected:

"Water flooded two miles across the fields." "Dust covered the furniture."

In such sentences, the patient which is moved is also often the instrument which moves it. No agent is mentioned, but could be present: "The damkeeper flooded the water…". The elements are therefore:

{object$_1$\instrument – transform\move – locative – location\object$_2$ – (agent)}.

The Time Sentence

A *time sentence* identifies and states the point in time of an occurrence:

"The meeting was at 10.00." "We went home on Friday."

A time sentence contains two pieces of information. It states the unit of time which is used to specify the time, such as the hour, day, month, or year, and the sequence of that unit. In ordinary experience, time is a sequence of events, one after the other. For instance, these examples mean:

"The meeting was at the tenth hour." "We went home on the sixth day."

If {object} is the occurrence whose point in time is identified, {time} is the unit, and {sequence} is the sequence of that unit, a time sentence has the structure:

{object – time – sequence}

where {object} is "we had a meeting" and "we went home". This sentence structure assumes that the occurrence is known, and the {time} is new information. The sentences mean:

"The meeting was at 10.00, not 11.00." "Our going home was on Friday, not Thursday."

Alternatively, the {time} is known and the occurrence is new information:

"At 10.00, we had a meeting." "On Friday, we went home."

A clock or calendar {time} can lie within another {time} of wider compass:

"The meeting was at 10.00 on Friday."

"Friday" is in this case a qualifier to "10.00", giving:

{object – time$_1$ – sequence} {object$_1$ – time – sequence}.

A {time} can be set by a dynamic sentence, which may have an {agent} or {instrument}:

"We set Friday as the day of our return home."

In this sentence, the occurrence or {object} is "our return home", and {time} is "to be Friday". The sentence is:

{agent – object – time – sequence}.

{time} can be expressed not by a particular hour or day, etc, but by another event, which may be before, after, or at the same time:

"We returned home when we were ready."
"We returned home before/after we were expected."

In these instances, {time} expresses the concepts of "when", "before", "after", etc, and {sequence} is the event to which it is related. With respect to the time function of these sentences, the same structure:

{object – time – sequence}

therefore applies. For example, "We returned home when/before/after we were ready" is:

{agent\object$_1$ – move$_2$ – locative – location}
{object$_2$ – time – sequence$_3$} {object$_1$ – attribute$_3$}.

{time} is a function of a particular occurrence. The relative times of the occurrences of successive sentences in a discourse are described by the aspect elements {state}, {imperfect}, {perfect}, {prospect}, {aorist}, {already}, and {still} (Chapter 14., Aspect).

In addition to referring to a unit of time, {time} can be any occurrence to which a sequence can be assigned, and the same functional structure therefore applies to sentences of the type:

"James Monroe was the fifth President of the United States."

In this case, {time} is "President" or "Presidency". The sentence is:

{object – time$_1$ – sequence} {object$_1$ – role – target}.

The element {sequence} implies a base point from which it is counted. In the case of clock or calendar {time}, this base point does not generally need to be expressed. For other {sequence}, it can be meaningful:

"James Monroe was the fifth President since George Washington."

Reference to the base point is then a {compare} function (The Comparison Sentence, below):

{object – time – sequence$_1$} {object$_1$ – compare – base}.

The Attributive Sentence

A transformation sentence (above) alters the state or condition of its {object}. Its resultant is a stative sentence which describes the state or condition, for which we use the term {attribute}. The sentence is an *attributive sentence*:

{object – attribute}

Evidently, such a sentence can be expressed without any reference to the means whereby the state or condition came about:

"The logs were chopped." "The fence was preserved." "The car was roadworthy."
"The grass was short." "The ground was soft." "The figures were printed."

An attributive sentence is implied whenever the {attribute} is used as a qualifier:

"the chopped logs"; "the preserved fence"; "the roadworthy car"; "the short grass";
"the soft ground"; "the printed figures".

The qualifier can be expressed as:

{object$_1$} {object$_1$ – attribute}

A *quantity* is an attribute of an {object} or other entity in the form of a number, which implies that the entity can be counted. That which the quantity counts is a *unit*. It may be physical, or conceptual, or a measure in time or space:

"three cars"; "two suggestions"; "four metres"; "five hours"; "six colours"; ten kilos".

For some entities, clarification of the unit may be needed. "Five sands" may mean five grains of sand or five types of sand. "Three wines" may mean three bottles of wine or three wine labels. This concept of countability is not the same as that used in English grammar, in which certain words may not take a plural (*"behaviours"; *"leisures"; *"poetries"; *"safeties"). It means simply that a countable unit has to be identified.

A quantity occurs more usually as a qualifier:

"He has three cars"; "She made two suggestions"; "He measured four metres".

Such a sentence can be understood as an observation on an earlier sentence which identifies the entity which is counted. The entity is interpreted as a unit and a quantity is assigned to it:

"He has some cars; they are three." "She made some suggestions; they were two."
"He measured some metres; they were four."

Alternatively, the entities which are counted may have been identified at an earlier stage in the discourse, so that the sentence is:

"The cars that he has are three in number." "The suggestions that she made were two."
"The tape that he measured was four metres."

Since a quantity is an attribute, it is expressed by the same element as other {attribute}:

{object – attribute}.

For example, under the notation of the Possession Sentence (below):

"He has three cars" is {recipient – possession – object$_1$} {object$_1$ – attribute}.

However, quantities show some characteristics not found with other {attribute} functions. A quantity can be a proportion of a single unit:

"He has eaten half the loaf"; "She has read two-thirds of the book".

We cannot employ for this sentence the same structure as for whole numbers, for example we cannot say:

*"The loaf that he has eaten is one-half" or *"The book which she has read is two-thirds".

The function of these sentences is to relate a part to the whole:

"The part of the loaf which he has eaten is one half."
"The proportion of the book which she has read is two-thirds."

Similarly, the relation of a part to a whole occurs when a quantity is applied to another quantity:

"Two of the three cars are in the garage." "I like two of your three suggestions."

The same relation occurs when the unit which the quantity counts is independent of the entity measured:

"He measured four metres of tape." "He bought two kilos of apples."

In these cases, the unit, such as "metres" or "kilos, is a part of the tape or the apples.

For all these constructions, generally termed the "partitive function", the structure {object – attribute} is not sufficient. A further element is needed which describes the relation of a part to the whole. In the following section (The Constituent Sentence), we propose the element {constitute}, so that the expressions "half of the loaf", "two of the three cars", and "four metres of tape" are described by:

{object – constitute – attribute}.

The examples are considered further below.

The Constituent Sentence

A *constituent sentence* states that one entity is part of another entity. Simple examples are:

The list included Mrs Smith.	Mrs Smith was on the list.
The building has baroque details.	The baroque details belong to the building.
The Library supplied the five books.	The five books are from the Library.
Mary has green eyes.	The green eyes belong to Mary.
The carpet has a hole in it.	There is a hole in the carpet.

As we shall see in Chapter 16. (The Object Component), every sentence has an {object} which it places in a state or relationship. In the first examples, the {object} contains a part. In the second, the {object} is part of a larger entity. In both cases, the sentence can be described by the {object} and the entity with which it has a constituent relationship, whether as a part or containing a part. This constituent relationship is generally expressed by a noun and an auxiliary verb such as "has" or "is from". We may call it {constitute}, so that the structure is:

{object – constitute}.

In reality, the discourse purpose of many constituent sentences is not to describe the constituent relationship of the {object}, which is known, but to provide more information on the {constitute} in the form of an attribute or quantity, expressed by {attribute}. This additional information is underlined in the following examples:

The houses in this street have <u>slate</u> roofs.	The slate roofs belong to the houses <u>in this street</u>.
The Smith family includes <u>three</u> brothers.	The three brothers are from the <u>Smith</u> family.
The County Library supplied <u>these</u> books.	These books are from the <u>County</u> Library.
The paper bag contained <u>five red</u> apples.	The five red apples are in the <u>paper</u> bag.
This old jug has a <u>broken</u> handle.	The broken handle is from <u>this old</u> jug.

The full structure is therefore:

{object – constitute – attribute}.

The qualifiers of the {object}, being part of the topic, are not part of this functional structure. However, these qualifiers may themselves be a constituent, expressed by a genitive link in the form

$\{object_1\}$ $\{object_1$ – constitute – attribute$\}$:

"the building's baroque details"; "Mary's green eyes"; "the bag's six red apples".

A genitive link is also used to express the connection between a possession and a recipient. Certain languages reflect this distinction by two different words for the functions of the genitive link Chapter 12., The Genitive Link):

Samoan: "'o le solofanua a Eti" "Ted's horse" [the horse of Ted] {possession}
"'o le ulu o le tama" "the boy's head" [the head of the boy] {constitute}[11]

Italian does not permit a genitive link for a constituent and requires the auxiliary "avere" ("have"):

"Aveva un occhio che gli faceva molto male." "His eye was hurting him a lot."
[He-had an eye which to-him made very bad.][12]
not *"Il suo occhio gli faceva molto male." [The his eye to-him made very bad.]

The foregoing describes the basic constituent function. However, unlike most other functions the constituent function can repeat itself, so that the {attribute} has a further {constitute} with its own {attribute}:

"The houses have roofs made of Welsh slate." "The Library supplied five of the six books."
"The building's details are Strawberry Hill Gothic."

We may express this recursive relationship with:

{object – constitute – $attribute_1$} {$object_1$ – constitute – attribute}

as many times as is necessary.

This construction in which a quantity is a {constitute} of another quantity is called the "partitive function":

"six metres of rope"; "three pieces of paper"; "seven head of cattle";
"three columns of the newspaper"; "three breeds of dog"; "six shades of blue".

All of these are examples of {$attribute_1$} {$object_1$ – constitute – attribute}. They occur in sentences such as:

"He has three of the five cars"; "She made two of the three suggestions";
"He measured four of the six metres of tape".

For example, the first of these sentences is:

{recipient – possession – $object_1$} {$object_1$ – $attribute_2$} {$object_2$ – constitute – $attribute_3$}.

In these sentences, all the elements are definite. In the following examples, the first {attribute} is indefinite:

"He has some of the three cars"; "He measured some of the six metres of tape".

The constituent relationship may arise through the action of an {agent} or {instrument}, in which case the {object}, being altered, is a patient:

"The Secretary included Mrs Smith on the list."
"The architect gave the building 25 baroque details."
"The cigarette burnt a hole in the carpet."
"The knock broke the handle of the old jug."
"She selected five books from the County library."

The elements are:

[11] Marsack, 49.
[12] Maiden & Robustelli, 159.

{object – constitute – attribute – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A particular instance of a constituent relationship is the physical dimensions of an object in space, time, or some other measure:

"Mount Everest is 8848 metres high." "The River Thames is 338 kilometres long."
"The price of apples is £1.20 per kilo." "The earth's diameter is 6378 km."
"The meeting lasted two hours." "It rained all week."

We may regard the dimensions height, length, price, diameter, and duration as a part of the {object}, expressed by {constitute}, and the measure (such as 8848 metres) as the {attribute}. However, the measure generally includes both a quantity (8848) and a unit (metres). This means that the measure has a {constitute} in the form of the unit and an {attribute} which is the quantity:

{object – $attribute_1$} {$object_1$ – constitute – $attribute_2$}.

Many dimensions, but not all, are relative to a base point:

"Mount Everest is 8848 metres high from sea level."
"The River Thames is 338 kilometres long from its source to the North Sea."
"The meeting lasted two hours, from 10.00 to 12.00."

For this, we refer to the comparison sentence (The Comparison Sentence, below):

{object – $attribute_1$} {$object_1$ – constitute – $attribute_2$}
{$object_2$ – compare – base}.

Like other {constitute}, a dimension can in some cases be set by an {agent} or {instrument}:

"The greengrocer set the price of apples at £1.20 per kilo."
"She took two hours to finish the report."
"He measured four metres of tape."

{agent – object – $attribute_1$} {$object_1$ – constitute – attribute}.

A constituent sentence can also include the statement that the {object} lacks a {constituent}:

"My car has lost its exhaust." → "My car needs a new exhaust."

{object – not – constitute – attribute}.

Such a lack can arise through the action of an {agent} or {instrument}:

"The mechanic removed the old exhaust from the car with a spanner."
→ "My car needs a new exhaust."
"The collision knocked the bumper off my car."
→ "My car needs a new bumper."

The sentence then has the structure:

{object – not – constitute – attribute – (agent) – (instrument)}.

The Effect Sentence

Some states or conditions, both mental and physical, are the involuntary reaction of a person or object to an external cause. This is expressed in language by an *effect*, which must include the cause as an element. Effects are created by a transitive sentence, including transitory behavioural reactions which do not have a stative resultant:

Mental effects

"His behaviour angered her."	→	"She felt angry at his behaviour."
"The results were surprising to us."	→	"We were surprised at the result."
"The future worries us."	→	"We are worried about the future."
"The speech excited the audience."	→	"The audience was excited at the speech."
"Seeing you here has made her happy."	→	"She is happy to see you here."
"The outcome disappointed us."	→	"We are disappointed at the outcome."

Physical effects

"The wound in my leg is causing me pain."	→	"I am in pain from a wound in my leg."
"Walking keeps her fit."	→	"She is fit from walking."
"Baggage burdened down the car."	→	"The car was heavy with baggage".
"Asbestos polluted the building."	→	"The building was polluted with asbestos."
"Errors corrupted the text."	→	"The text was riddled with errors."

Behavioural effects

"She started back in horror."	→	-
"He laughed at the thought."	→	-
"They gasped with amazement."	→	-
"We shivered from cold."	→	-

Because the effect is involuntary, the person suffering it is not an agent, but a patient, and the cause is an instrument. The result of the effect is expressed by its action. The elements are therefore:

{object – effect – instrument}.

If the effect is physical, it can in principal be measured:

{object – effect – instrument – (measure)}.

Effects can operate in succession, and are then expressed by more than one instrument:

"His behaviour so angered her that she felt faint."
"Software bugs caused errors which corrupted the text."

Many but not all effects can be due to the action of an agent:

"He burdened down the car with the baggage."
"He angered her with his behaviour."
"She excited the audience with her speech."

The full elements for an effect are therefore:

{object – effect – instrument – (agent) – (measure)}.

The Freedom Sentence

Many effects can be removed by an action which we can call a *freedom*. A mental effect is removed by another effect:

"His remarks reassured her."
"The audience was calmed again by the following speech."
"The nurse relieved the pain by tending the wound."
"Contractors have freed the building of asbestos."
"The editor used software to get rid of the errors in the text."

The freedom is brought about by an {agent} or {instrument}, or both. The outcome is that the {object} is {free} of the effect. As the effect is known, it can be designed {definite} and marked as negative:

{object – free – not – definite – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A freedom is a *reversal* of an effect (Chapter 18., The Complementary Sentence).

The Dependency Sentence

The sentences we have so far been considering describe an actual state or condition, or the actions causing that state or condition. Other sentences refer to a state or condition which may or may not arise, which we call a *dependency*:

"Parliament subjected this law to the Human Rights Act."
"Subsidence placed the building at risk of collapse." "The storm endangered the boat."
"Smoking is a threat to our health."

A dependency is a risk or uncertainty to a {object}, which may be definite or indefinite. The dependency is uncertain and therefore {indefinable}. It arises through an external cause or {instrument}. If we use {depend} for the state of risk or uncertainty, the core elements are:

{object – depend – indefinable – instrument}.

In addition, the sentences state that the dependency may arises through the action of an {agent}. The elements are therefore:

{object – depend – indefinable – instrument – (agent)}.

It seems useful to apply this formula to the above examples:

Patient	**Depend**	**Indefinable**	**Instrument/Agent**
this law	subject	effects of the Act	Parliament
the building	risk	collapse	subsidence
the boat	danger	sinking (not stated)	the storm
our health	threat	deterioration (not stated)	smoking

The {indefinable} consequences of the risk or uncertainty may or may not be not stated. If not stated, it is inferred from {depend}. The state of risk or uncertainty, {depend}, is not indefinable and is always given. In fact, {depend} can be quantified:

"There is a 75% risk of smokers dying before they are 75."

The full elements can therefore be stated:

{object – depend – indefinable – (measure) – instrument – (agent)}.

If the object of the dependency is a person, he/she may place him/herself in that position:

"He put himself at risk of bankruptcy with the loan."
"He risked his health through smoking."

In that case, the agent is the same as the patient:

{agent\object – depend – indefinable – (measure) – instrument}.

The object may be inanimate, but may nevertheless be the {instrument} of its dependency:

"The Society's charter makes it dependent on donations."

"The rock's structure makes it liable to crumble."

{instrument\object – depend – indefinable – (measure)}.

The Relief Sentence

A risk or threat to a {object} can be relieved through the action of an {agent} or {instrument}:

"Flying buttresses protect the cathedral walls from collapsing."
"He rescued his friend from drowning."
"The guard protected the king from attack."

A sentence to express this includes the {indefinable} dependency from which the patient is relieved, as well as the {relief} action:

{object – relief – not – indefinable – (instrument) – (agent)}.

A {relief} is a *reversal* of a dependency (Chapter 18., The Complementary Sentence).

The Identification Sentence

An *identification* sentence states that two entities, of which at least one is definite, are the same. Since an identification is a state or condition, the definite entity is an {object}, and entity with which the {object} is identified is an {identification}:

"His office is his bedroom." "The eighth planet of the solar system is Neptune."

An identification sentence can also identify two general classes, of which at least one is generic:

"A cygnet is a young swan." "A capital city is the seat of government."

An identification sentence is therefore:

{object – identification}.

An identification sentence may select one entity from a class of definite entities, and identify that selected entity with the {object}:

"His office is his bedroom, not his kitchen."
"The eighth planet is Neptune, not Uranus."
"A capital city is the seat of government, not necessarily the seat of commerce."

In discourse terms, this is {definite – select}. In functional terms, it is:

{object – identification$_1$ – not – identification$_2$}.

In the foregoing examples, the {identification} is definite. It may also be indefinite, in which case the sentence selects one entity from a class of indefinite entities, and identifies that with the {object}:

"My son is a teacher at the local school." "Neptune is a planet of the solar system."
"My son is a teacher, not an accountant." "Neptune is a planet, not an asteroid."

It was shown in Chapter 6. (The Identification Function) that this indefinite {identification} is nonspecific. An individual noun can be either the {object} or the {identification}:

"Frederick is my elder son." "My elder son is called Frederick."

The first sentence refers to a known person, Frederick. The second sentence states that the name "Frederick" has been selected for a known person.

An identification can be the result of a process of naming or selecting the {identification}:

"He selected his bedroom as his office."
"The eighth planet was named Neptune in 1846."
"A capital city is defined as the seat of government of a country."
"This rock is limestone, according to the local museum."

If we call the naming or selecting element {agent}, the identification sentence is:

{object – identification – (agent)}.

Correct use of the element {identification} resolves the ambiguity in sentences such as: "There was tittle-tattle about his lovers". This has the functional structure {suppose – object – indefinable}. If the identification of the lovers are supposed to be known, {indefinable} is information about them. If the sentence means "There was tittle-tattle about who were his lovers", then {indefinable} is their {identification}.

Languages express identification by an auxiliary verb "be" or its equivalent:

Spanish: "París es la capital de Francia." "Paris is the capital of France."[13]

Irish: "Is é an leabhar mór an duais." "The big book is the prize."
[Is it the book big the prize.]
"Is maith an múinteoir é Séamas." "James is a good teacher."
[Is good the teacher he James.][14]

Russian: "Moi brat byl uchitelem." "My brother was [a] teacher $_{(instrumental)}$."

Chinese: "Zhè shì Wáng xiāngsheng." "This is Mr Wang." [This is Wang-Mr.][15]

Japanese:
"Ano hito wa sensei da." "That person is a teacher." [That person $_{(topic)}$ teacher is.][16]

Or by a rule of word order which distinguishes the {object} from the {identification}:

Russian: "On vrach." "He is the doctor." [He doctor.]

Arabic: "naḥnu fallāḥūna" "We [are] farmers."[17]

Maori: "He pukapuka hou tēnei." "This is a new book." [A book new this.][18]

Or by a suffix to the {identification}, making it into a verb:

Akkadian:
"šarrāta" "Thou art king." [King-thou]

Inuit: "Uanga Tuumasiuvunga." "I am Tuumasi." [I Tuumasi-am-I.][19]

The Substitution Sentence

A substitution replaces an object with another entity. The substitution may be in the physical world, in time, in human affairs, in an intellectual concept, or in a person's emotions:

[13] Butt & Benjamin, 310.
[14] Dillon & Ó Cróinín, 53-4.
[15] Yip & Rimmington, 33.
[16] Makino & Tsutsui, 522.
[17] Badawi et al, 310.
[18] Foster, 48.
[19] Fortescue, 70.

"The sash windows were replaced with casement windows."
→ "The windows were casement (not sash)."
"The fourth item on the schedule was replaced with the new proposal."
→ "The fourth item was the new proposal."
"Lloyd George replaced Asquith as Prime Minister."
→ "Prime Minister was Lloyd George (not Asquith)."
"Evolution replaced the book of Genesis as the theory of the origin of species."
→ "The theory of the origin of species was evolution (not Genesis)."
"Angela replaced Jacqueline as his favourite."
→ "Angela was his favourite (not Jacqueline)."
"The weather today has turned sunny instead of the rain."
→ "It is sunny, not raining today."

The {object} of the substitution is therefore that function or role which was originally occupied by one entity but is now occupied by another. The resultant sentence is that the {object} is identified with the new entity, in the form of an identification sentence. The original occupant of the function or role can be called {original}:

{object – identification – (not original)}.

The action of substitution is {substitute}, so that the substitution sentence has the core structure:

{object – substitute – original – identification}.

A substitution sentence can have an {agent} or {instrument}:

"King George V appointed Lloyd George Prime Minister in place of Acquith."
"Scientific opinion substituted evolution for the book of Genesis as the theory of the origin of species."
"His volatile emotions replaced Jacqueline with Angela as the favourite."

Including these elements, we have:

{object – substitute – original – identification – (agent) – (instrument)}.

The Comparison Sentence

A *comparison sentence* compares the same characteristic of two entities. This characteristic can be anything which can in some way be measured or contrasted, such as a constituent or attribute:

"My father lived longer than my mother."
"These apples are cheaper than those."
"Sarah is more beautiful than Harriet."

Or an action:

"John runs faster than Jim."

Or a possession:

"Jim has more money than John."

These sentences can be expressed in a common format:

"The life of my father was longer than that of my mother."
"The price of these apples is less that those."
"Sarah's beauty is greater than Harriet's."

"John's running is faster than Jim's."
"Jim's money is more than John's."

One entity is the {object} of the comparison. The other is the definite {base} against which the comparison is made. We may use {compare} to refer to the comparison of the two characteristics, so that the comparison sentence is:

{object – compare – base}.

We saw in the attributive sentence (above) that a countable unit it can be qualified by a quantity: "a life of 75 years"; "a price of one pound per kilo"; "a play of three hours"; "a rod of ten metres". If the characteristic which a comparison sentence compares is countable, then the quantity of {compare} is its relative size between the {object} and the {base}:

"My father lived five years longer than my mother."
"These apples are 50 pence per kilo cheaper than those."
"John runs twice as fast as Jim."

Again, these sentences mean:

"My father's life was five years longer than that of my mother."
"The price of these apples is 50 pence less per kilo than that of those."
"John's running as twice as fast as Jim's."

Such a quantified comparison can be represented:

{object – compare$_1$ – base} {object$_1$ – constitute – attribute}.

A comparison sentence can also compare a characteristic with the same characteristic of a class of entities, a structure called *superlative*. Such a sentence has the same structure as above, except that {base} refers to the class of entities:

"My father was the longest lived of his family."
"These apples are the cheapest in the shop."
"John's runs the fastest."

As we noted in Chapter 3. (Selection and Comparison), the class of entities which is the {base} of a superlative can be generic (a definite superlative) or non-specific (an indefinite superlative). In the latter case, {base} is of course indefinite:

German: "Eisen ist das härteste der Metallen." "Iron is the hardest of the metals." (definite superlative)
"Eisen ist am härtesten." "Iron is hardest." (indefinite superlative)

Arabic: "ʔafḍalu l-tajhīzāti l-ṭibbiyyati" "the best of medical equipments" [best the-equipments the-medical] (definite superlative)
"ʔaqṣā ḥurriyyatin mumkinatin" "the greatest possible freedom" [greatest freedom possible][20] (indefinite superlative)

Italian: "Venezia è la città più splendida che c'è in Italia." (definite superlative)
"Venice is the most splendid city there is in Italy."
[Venice is the city most splendid that there is $_{(indicative)}$ in Italy.]
"Venezia è la città più splendida che ci sia." (indefinite superlative)
"Venice is the most splendid city there is."
[Venice is the city most splendid that there is $_{(subjunctive)}$.][21]

[20] Badawi et al, 251-2.
[21] Maiden & Robustelli, 323.

A comparison can result in the observation that the quantities of the two characteristics are the same, in which case the quantity qualifying {compare} is nil:

"My parents each died at the age of 75 years." "These apples are the same price."

The same structure applies to another form of comparison, a similarity (Chapter 6., The Identification Function). This is an identification or difference between a characteristic of two (or more) entities:

"She resembles her sister in looks." "My wife and I have different hobbies."

In the first sentence, {object} and {base} are the looks of the two sisters and {compare} is "similar". In the second sentence, {object} and {base} are the hobbies of myself and my wife and {compare} is "different". Neither of these sentences is quantified.

A comparison is a stative sentence, which does not necessarily result from a dynamic one. However, it may do, in which case there is an {agent} or {instrument}:

"The shopkeeper priced these apples at 50 pence per kilo less than those."

A comparison may not be established by an {agent}, but may be observed by one:

"The historian contrasted the economic policies of the Roman and Byzantine Empires."

The full structure of a quantifiable comparison is therefore:

{object – $compare_1$ – base – (agent)/(instrument)} {$object_1$ – constitute – attribute}.

A comparison can compare a characteristic of a single entity, before and after a change. This change can be the result of an external {agent} or {instrument}:

"The road was widened by 10 metres."
→ "The road was 10 metres wider."
"The bank raised the interest rate by ¼ %."
→ "The interest rate was ¼ % higher."
"The move reduced his drive to work by one hour."
→ "He lives one hour closer to his work."
"She half filled the bucket with water."
→ "The bucket was half filled with water."
"She removed £100 from her account."
→ "Her account was £100 less."

In these cases, {object} and {base} are the same, and {compare} is the difference between the characteristics before and after:

{$object_1$ – $compare_2$ – $base_1$ – (agent)/(instrument)} {$object_2$ – constitute – attribute}.

All the above examples compare the characteristics of two objects, called {object} and {base}. For the comparison to be possible, {base} must be definite, or in the case of an indefinite superlative, indefinite. An action may however be compared with a hypothetical or non-existent {base}:

"She rode like a whirlwind." "He lives as though there were no tomorrow."

In these examples, "rode" and "lives" are definite. The {base} "whirlwind" and "there were no tomorrow" are indefinable. The sentences could be expressed:

"Her riding was like a whirlwind." "His living is as though there were no tomorrow."

In some languages, {base} is in the subjunctive in this type of expression:

Italian: "Mi ha guardato come se fossi matto." "He looked at me as if I were mad."
[To-me he-has looked as if I-were (subjunctive) mad.]

Russian: "Usnula tak, kak budto by ona chto-to sovershila."
"She fell asleep as if she had accomplished something."
[She-fell-asleep so, as if (subjunctive) she something accomplished.][22]

Hindi: "baccā darvāze par khaṛā thā jaise kisī ke intazār me˜ ho"
"The boy was standing at the door as if waiting for someone."
[Boy door-on standing was as-if someone-of waiting-in he-was (subjunctive).][23]

The comparison sentence also includes the concept of sufficiency, and the related ones of insufficiency and excess. An {object} is or is not sufficient to achieve an indefinable objective expressed by {base}:

"There is sufficient/insufficient/too much butter in the fridge."
"The weight of evidence is sufficient/insufficient/more than sufficient to accuse him."

The first sentence implies "sufficient/insufficient/excessive for our daily needs". The application of the comparison sentence to these examples can be summarised:

{object}	{compare}	{base}
butter	sufficient/insufficient/excessive quantity	our daily needs
evidence	sufficient/insufficient/excessive weight	to accuse him

The Participation Sentence

In a *participation* sentence, an {agent} participates in an action, either by him/herself or with other {participants}, towards an inanimate {target} without altering it. The sentence describes the action and the {agent}'s involvement, but not the relation with the {target}. The elements are therefore:

{agent – participate – (participants) – target}.

A participation sentence include the concepts of "cope with", "play at", "fulfil", "attend to", "speak", "protest against", "take part in", among others:

English: "He took part in the attack on the fortress."
"He played a game of croquet with his friends."

French: "Ils jouent aux cartes." "They are playing [at] cards."

Italian: "Giocano a scacchi" "They are playing [at] chess."

Spanish: "Ella se ocupa de la parte técnica." "She takes care of the technical side."
[She herself occupies of the side technical.][24]

German: "Er wohnte der Versammlung bei." "He attended [to] the meeting."
"Er kam seiner Pflicht nach." "He fulfilled [to] his duty."

Russian: "Ego protivniki napali na etu teoriyu." "His opponents attacked [on] the theory."[25]
"Ona igraet na pianino." "She is playing [on the] piano."

Arabic: "yatakallamāni l-luɣata nafsahā" "They both speak the same language."

[22] Wade, 498.
[23] McGregor, 131.
[24] Harrap, 357.
[25] Folomkina & Weiser, 46.

[They-speak-themselves $_{(dual)}$ the-language the-same.][26]

Persian: "be in eʔteraz kard" "He protested at this." [To this protest he-made.][27]

Malay: "Mandy memenuhi semua keperluan kerja itu."
"Mandy fulfilled all the requirements for the job."
[Mandy fulfil all necessity job-the.][28]

A participation also includes the concepts of "resist", "attack", "obey", and "care for":

French: "Je lui ai résisté." "I resisted him." [I to-him have resisted.][29]

Italian: "I ragazzi hanno ubbidito al professore."
"The boys [have] obeyed [to] the teacher."[30]

German: "Er kümmert sich um einen Kranken." "He is looking [himself] after a sick person."

Russian: "Borolsya s vragom." "He fought the enemy." [He fought-himself with the enemy.]

Persian: "be ma taʔaddi kard" "He oppressed us." [On us oppression he-made.]
"bar došmanan taxtand" "They attacked the enemy." [On enemy they-attacked.][31]

Hindi: "hamne duśman par hamlā kiyā" "We attacked the enemy."
[By-us enemy-on attack made.][32]

The {target} is not an {object}, since an {object} has to be in some way affected. While the participation action may have some effect on the {target}, the sentence provides no information on what that might be. A {beneficiary} may occur as a qualifier to the {target}:

"The army attacked the enemy's position." "They protested against Government policy." "She is looking after my back problems."

{agent – participate$_1$ – (participants) – target$_2$} {object$_2$ – benefit$_1$ – beneficiary}

Since the change effected by the participation occurs generally in the mind of the agent, it is difficult to detect whether it has been completed or not. Participation sentences are therefore often expressed by an adjective: "They were obedient to the rules/aggressive towards the enemy/attentive to the task/involved in the event", etc.

As we shall see in the following section, many participations are carried out by virtue of a {role} that the {agent} possesses:

"The doctor treated me for arthritis."
"Our tax accountant is Mrs Jones."
"The scientists researched the problem."
"The aggressors attacked without warning."
"The rebels rose against the regime."
"The warriors fought the battle."

These are:

{agent\role – participate – (participants) – target}.

[26] Badawi et al, 220.
[27] Lambton, 115.
[28] Sneddon, 88.
[29] Fraser & Squair, 218-9.
[30] Maiden & Robustelli, 280.
[31] Lambton, 113, 115.
[32] Snell, 94.

The Role Sentence

As we discuss in Chapter 12. (Role), a *role* is a noun which describes a function in human society. A *role sentence* is one which assigns a role to particular individual:

> "John is a hospital consultant." "Lloyd George was Prime Minister."
> "My grandfather was French." "Sarah is a foreign exchange dealer."

Implicit in this sentence is the competence by which the role is exercised:

> "John is a consultant at Guy's hospital."
> "Lloyd George was Prime Minister as head of a coalition Government."
> "My grandfather was French by birth."
> "Sarah is employed as a foreign exchange dealer."

The person fulfilling the {role} is not an agent, and so is represented by the element {object}. If we call the competence by which the {role} is exercised {competence}, a role sentence is:

> {object – role – competence}.

A role can have a sphere of performance, which is distinct from the {competence}. In these examples, the {competence} is in brackets:

> "Louis XIV was (hereditary) king of France from 1643 to 1715."
> "Mary is (the elected) Treasurer of the Society."
> "John is a consultant (in tropical diseases) at Guy's hospital."
> "Lloyd George was Prime Minister of Great Britain (as head of a coalition Government)."
> "G.R. Elton was a (recognised) historian of Tudor England."

The role sentence does not state any effect of the {role} on its sphere of operation, so the sphere of operation is not a patient but a {target}, and the sentence becomes:

> {(agent) – object – role – competence – (target)}.

A role can be an industry such as construction or oil extraction, in which case the {object} is the company or enterprise engaged in it, the {competence} is the competence whereby it does so, and the {target} is its sphere of activity:

> "Shell is a company in the oil industry." "Taylor Woodrow is a registered house builder."

A role frequently occurs in sentences in which a person or object fulfils another function by virtue of an competence which he/she/it holds:

> "As king of France, Louis XIV built the Palace of Versailles."
> "As Treasurer of the Society, Mary signs the cheques."

If the competence is also stated, these sentences would be:

> "As hereditary king of France, Louis XIV built the Palace of Versailles."
> "As elected Treasurer of the Society, Mary signs the cheques."

and can be represented as:

> $\{agent_1 – create – creation\}$ $\{object_1 – role – (competence) – target\}$
> $\{agent_1 – transform – object\}$ $\{object_1 – role – (competence) – target\}$.

However, if the sentences are:

> "As king, Louis XIV built the Palace of Versailles."
> "As Treasurer, Mary signs the cheques."

they can be summarised as:

{$agent_1$ – create – creation} and {$agent_1$ – transform – object} {$object_1$ – role}.

In all the above examples, the {object} of the {role} is the subject. It is also possible for the {role} to be the subject:

"Louis XIV's reign was the longest in French history."
"My grandfather's French nationality was inherited from his mother."
"The treasurership is an onerous position."
"The history of Tudor England is frequently studied."
"The oil industry grew by 5% last year."

These sentences refer to a {role} as an office or industry rather than as a person or company. The first example has the structure:

{$object_1$ – constitute – $attribute_2$} {$role_1$ – object} {$object_2$ – compare – base}.

The Style Sentence

In fulfilling an action in human society, a person may exhibit a certain quality or style, which is expressed by a *style sentence*:

"John has a certain style of speaking in public."
"Mary is an honest Treasurer of the Society."
"The Court of King James I was corrupt."
"He was meticulous in his preparation of the accounts."
"She was aggressive in her interview of the witness."
"They were sincere in their expressions of regret."
"Henry was an expert oarsman."
"Joan had difficulty preparing the report."

A style sentence does not provide new information on the action itself or express its performance, but assumes that the hearer knows that it is performed. The action is therefore {definite}, and the person showing the style is not its agent. In addition, the person showing it is not a recipient, since the sentence does not assume that the style has been received from an outside source. The sentence describes an quality or condition of the person, who is therefore an {object}. If {style} is the style function, a style sentence is:

{object – style – definite}.

A sentence which describe a similar but different function to a style is an ability sentence (see below), such as "John can speak in public". However, an ability has not yet been performed, and is therefore {indefinable}. Also discussed below is an opinion sentence, in which a person has a considered mental reaction to a {definite} object. However, the holder of an opinion is a {recipient}.

Since a style sentence describes a quality, it is stative. Since a style describes the performance of an action, it often occurs as an adverbial to a sentence which expresses the performance:

"John spoke in public with a certain style."
"Mary acted honestly as Treasurer of the Society."
"The Court of King James I operated corruptly."
"He prepared the accounts meticulously."
"She interviewed the witness aggressively."
"They expressed sincere regrets."
"Henry rowed expertly."
"Joan completed the report with difficulty."

A style may also express the manner of an inchoative or adoptive modal sentence:

"She hastened to complete the report."
"She persisted in writing the report."
"She hesitated to write the report."
"She ventured to write the report."

As with other adverbials (Chapter 16., The Adverbial Component), such a construction is two sentences: an action is performed, and it is performed in a particular style. The structure is, for example:

$\{agent_1 – participate_2 – target\}$ $\{object_1 – style – definite_2\}$, or
$\{agent_1 – transform_2 – object – resultant\}$ $\{object_1 – style – definite_2\}$.

Since a {style} is definite, it cannot be indefinite or indefinable:

*"Joan prepared a report with difficulty." *"Joan did not prepare a report with difficulty."

The Possession Sentence

A *possession* is a relationship between a person (or animate being), called a {recipient}, and an {object} which may be animate or inanimate. A possession can be a mental image in the mind of the recipient, or an external concept.

Possessions may arise from an action (a *dative* sentence) in which an agent or instrument establishes the relationship between the recipient and the object. The following are agential datives:

"Mary gave the book to John."	→	"John has the book."	(possession)
"Mary showed the book to John."	→	"John sees the book."	(sight)
"Mary taught John geography."	→	"John understands geography."	(understanding)
"Mary lent the book to John."	→	"John has the book on loan."	(loan)
"Mary introduced Shirley to John."	→	"John is acquainted with Shirley."	(acquaintance)
"Mary brought John's attention to the noise."	→	"John hears the noise."	(sensation)
"Mary explained the details to John."	→	"John knows the details."	(knowledge)
"Mary reminded John about the appointment."	→	"John remembers the appointment."	(memory)
"Mary entrusted John with the children."	→	"John has care of the children."	(care)

The possession is expressed in noun form, in brackets. The dative sentences can be understood as "x gives possession of y to z" and the possession sentences as "z has possession of y". A stative possession sentence may also be the result of a dynamic sentence of the form "z receives or takes possession of y" (a *receptive* or *adoptive* sentence), without the intervention of an agent or instrument:

"John found the book."	→	"John has the book."
"John noticed the book."	→	"John sees the book."
"John got to know Shirley."	→	"John is acquainted with Shirley."
"The noise came to John's attention."	→	"John hears the noise."
"John learnt the details."	→	"John knows the details."
"John recollected the appointment."	→	"John remembers the appointment."

Dative, receptive, and adoptive sentences are together called *transfers*. The following dative sentences have both an agent and an instrument:

"Mary sent the book to John through the post."
"Mary explained the details to John with the aid of diagrams."

The following dative sentences are instrumental, and an instrument can also be part of the possession sentence:

"The post delivered the book to John."
→ "John has the book from the post." (possession)
"The diagrams explained the details to John."
→ "John understands the details from the diagrams." (understanding)
"The noise gave John a headache." → "John has a headache from the noise." (headache)

Possession and transfer sentences therefore have the elements:

{recipient – possession – object – (agent) – (instrument)}.

A possession can be a person or material object, and the connection between it and the recipient can be expressed by a genitive link:

"They elected Mrs Jones as our Chairman." (chairman)
→ "Mrs Jones is our Chairman."
"We were sold a Ford Focus as our car." (car)
→ "Our car is a Ford Focus."

The connection between the recipient and the object possessed is not clear if no possession is stated, for example *"John, headache" or *"John, book red". Languages therefore generally possess a default possessive auxiliary, which in English is usually "have", "feel", or "suit". For many languages, this possessive auxiliary is not structured as a verb, but as a locative applied to the recipient. This "indirect recipient" is often placed in topic position, while the object possessed is often marked existentially:

German: "Mir ist kalt." "I feel cold." [To-me is cold.]
"Mir ist traurig zumute." "I feel sad." [To-me is sad to-mood.]

Italian: "Mi duole il dito." "My finger hurts." [To-me hurts the finger.]

Russian: "U menya novyi kostyum." "I have a new suit." [With me new suit.]
"Eto menya vpolne ustraivaet." "That will suit me perfectly."
[That of-me fully suits.][33]
"Ucheniku veselo." "The pupil feels cheerful." [To-pupil cheerful.][34]

Hungarian:
"Jóska feleségének jó állása van." "Joska's wife has a good job."
[Joska wife-his-to good job-her is.]
"Lajos bácsinak fáj a feje." "Mr Lajos has a headache."
[Lajos Mr-to hurts the head-his.][35]

Welsh: "Y mae'r fasged gan Mair." "Mary has the basket."
[There-is the basket with Mary.][36]

Irish: "Tá gúna nua ag Eibhlín." "Eileen has a new dress." [Is new dress at Eileen.]
"Tá eolas an bhaile go maith aige." "He knows the town well."
[Is knowledge of-the town well at-him.][37]

Greek: "Σου πάει αυτή η φούστα." "This skirt suits you." [To-you goes this the skirt.][38]

[33] Folomkina & Weiser, 210, 506.
[34] Wade, 120.
[35] Pontifex, 165, 257.
[36] Bowen & Rhys Jones, 38.
[37] Dillon & Ó Cróinín, 42.
[38] Holton et al, 263.

Turkish: “Evin bahçesi var.” “The house has a garden.” [House-of garden-its there-is.][39]

Arabic: “lahu banūna fī l-jāmiʕati” “He has sons in the University.”
[For-him sons in the-University.]
“maʕī l-ʔāna 71,5 frank” “I had with me 71.5 francs.” [With-me 71.5 francs.][40]

Hindi: “mere pās ek gārī hai” “I have a car.” [Me-with a car is.]
“unko uskā nām mālūm thā” “They knew his name.”
[To-them his name known was.]
“āj kā din mujhe hameśā yād rahegā” “I shall always remember today.”
[Today-of day to-me always mind will-remain.]
“mujhe bhūkh lagī hai” “I am hungry.” [To-me hunger attached is.][41]

Malay: “Dia ada rumah baru.” “He has a new house.” [He there-is house new.][42]

Chinese: “Wǒ yǒu gè dìdi.” “I have a younger brother.” [I there-is unit younger-brother.]
“Dǒngshìzhǎng xīnshuǐ shífēn gāo.”
“The director of the board has an extremely high salary.”
[Board-director salary extremely high.][43]

Japanese:
“Watashi ni wa ki no ue no chīsana tori ga mieta.”
“I could see small birds on the tree.”
[I-to (topic) tree-of top-of small bird (subject) were-visible.]
“Watashi ni wa uguisu no koe ga yoku kikoeru.”
“I can clearly hear the cries of a nightingale.”
[I-to (topic) nightingale-of voice (subject) well is-audible.][44]

Swahili: “Kalamu ina mwalimu.” “The teacher has the pencil.”
[Pencil is-with teacher.][45]

Inuit employs an auxiliary suffix:

“Aninngaasaatiqarpunga.” “I have some money.” [Money-some-have-I.]
“Ilinniartitsisuraarput.” “He is our teacher.” [Teacher-have-we-him.]
“Niaqunnguvuq.” “He has a headache.” [Head-haspain-he.][46]

Some possessive relations between persons are expressed by the non-literal use of locative words:

“We support the President.”	“We’re all behind you.”
“Jones is under Smith.”	“We’re right beside you.”

In the *provision* of goods and services, the relationship between the agent and recipient is the same as the means by which it is established:

“The consultancy manned the team with accountants.”	(man)
“The soldiers were armed with rifles.”	(arms)
“The ostler fed the horses.”	(feed)
“They named their son Frederick.”	(name)
“Tenniel illustrated ‘Alice in Wonderland’.”	(illustration)

[39] Lewis, 143.
[40] Badawi et al, 190-3.
[41] McGregor, 51, 118, 133; Snell, 148.
[42] Dodds, 21.
[43] Yip & Rimmington, 35, 113.
[44] Makino & Tsutsui, 188, 244.
[45] Perrott, 79.
[46] Fortescue, 171, 321.

"The aid workers clothed the victims." (clothes)
"The workers were housed in cottages on the estate." (house)

In these sentences, the elements {possession} and {instrument} are therefore combined:

{recipient – possession\instrument – object – (agent)}.

A stative possession sentence can also be the result of a dynamic sentence of the form "x takes possession of y", in which the recipient acts as agent in establishing the relationship between him/herself and the object. In such *adoptive* sentences the elements {recipient} and {agent} are combined:

{agent\recipient – possession – object – (instrument)}.

The adoptive can be expressed by an auxiliary or by a specific adoptive verb:

"John took the book."	→	"John has the book."
"John looked at the book."	→	"John sees the book."
"John studied geography."	→	"John understands geography."
"John borrowed the book."	→	"John has the book on loan."
"John listened to/for the noise."	→	"John hears the noise."
"John investigated the details."	→	"John knows the details."
"We bought a Ford Focus."	→	"Our car is a Ford Focus."
"John earns a large salary."	→	"John has a large salary."
"Sheila took a share in the enterprise."	→	"Sheila shares in the enterprise."
"The Smiths settled in Blackpool."	→	"The Smiths' home is in Blackpool."
"I have read your book."	→	"I am familiar with your book."
"John took care of the children."	→	"John has the children in his care."

In some languages, an adoptive sentence is constructed by a dative reflexive which can be understood as "take to oneself":

Italian: "S'è presa cura dei cinque bambini." "She took care of the five children."
[Herself she-is taken care of the five children.]

Welsh: "Erbyn hyn mae teulu newydd o foch daear wedi ymgartrefu'n hapus."
"A new family of badgers has now settled in happily."
[By now is family new of badgers after itself-settle in happy.][47]

Russian: "Zabotilas' o roditelyakh." "She took care of her parents."
[She-cared-herself about parents.]

Arabic: "lā ʔataðakkaru ʔannī ʔalqaytu naẓarī ʕalayhi marratan"
"I do not remember that I ever once cast a glance at him."
[Not I-remember-myself that-I cast glance-my at-him once.][48]

The following sections describe sentence types which are variations of the possession function.

The Deficiency Sentence

A *deficiency* is the absence of a relationship between a person and an {object}, which is felt by the person as a need. Since the deficiency is to the disadvantage of the person, he/she is not the recipient but a {beneficiary}:

"John needs a new car." "John lacks practice in public speaking."

[47] King, 238.
[48] Badawi et al, 605.

A deficiency is not simply the negative of a possession, which does not imply that a need was felt: "I do not have car" does not mean "I need a car", but a reversal of a possession (Chapter 18., The Complementary Sentence).

A deficiency may arise from a process whereby the {beneficiary} loses the {object}:

"John has lost his wallet." → "John is missing his wallet."

Alternatively, a deficiency may the result of an action by an {agent} to remove the {object}:

"The thief stole John's wallet." → "John is missing his wallet."
"My driving license was withdrawn."
→ "I lack a driving license."

If we use {lack} for the deficiency function, a deficiency sentence is:

{beneficiary – lack – not – object – (possession) – (agent)}.

The element {not} is expressed because the {object} which is lacking can be either {definite} or {indefinable}, not {indefinite}. In "John is missing his wallet", the wallet exists but is missing. In "I lack a driving licence", no driving licence exists.

It is possible for a {beneficiary} to renounce a definite {object} of which he/she previously had need:

"We have given up the cottage;" "She rejected the opportunity;"
"He has wasted his inheritance;"

or an indefinable {object} which he/she does not yet possess:

"We renounce all worldly goods." "She rejected any opportunity of promotion."

In these cases, the elements {agent} and {beneficiary} are combined:

{agent\beneficiary – lack – not – object – (possession) – (instrument)}.

Languages often construct a deficiency with a locative beneficiary in topic position:

French: "Il leur faudra cent francs." "They will need 100 francs."
[It to-them will-be-necessary 100 francs.][49]

German: "Es fehlt mir an nötigen Gelde." "I lack necessary funds."
[It lacks to-me at necessary funds.]

Italian: "Mi era occorso l'aiuto dei miei studenti." "I needed my students' help."
[To-me was needed the help of-the my students.]
"A Giorgio manca il passaporto." "George lacks his passport."
[To George lacks the passport.][50]

Russian: "Detyam nuzhen khoroshii ukhod." "Children need good care."
[To-children necessary good care.][51]

Welsh: "Y mae eisiau bwyd ar y bachgen." "The boy needs food."
[There-is need food on the boy.][52]

Irish: "Tá an leabhar caillte ag an ngarsún." "The boy has lost the book."

[49] Fraser & Squair, 178.
[50] Miaden & Robustelli, 264, 356
[51] Folomkina & Weiser, 326.
[52] Bowen & Rhys Jones, 115.

[Is the book lost at the boy.]

Hindi: "hame˜ ye pustke˜ nahī˜ cāhie" "We don't need these books."
[To-us these books not necessary.][53]

The beneficiary may also be marked with a locative in the dative deficiency sentence:

French: "On lui a volé son argent." "They have stolen his money".
[One to-him has stolen the money.][54]

Spanish: "Les robaron el coche." "They stole your car." [To-you they-stole the car.]

The Exchange Sentence

In an exchange sentence, a mutual relationship exists between an {agent} and {recipient}. There are therefore potentially two transfer and possession sentences, relating to an $\{object_1\}$ and a compensating $\{object_2\}$:

$\{agent_1 – possession_1 – object_1 – object_2 – recipient_1\}$ $\{agent_1 = recipient_2\}$
$\{agent_2 – possession_2 – object_2 – object_1 – recipient_2\}$ $\{agent_2 = recipient_1\}$

Examples are:

"She sold the book to a friend for £10."
"Her friend bought the book for £10."

"He rescued his companion."
"His companion thanked him for rescuing him."

"Mary won a good grade for her work at school."
"The school congratulated Mary for her work."

An exchange sentence can have a {beneficiary} who is different from either agent or recipient:

Indonesian:
"Dia membelikan adiknya buku." "He bought his brother a book."
[He bought-for brother-his book.][55]

Swahili: "Numewanunulia sukari." "I have bought sugar for them."
[I have bought-for-them sugar.][56]

Japanese:
"Watashi wa chichi ni kamera o katte moratta."
"My father bought a camera for me."
[I $_{(topic)}$ father-by camera $_{(object)}$ buying received.][57]

This gives the structure:

$\{agent_1 – possession_1\backslash benefit – object_1 – object_2 – recipient_1 – (beneficiary)\}$
$\{agent_1 = recipient_2\}$
$\{agent_2 – possession_2\backslash benefit – object_2 – object_1 – recipient_2 – (beneficiary)\}$
$\{agent_2 = recipient_1\}$

An agent can also carry out an exchange for his/her own benefit:

[53] McGregor, 77.
[54] Fraser & Squair, 264.
[55] Sneddon, 251.
[56] Perrott, 111.
[57] Makino & Tsutsui, 263.

"James bought the book from the bookshop for his own use."
"The bookshop sold James the book for his own use."

{$agent_1$\beneficiary – $possession_1$\benefit – $object_1$ – $object_2$ – $recipient_1$}
{$agent_1 = recipient_2$}
{$agent_2$ – $possession_2$\benefit – $object_2$ – $object_1$ – $recipient_2$ \(beneficiary)}
{$agent_2 = recipient_1$}

The Perception Sentence

A *perception* is mental impression which a {recipient} has of an {object}, either at first hand though the senses or at second hand though memory or knowledge. The {object} can be already known to the recipient, or new to him/her:

"John saw the/a book." "John heard the/a noise." "Mary knew John."
"Mary remembered the/an appointment." "Peter heard about his neighbours."
"Henry saw the/a mistake."

The mental impression (the perception) can also be of some quality or action of the {object}:

"John saw that the book was open at page 109."
"John heard the noise come from behind some bushes."
"Mary knew James to be an indifferent correspondent."
"Mary remembered that the appointment was due tomorrow."
"Peter heard that his neighbours had a large family."

If as in these examples the {object} is known to the {recipient}, it is definite. The {object} and the perception constitute a statement of which the {object} is the subject, and which the {recipient} perceives: "The book was open at page 109"; "The noise came from behind some bushes", etc. We may therefore expect that the elements of the perception are similar to the elements of a statement (Chapter 13., Statement). We can distinguish perceptions which are known to the {recipient} and are therefore definite:

"John saw that the book was open at page 109."
"Mary remembered that the appointment was due tomorrow."

In these sentences, the {recipient} is selecting one perception from a range of possible known perceptions concerning a definite {object}. If we call the act of perceiving {perceive}, the structure is:

{recipient – perceive – object – select}.

In other sentences, the {recipient} is perceiving new information concerning a definite {object}:

"John heard the noise come from behind some bushes."
"Mary knew James to be an indifferent correspondent."
"Peter heard that his neighbours had a large family."

As we noted in Chapter 13. (Statement), a statement containing an indefinite comment qualifies the comment with a definite element {circumstance} so that the comment can be definite in a subsequent sentence. In an indefinite perception of a definite {object}, the {circumstance} is provided by the action of perception and does not need to be further stated. Taking the above sentences as examples, the bushes are identified by John's hearing of a noise, James' identification as an indifferent correspondent is made by Mary, and the large family is identified by Peter's hearing about them. The elements of these perception sentences are therefore:

{recipient – perceive – object – indefinite}.

If the {object} is definite, the sentences can be expressed with it as the topic, which means only that the order of elements is different:

"The book was seen to be open at page 109."
"The noise was heard by John to come from behind some bushes."
"James was known by Mary to be an indifferent correspondent."
"The appointment was remembered by Mary to be due tomorrow."

Italian: "Ti credevo già partita." "I thought you'd already gone."
[You I-thought already gone.][58]

The distinction between a definite and indefinite perception of a definite object can be seen in the examples:

"John was found alive." "John was found to be alive."

In the first example, "alive" is known information which is {select} in preference to the alternative, which might be "dead". In the second example, "alive" is new information and therefore {indefinite}.

We now consider perceptions in which the {object} is new information to the {recipient} and therefore indefinite. The {recipient} perceives some definite information concerning the {object} which enables him/her to identify it:

"John saw a book open at page 109."
"John heard a noise coming from behind the bushes."
"Mary remembered an appointment which was due tomorrow."
"Henry saw a mistake in the text."

This identifying information has the same purpose as {circumstance} in a statement with an indefinite comment. The structure is therefore:

{recipient – perceive – object – circumstance}.

The {circumstance} cannot be indefinite. It is not possible for a new quality or action to be perceived on an indefinite {object}:

*"John saw a book open at a page."
*"John heard a noise coming from behind bushes."
*"Mary remembered an appointment in a schedule."
*"Henry saw a mistake in a text."

An indefinite {object} of a perception can be made the {object} of an existential sentence:

"A book was seen to be open at page 109."/"There was a book seen to be open at page 109."
"A noise was heard by John to come from behind the bushes."/"There was a noise heard…"
"An appointment was remembered by Mary to be due."/"There was an appointment…"
"A mistake was seen by Henry in the text."/"There was a mistake…"

It will be recalled from Chapter 13. (Existential Sentence) that the structure of an existential sentence is {indefinite – circumstance}, which is consistent with the foregoing.

We can therefore summarise a perception sentence as:

{recipient – perceive – object – select/indefinite/circumstance},

depending on the nature of the {object} and the perception. A perception can take place with the aid of an {instrument}:

"John saw the book through the telescope to be open at page 109."
"From previous experience, Mary knew James to be an indifferent correspondent."
"Her diary reminded Mary that the appointment was due."

[58] Maiden & Robustelli, 311.

{recipient – perceive – object – select/indefinite/circumstance – (instrument)}.

As with other sentence types, a perception includes its negative, that is a failure to perceive. If the {object} and the perception are definite, the truth or falsehood of the perception is not affected by whether it is perceived or not:

"John did not see that the book was open at page 109."

{recipient – not – perceive – object – select – (instrument)}.

If a possible perception concerning a definite {object} is indefinite, a failure to perceive it does not establish whether the perception occurred or not. In that case, the perception is {indefinable}:

"John did not hear the noise come from behind some bushes."
"Peter did not hear that his neighbours had a large family."

The elements of a sentence which describes a failure of perception concerning a definite object can therefore be summarised:

{recipient – not – perceive – object – select/indefinable – (instrument)}.

However, if the {object}is indefinite, a failure to perceive it does not supply information on whether it exists or not. Both the {object} and the {perception} are then {indefinable}. Such sentences are not perceptions, but suppositions, and are discussed below (The Supposition Sentence):

"John did not see a book which was open at page 109."
"John did not hear a noise which came from behind the bushes."

A perception may be involuntary; a person may not wish to see, hear, know, or remember something. Alternatively, it may be adopted by the recipient as a deliberate action:

"John looked at the book open at page 109."
"John listened to the noise coming from behind the bushes."
"Mary realised that James was an indifferent correspondent."
"Mary recollected that the appointment was due tomorrow."

If the perception is adopted, the element {recipient} combines with {agent}:

{agent\recipient – perceive – object – select/indefinite/circumstance – (instrument)}.

An adoptive perception is expressed in some languages through a dative reflexive, in the sense "to oneself":

Italian: "Mi sono accorto che era tardi." "I realised it was late."
[Myself I-am realised that it-was late.]

The Negative Perception Sentence

This heading refers not to a failure by a recipient to perceive ("John did not see the book"; "Mary did not remember the appointment"), but to a perception that something is not true. Let us first consider a negative definite perception concerning a definite object:

"John saw that the book was not open at page 109."
"Mary remembered that the appointment was not due tomorrow."

In that case, the {recipient} is not selecting a perception but perceiving that a particular definite condition is not valid for the {object}. The structure is therefore:

{recipient – perceive – object – not – definite}.

If the {object} is definite, but the negative perception is indefinite, we have sentences such as:

"John heard that the noise did not come from behind some bushes."
"Mary knew that James was not an indifferent correspondent."
"Peter heard that his neighbours did not have large family."

These sentences mean: "There were no bushes from which the noise came"; "There is no indifferent correspondent who is James"; "There is no large family belonging to the neighbours". The perception is {indefinable}, so the sentence is:

{recipient – perceive – object – not – indefinable}.

If we add the element {instrument}, the elements of a negative perception can be summarised as:

{recipient – perceive – object – not – definite/indefinable – (instrument)}.

All the above examples relate to a definite {object}. A negative perception cannot relate to an indefinite object. The following sentences are meaningless:

*"John saw that a book was not open."
*"Mary remembered that an appointment was not due."
*"John heard a noise not coming from behind some bushes."
*"Henry saw a mistake which was not in the text."

However, it is possible for an {object} to be negative, in which case it is indefinable:

"John saw no book." "Mary remembered no appointment."
"There was no noise which John heard." "Henry saw no mistake."

In Italian, the verb of an indefinite negative perception is subjunctive:

"Sembra che Alberto non arrivi in tempo." "It seems that Alberto will not arrive in time."
[It-seems that Alberto not arrive $_{(subjunctive)}$ in time.][59]
"Non so se sia già partito." "I don't know whether he's $_{(subjunctive)}$ already left."[60]

The Opinion Sentence

A *opinion* is a considered mental reaction by a person to an event which he/she has perceived. The event is an action or state, which may relate to the opinion-holder or to a third party. An opinion sentence does not express the perception, but the mental reaction to it. It can be expressed with the opinion-holder or the event as the topic:

"We were pleased by the play."	"The play pleased us."
"He was satisfied with the contract."	"The contract satisfied him."
"He likes skiing."	-
"He objected to the proposal."	"The proposal was objected to"
"She was offended at the offer."	"The offer offended her."
"They trusted the information."	"The information gave them confidence."
"She was interested in his work."	"His work interested her."
"She pitied their distress."	"Their distress was pitiful to her."
"She is proud of her work."	"Her work gives her pride."
"We take the matter seriously."	"The matter is serious for us."
"He was ashamed at his performance."	"His performance shamed him."

The event can be expressed by any factual sentence, which may again be the topic:

[59] Maiden & Robustelli, 401.
[60] Speight, 151.

"She was pleased that Johnnie had eaten his lunch."
"She was interested that Hilary and Tensing had climbed Mount Everest."
"Johnnie's having eaten his lunch pleased her."
"Hilary and Tensing's climbing of Mount Everest interested her."

An opinion sentence can be expressed as a possessive sentence in which the opinion is the possession, with either "have" or "take" as an auxiliary:

"We had/took pleasure in the play." "He had/took satisfaction with the contract."
"They had confidence in the information." "She took an interest in his work."

The opinion-holder is therefore a {recipient}. From the above examples, it might appear that an opinion is held with regard to an object, but this is not so. In other sentence categories, an {object} is an entity which a sentence places in state or event. For example, a perception perceives a state or event concerning an {object}:

"She read that Hilary and Tensing had climbed Mount Everest."
"She saw that Johnnie had eaten his lunch."

In contrast, an opinion is held concerning the state or event itself. The sentences at the start of this section mean:

"We were pleased by the performance of the play."
"He was satisfied with the performance of the contract."
"He likes the experience of skiing."
"He objected to what was proposed."

This distinction is shown by the ability to place the words "the fact that" in front of an opinion event, but not in front of a perception:

"She was pleased at the fact that Johnnie had eaten his lunch."
"She was interested in the fact that Hilary and Tensing had climbed Mount Everest."
*"She saw the fact that Johnnie had eaten his lunch."
*"She read the fact that Hilary and Tensing had climbed Mount Everest."

Since the event concerning an {opinion} is held is known, it is {definite}. The elements of an opinion are therefore:

{recipient – opinion – definite}.

Like other possession sentences, {opinion} are often constructed with a locative recipient:

French: "Ça va lui faire plaisir." "He will be pleased at that."
[That will to-him cause pleasure.][61]

Spanish: "Le daba vergüenza contestar." "He was too ashamed to answer."
[To-him gave shame to-answer.][62]

Italian: "Ci sono piaciute le tue poesie." "We liked your poems."
[To-us are pleased the your poems.][63]

Welsh: "Y mae'n well gennyf i weithio yn yr ardd." "I prefer to work in the garden."
[It is better with me to work in the garden.]
"Y mae'n ddrwg gennyf i glywed am eich dannoedd."
"I'm sorry to hear of your toothache."
[It is bad with me hearing of your toothache.][64]

[61] Collins (1981), 324.
[62] Harrap, 23.
[63] Maiden & Robustelli, 264.

Greek: "Δε μου αρέσει αυτό το κρασί." "I don't like this wine."
[Not to-me it-likes this the wine.][65]

Russian: "Nam bylo zhal' ego." "We felt pity for him." [To-us was pity of-him.][66]
"Bratu nadoyelo rabotat'." "My brother is bored with working."
[To-brother boring to-work.][67]

Persian: "in ketab mara pasand amand" "I liked this book."
[This book to-me pleasant came.][68]

Hindi: "mujhe tumhārī bāto˜ par viśvās nahī˜ hai" "I don't trust what you say."
[To-me your words-on trust not there-is.]
"hame˜ rīnā par bahut garv hai" "We are very proud of Rina."
[To-us Rina-on much pride is.][69]

An {opinion} can sometimes be the result of an intentional action by a third party:

"He interested his wife in Spanish architecture."
"She satisfied him that the contract had been fulfilled."
"He offended her with his remarks."
"He was true to his friends."

The elements of such a sentence are:

{recipient – opinion – definite – (agent)}.

However, the majority of {opinion} arise from an intentional action by the {recipient} to adopt it, and can be described by:

{agent\recipient – opinion – definite}.

These are the same as adoptive sentences for other possessions: Examples are:

"We took pleasure in the play."	→	"The play pleased us."
"She took an interest in his work."	→	"His work interested her."
"He took satisfaction in the contract."	→	"He was satisfied with the contract."
"She took pity on their distress."	→	"She pitied their distress."
"She takes pride in her work."	→	"She is proud of her work."
"We take the matter seriously."	→	"The matter is serious for us."
"He took a liking to skiing."	→	"He likes skiing."
"He took objection to the proposal."	→	"He disliked the proposal."
"She took offence at the offer."	→	"The offer offended her."
"They took confidence from the information."	→	"They were confident of the information."
"He took shame at his performance."	→	"He was ashamed at his performance."

Some languages express an adoptive {opinion} by a dative reflexive construction which can be understood as "take to oneself":

---

[64] Bowen & Rhys Jones, 115-6.
[65] Holton et al, 263.
[66] Folomkina & Weiser, 477.
[67] Wade, 120.
[68] Lambton, 131.
[69] Snell, 177, 213.

Italian: "S'è pentito d'aver detto tante bugie." "He repented of having told so many lies."
[Himself he-is repented of having told so many lies.][70]
"Mi vergogno di averlo fatto." "I am ashamed of having done it."
[Myself I-shame of having-it done.]
"Mi rammarico di averlo scritto." "I regret having written it."
[Myself I-regret of having-it written.]

Greek: "Ντρέπομαι για τη συμπεριφορά μου." "I'm ashamed of my behaviour."
[I-shame-myself for the behaviour my.]
"Λυπάμαι που έχασε ο Νίκος τη δουλειά του." "I am sorry that Nikos lost his job."
[I regret-myself that lost the Nikos the job his.]
"Δέχτηκε την πρόταση μας αμέσως." "He accepted our proposal immediately."
[He-accepted-himself the proposal our immediately.][71]

Russian: "On zainteresovalsya filosofiei." "He became interested in philosophy."
[He interested-himself with philosophy.]
"Ona gordilas' svoim synom." "She was proud of her son."
[She prided herself with her son.]
"My voskhishchalis' ikh igroi." "We admired his acting."
[We admired-ourselves with his acting.][72]

Arabic: "iʕtaqaduhu ṣadīqan" "I believed him a friend." [I believed-myself-him friend.]
"iʕtaraḍa l-iθnāni ʕalā ṣarāmati l-qawānīna"
"The two men objected to the harshness of the laws."
[Objected-themselves the-two to harshness the-laws.][73]

An opinion sentence can be expanded to include the communication of that opinion to a third party {recipient}:

"He complained to the management about the standard of service."
"They showed interest in the proposal."
"They rejoiced at their good luck."
"They lamented their ill fortune to their friends."
"They expressed pleasure to me that you had succeeded."

The {opinion} is communicated by an {agent} who is also its {recipient}. The opinion communication sentence therefore includes two recipients, {recipient$_1$} who holds the opinion and {recipient$_2$} who receives the communication. The event is known to both the speaker and the hearer, and so is {definite}. In addition, the agent uses a means or {instrument} to communicate, which may be stated or may not:

"He complained to the management in writing about the standard of service."
"Their expressions showed their interest in the proposal."

The elements of a communicated {opinion} are therefore:

{agent\recipient$_1$ – (instrument) – opinion – definite – recipient$_2$}.

The addition of {instrument} and {recipient$_2$} differentiates this sentence from an {opinion} which is not communicated.

The {instrument} of a communicated {opinion} may be a document:

"He wrote a letter of complaint to the management about the standard of service."
"The ambassador presented her credentials to the Foreign Minister."

[70] Maiden & Robustelli, 112.
[71] Holton et al, 217.
[72] Folomkina & Weiser, 25, 242, 386.
[73] Badawi et al, 352.

"He issued a certificate of satisfaction on the performance of the contract."

In that case, the document itself expresses the {opinion}, so that the {instrument} and {opinion} are the same entity:

{agent\recipient$_1$ – opinion\instrument – definite – recipient$_2$}.

We should also consider negative {opinion}:

"We are sorry that you are not well." "We are glad that it is not raining."

We recall that an {opinion} is a considered mental reaction to an event that a {recipient} has perceived. If the event has not happened, the {recipient} cannot have perceived it. However, the {recipient} may have perceived that an expected event has not happened: "We are sorry that you are not well". In that case, the expected event is {definite} and the opinion sentence is:

{recipient – opinion – not – definite – (agent)}.

Alternatively, the {recipient} may have hypothesised that an expected event might have occurred "We are glad that it is not raining". In that case, the expected event is {indefinable} and the mental reaction is a supposition, as discussed below.

The Supposition Sentence

We have so far considered two types of mental impression that a {recipient} has of a {object}, in both of which the impression is true or believed by the speaker to be true. In a perception, the impression becomes a fact in the mind of the {recipient} through being perceived. In an opinion, the {recipient} considers the impression further and forms a considered view on it:

"She saw the picture; she thought it was beautiful."

Another form of considered mental response is to an event which may occur but has not, which we can call a *supposition*. A supposition may be something expected, or hoped for, or feared, or doubted, or imagined, or intended, or wished for:

"She considered the argument to be closed."	→	"She thought the argument to be closed."
"They took fright that the king might die."	→	"They feared the king might die."
"I take hope that you will recover."	→	"I hope you will recover."
-		"We doubt if it will rain."
"We imagined that it might rain."	→	"We supposed it might rain."
"We took a decision to go home."	→	"We decided to go home."
"We expected them to come."	→	"We waited for them to come."
"We resolved to invite you."	→	"We wish to invite you."
"I intend to have muffins for tea."	→	"I wish we had muffins for tea."

A supposition can be expressed as a possession sentence, in which the {recipient} possesses an expectation of an event: "We have a fear about…"; "We have hope that…"; "We have doubts whether…"; "We have an idea that…"; "We have the intention that…"; "We have a desire for…". As a voluntary response, it can also be the result of an intentional action by the {recipient} to adopt it. In the above examples, the first sentence is the adoptive and the second is the possessive. Since the point at which a recipient adopts a supposition is often not clear, the distinction in meaning between the adoptive and possessive may be slight.

The supposition may refer to an {object} which is known to the {recipient} and is therefore definite. The event supposed can be any type of sentence:

"She hoped that the lunch was ready."
"She hoped that Johnnie would eat his lunch."

"She hoped that they would go home."

Unlike an event which is subject to an opinion, a supposed event has not occurred at the time that it is expected, and may not occur at all. It is therefore {indefinable}, and may be expressed in the subjunctive in languages which possess that form:

Italian: "Credo che sia già partito." "I think that he's $_{(subjunctive)}$ already gone."
"Cerco una giacca che vada bene con questa gonna."
"I'm looking for a jacket which goes $_{(subjunctive)}$ well with this skirt."[74]

Spanish: "Prefiero un coche que tenga cuatro puertas."
"I prefer a car which has $_{(subjunctive)}$ four doors." [75]
"Tenía miedo no le vieran." "He was afraid that they would see him."
[He-had fear not him they-saw $_{(subjunctive)}$.][76]

In the second Spanish example, the {indefinable} character of the supposition is reinforced through use of the negative "no".

German: "Ich wünschte, ich wäre zu Hause." "I wish I were $_{(subjunctive)}$ at home."

Greek: "Το βράδι θέλει να βλέπει τηλεόραση."
"In the evening she wants to watch television."
[The evening she-wants that she-watches $_{(subjunctive)}$ television.][77]

Persian: "tasavvor mikonam ta hala raside bašad" "I think he will have arrived by now."
[Supposition I-make by now arrived he-is $_{(subjunctive)}$.]
"tasmim gereftand ke beravand" "They decided to go."
[Decision they-took that they go $_{(subjunctive)}$.][78]

Hindi: "maiˇ cāhtā hūˇ ki vah hindī sīkh le" "I want him to learn Hindi."
[I wanting am that he Hindi learns $_{(subjunctive)}$.][79]

Swahili: "Nataka watoto waje hapa ili tupate kuanza kazi yetu."
"I want the children to come here so that we can begin our work."
[I-want children they-come $_{(subjunctive)}$ here so-that we-can $_{(subjunctive)}$ begin work our.][80]

A supposition cannot be made concerning an indefinite object which is not known to the {recipient}. Such an indefinite object is part of the supposition and is therefore {indefinable}:

"She hoped that there were fairies at the bottom of the garden."
"I'm looking for a jacket which goes well with this skirt."
"I prefer a car which has four doors."

If we use {suppose} for the mental process, the elements of a supposition sentence are:

{recipient – suppose – (object) – indefinable}

and of an adopted supposition are:

{agent\recipient – suppose – (object) – indefinable}.

A supposition may also be made by the recipient concerning him/herself:

[74] Speight, 152.
[75] Butt & Benjamin, 240.
[76] Butt & Benjamin, 278.
[77] Holton et al, 221.
[78] Lambton, 151, 153.
[79] McGregor, 130.
[80] Perrott, Suppl. 21.

"They imagined that they had become rich." "She hoped she would pass the exam."

In that case, the elements {recipient} and {object} are combined:

{recipient\object – suppose – indefinable}
{agent\recipient\object – suppose – indefinable}.

A locative recipient construction may be used for a supposition:

Italian: "Gli dispiaceva che essi non venissero." "He was sorry that they would not come."
[To-him was displeasing that they not came (subjunctive).]

Irish: "Ní miste leis fanúint leat." "He does not mind waiting for you."
[It-is-not harm with-him waiting for you.][81]

Hindi: "us ādmī ko das aṇḍe cāhie" "That man wants ten eggs."
[That man-to ten eggs are-wanted.][82]

The same languages which employ a dative reflexive for an adoptive opinion may also employ it for a supposition:

German: "Ich habe mir vorgenommen, das nächste Woche zu tun."
"I intend to do that next week." [I have to-myself intended, that next week to do.]

Italian: "S'é decisa di non verderlo." "She decided not to see him."
[Herself is decided of not to-see-him.]

Greek: "Φοβάται μήτως δεν τη συναντήσει." "He is afraid he might not meet her."
[He-fears-himself lest not her he-meets.][83]
"Σκέπτομαι να πάω στην Κρήτη το Πάσχα."
"I'm thinking of going to Crete for Easter."
[I-think-myself that I-go to-the Crete the Easter.][84]

Russian: "Ya nadeyus' vskore uvidet' vas." "I hope to see you soon."
[I hope-myself soon to-see you.]
"Mogu sebe predstavit', chto on govoril." "I can imagine, what he said."
[I-can to-myself imagine, what he said.][85]

Arabic: "taṣawwara ʔanna l-baḥra fī ṣiqilliyyata ʔakθaru zurkatan"
"He imagined that the sea in Sicily is bluer."
[He-imagined-himself that the-sea in Sicily more in-blueness.]
"tamannaytu law tursilī ʔilayya šayʔan" "I wished you would send me something."
[I-wished-myself if you-sent to-me something.][86]

When a supposition is a gerund, it is an intention in the mind of the {agent}:

Italian: "Studia molto affinché possa vincere il premio."
"He's studying a great deal so as to win the prize."
[He-studies much so-that he-can (subjunctive) win the prize.]
"Aprite la porta senza che lui se ne accorga." "Open the door without his noticing."
[Open the door without that he himself of-it notices (subjunctive).][87]

[81] Dillon & Ó Crónín, 181.
[82] McGregor, 77.
[83] Holton et al, 452.
[84] Stavropoulos & Hornby, 768.
[85] Folomkina & Weiser, 225, 232.
[86] Badawi et al, 649.

German: "Sie ging vorbei, ohne daß sie mich auch nur einmal angeschaut hätte."
"She passed by without even once looking at me."
[She passed by, without that she me even once looked-at had $_{(subjunctive)}$.][88]

Hungarian:
"Felhasználtam az alkalmat arra, hogy elszökjek."
"I used the opportunity to get away."
[I-used the opportunity onto-that, that I away-get $_{(subjunctive)}$.][89]

Persian: "inra panhan kard ta kasi peida nakonad" "He hid this so that no-one would find it."
[This $_{(object)}$ hiding he-made so-that anyone finding not-he-makes $_{(subjunctive)}$.][90]

The Communication Sentence

A *communication* is the intentional transfer of a mental impression, or message, and is therefore carried out by an {agent}. The message relates to an {object}, and conveys new information to the {recipient}. The {object} may be a person or thing, and may be known or unknown:

"Mary told John that the weather was fine."
"John reminded Mary that the appointment was due."
"Mary showed John some books in the library."
"Mary brought to John's attention a noise from behind the bushes."
"Henry telephoned to James that their father was out of hospital."
"James' expression showed that he was happy."

The {object} is therefore definite or indefinite. If it is definite, the {agent} may have selected some existing information which he/she wishes to connect with the {object}:

"John told Mary that the appointment was on Tuesday (not Wednesday)."
"Mary said to John that his car was in the garage (not at home)."
"James's expression showed that he was happy (not sad, or indifferent)."

In that case, the new information is {select}. If we use {communicate} as the act of communication, the elements of the sentence are:

{agent – communicate – object – select – recipient}.

A communication on a definite {object} may also supply a new piece of {indefinite} information:

"Mary brought to John's attention the noise from behind some bushes."
"Henry telephoned to James that their father was out of hospital."
"Ann told her sister that she had a new grandchild."

We noted in Chapter 13. (Statement) that a statement containing an indefinite comment identifies it with a definite {circumstance}, so that it can be definite in a subsequent sentence. In the case of an indefinite communication concerning a definite {object}, the {circumstance} is provided by the act of communication. In the above examples, they are: "the bushes from which the noise came, to which Mary brought John's attention"; "the release from hospital of their father, which Henry told James about"; "Ann's new grandchild that she told her sister about". The {circumstance} therefore does not need to be further stated, and the sentence has the elements:

{agent – communicate – object – indefinite – recipient}.

As with a perception, the definite {object} of a communication can be placed in topic position:

---

[87] Speight, 157.
[88] Lockwood, 276.
[89] Rounds, 43.
[90] Lambton, 151.

"The appointment on Tuesday was advised to Mary."
"The noise from behind the bushes was brought to John's attention."
"Their father's departure from hospital was telephoned to James."
"Her new grandchild was advised by Ann to her sister."

Italian: "Vi direbbero nati negli anni sessanta." "They said you were born in the 1960's."
[You they-said born in-the years sixty.][91]

Alternatively, the {object} of a communication can be new information and therefore indefinite. In that case, the communication includes some definite information which is sufficient to identify it:

"John told Mary about an appointment on Tuesday."
"James's face showed an expression of happiness."
"Mary brought to John's attention a noise from behind the bushes."

This definite information is the same as the {circumstance} in statements concerning an indefinite comment (Chapter 13., Statement). The structure of the communication is therefore:

{agent – communicate – object – circumstance – recipient}.

A {circumstance} cannot be indefinite. An indefinite communication concerning an indefinite object conveys no meaning:

*"John told Mary about an appointment on a day."
*"James's face showed an expression of feeling."
*"Mary brought to John's attention a noise from behind bushes."

The indefinite {object} of a communication can be the {object}of an existential sentence:

"An appointment on Tuesday was advised to Mary."/"There was an appointment…"
"An expression of happiness showed on John's face."/"There was an expression…"
"A noise from behind the bushes was brought to John's attention."/"There was a noise…"

We may therefore summarise the communication sentence as:

{agent – communicate – object – select/indefinite/circumstance – recipient}

depending on the nature of the {object} and the communication. Note that a communication does not necessarily result in a perception, which depends on the will and ability of the receiver to accept the message:

"She described the apartment to her friend as comfortable" does not imply
"Her friend believed that the apartment was comfortable."

The message is conveyed by some process such as speech, gesture, picture, notice, email, letter, or telephone, which is the {instrument} of the communication, and which may be omitted if the means of communication are evident. Communication is a human act by an {agent} to a human {recipient}, but both the {agent} and the {recipient} may be implied:

"The notice said that the paint was wet."
"James's expression showed that he was happy."
"The email gave the date of the conference."

Including the {instrument} gives us the structure:

{agent – (instrument) – communicate – object – select/indefinite/circumstance – recipient}.

[91] Maiden & Robustelli, 311.

A particular form of communication is an argument in which a conclusion is drawn from evidence. In that case, the evidence is the {instrument} of the communication:

"It appears from the evidence that the defendant is guilty."
"Eratosthenes' measurements showed the diameter of the earth."

As with other sentence functions, a communication includes its negative, that is a failure to communicate. If the {object} and the communication are definite, the communication remains true even though it is not communicated:

"John did not tell Mary that the appointment was on Tuesday."
"Mary did not say to John that his car was in the garage."
"James's expression did not show that he was happy."

The failure to communicate is not selected information, but a failure to connect a particular {definite} information to the {object}. The structure is therefore:

{agent – (instrument) – not – communicate – object – definite – recipient}.

If the failed communication concerning a definite {object} is indefinite, the failure does not establish whether the communication is true or not. It is therefore {indefinable}:

"Mary did not bring to John's attention the noise from behind some bushes."
"Henry did not telephone to James that their father was out of hospital."
"Ann did not tell her sister that she had a new grandchild."

Italian puts such a failed communication in the subjunctive, while the communication of a negative is in the indicative:

"Non diceva che i gioielli fossero falsi." "He did not say that the jewels were false."
[Not he-said that the jewels were $_{(subjunctive)}$ false.]
"Diceva che i gioielli non erano falsi." "He said that the jewels were not false."
[He-said that the jewels not were $_{(indicative)}$ false.][92]

The elements of a failure to communicate upon a definite {object} may therefore be summarised:

{agent – (instrument) – not – communicate – object – definite/indefinable – recipient}.

The Negative Communication Sentence

A negative communication is a communication that information concerning an {object} is not true. The information may be known, in which case the communication asserts that it does not apply to the {object}:

"Jack denied that he had stolen the tarts."

Alternatively, the communication may assert that a hypothetical event with regard to the {object} did not occur:

"Jack denied that the tarts had been stolen."

The above negative communications relate to a definite {object}. The {object} may also be indefinable:

"Jack denied that there were any tarts."

In languages with a subjunctive, that may be employed for the verb of the hypothetical negative information:

[92] Maiden & Robustelli, 328.

French: "Je nie que cela soit vrai." "I deny that that is $_{(subjunctive)}$ true."[93]

Italian: "Negava che fosse uno studente." "She denied he was a student."
[She-denied that he-was $_{(subjunctive)}$ a student.][94]

Spanish: "Niego que haya venido." "I deny she's come."
[I-deny that she-has $_{(subjunctive)}$ come.][95]

Consistent with our previous notation, the structure of a negative communication sentence is:

{agent – (instrument) – communicate – object – not – definite/indefinable – recipient}.

The Proposal Sentence

We have noted earlier that a supposition is a belief held by a person who does not know whether it is true, but who expects, hopes, fears, doubts, imagines, intends, or wishes that it may or will be so:

{recipient – suppose – (object) – indefinable}.

Similarly, a communication can be made to a recipient that an event may be true or may occur, but which has not happened or is not known to have happened. We can call such a communication a *proposal*:

"He forecast that it would rain."
"He suggested that they should go for a walk."
"He claimed that he had been away on business."
"He alleged that they had committed the crime."
"He encouraged them to complete the course."
"He told them to keep off the grass."

The purpose of such a communication is to induce an opinion or action on the part of the recipient. What is communicated is a hypothesis, and is {indefinable} as is the hypotheses of the supposition which the recipient may hold. As with other communications, a proposal of a hypothesis may or may not result in a supposition of the same hypothesis in the mind of the recipient.

A proposal may be a proposal of fact or action, an encouragement, or an instruction. It can be expressed as an event noun:

"His forecast was that it would rain."
"He made a suggestion that they should go for a walk."
"His claim was that he had been away on business."
"He made an allegation that they had committed the crime."
"He gave encouragement to them to complete the course."
"He gave an order that they keep off the grass."

A proposal has an {agent}, but that can be omitted: "The forecast was…"; "The suggestion was made…"; The claim was that…", etc. It has a {recipient}, but that can also be omitted as in some of the above examples. However, since a proposal is human act to a human audience, both {agent} and {recipient} are implied if not expressed.

The act of communication can be performed by an impersonal {instrument}, which ultimately derives from the human agency:

"The television forecast was for rain." "The notice said 'Keep off the grass'."

[93] Fraser & Squair, 190.
[94] Maiden & Robustelli, 329.
[95] Butt & Benjamin, 228.

Both an {agent} and {instrument} may be stated:

"His brother's example encouraged him to complete the course."
"He gave an order in writing that they should keep off the grass."

The {instrument} may take the form of an argument for a particular course of action:

"Our stockbroker's advice was to invest in mining stocks."
"The medical evidence is that you should give up smoking."

The proposal of an {indefinable} hypothesis generally concerns an {object}. If we use {propose} for the proposal, the elements are therefore:

{agent – propose – (instrument) – object – indefinable – recipient}.

An agent can make a proposal concerning him/herself:

"He claimed that he had been away on business."
"He offered to accompany them to the station."
"He pretended to be an insurance inspector."

In that case, the {agent} and {object} are combined:

{agent\object – propose – (instrument) – indefinable – recipient}.

An {agent} can also make a proposal concerning an {object} which is his/her possession, in which case the {agent} is also the {beneficiary} of the proposal:

"She asked the doctor to examine her painful knee."

Alternatively, the {beneficiary} can be third party:

"She asked the doctor to examine her child's throat."

As with other hypotheses, some languages may express it with a subjunctive:

Italian: "Il capitano comanda che tu venga subito."
"The captain orders you to come at once."
[The captain orders that you come $_{(subjunctive)}$ at-once.][96]

Greek: "Αρνήθηκε ν' απαντήσει." "He declined to answer."
[He-declined-himself that he-answers $_{(subjunctive)}$.][97]

Hungarian:
"Azt írták, hogy jöjjek haza." "They wrote that I should come home."
[That they-wrote, that I-come $_{(subjunctive)}$ home.][98]

Arabic: "ṭalaba minhu ʔan yaṭbaʕahā lahu" "He asked him to type it for him."
[He-asked to-him that he-type-it $_{(subjunctive)}$ for him.][99]

Persian: "xaheš mikonam darxaste mara qabul konid"
"I ask you to agree to accept my request."
[Request I-make request-of me $_{(object)}$ accept you-make $_{(subjunctive)}$.][100]

[96] Speight, 150.
[97] Stavropoulos & Hornby, 136.
[98] Rounds, 42.
[99] Badawi et al, 591.
[100] Lambton, 151.

Swahili: “Mama amekataa nisiende.” “Mother has refused to let me go.”
[Mother has-refused I-not-go (subjunctive).][101]

A particular form of proposal is an imperative, either second person:

“Go home!” “Sit down!” “Turn right!” “Do your homework!”

or third person:

“Let them go home!” “Let them sit down!” “Let him turn right!”
“Let them do their homework!”

An imperative is different from other proposals, in that {propose} is omitted, as its function is understood. So also is {agent}, which is understood to be the orderer, and {instrument}. {recipient} and {object} are the same, and either understood to be “you”, or stated if third-person. An imperative therefore has elements:

{recipient\object – indefinable}.

A more politely worded imperative may restore {agent}, {propose}, or {instrument}:

“Please sit down.” “I suggest you turn left.” “Here are your homework instructions.”

As with other hypotheses, an imperative may be in the subjunctive:

Italian: “Mi scriva presto.” “Write to me soon.” [To-me write (subjunctive) soon.]

Greek: “Ας μιλάει όσο θέλει.” “Let him speak as much as he wants.”
[Let he-speak (subjunctive) as-much he-wants.]

Swahili: “Chakula kipate moto.” “Let the food get hot.” [Food it-get (subjunctive) heat.]
“Mwambie mtoto asome.” “Tell the child to read.”
[Him-tell (subjunctive) child he-read (subjunctive).][102]

The Interrogation Sentence

Like other forms of communication, a *interrogation* is a question posed by a human {agent}, but can be made by a non-human {instrument} for which an agent is ultimately responsible:

“She asked him why he had applied for the job.”
“He asked when the train would depart.”
“He asked whether she had been to China.”
“This conclusion leads us to ask about his original motives.”
“The letter asked questions about our lifestyle.”

An {agent} and {instrument} can of course occur in the same sentence:

“He asked in a letter whether she had been to China.”

As we have noted elsewhere, a question consists of two elements: a topic, concerning which the enquiry is posed, and an enquiry. The topic is definite by its nature, and the enquiry is either {definite} or {indefinable} according to whether the question is definite or indefinite. The questions of the above four examples have the following structure, in which the enquiry is marked as definite or indefinable:

Topic	**Enquiry**
his application for the job	reason (definite)

[101] Perrott, 49.
[102] Perrott, 48-9.

the train's departure	time (definite)
she	a visit to China (indefinable)
his original motives	identification (definite)
our lifestyle	details (definite)

When a question is posed in an interrogation, the topic is the {object} and the enquiry is again either {definite} or {indefinable}. There may be a {recipient}. The element {query} includes the action of asking. The elements are therefore:

{agent – (instrument) – communicate – query – (recipient) – object – definite/indefinable}.

In "He asked whether she had been to China", the {object} is also the {recipient}. In "He wondered whether she had been to China", the {agent} is also the {recipient}, giving the following structures:

{agent – (instrument) – communicate – query – recipient\object – definite/indefinable}
{agent\recipient – (instrument) – communicate – query – object – definite/indefinable}.

The Representation Sentence

A *representation* is a creative act by which an {object} is represented in a new way. It therefore usually has an {agent}:

"Gainsborough painted his sitter as a country gentleman."
"The Prime Minister was photographed arriving at the conference."
"She summarised the article in five lines."
"We translated the book into Greek for the Greek market."
"The battle was commemorated by a monument."

An act of representation is creative in that it causes something to exist which did not previously exist. It therefore has the same element {create} as a creative sentence, but the outcome is not a {creation} but a {representation} of the {object}. There may be a {recipient}, to whom the representation is communicated, or a {beneficiary} on whose behalf it was produced. The representation may employ a means or {instrument}:

"Gainsborough painted his sitter in oils…"; "She summarised the article in a letter…"

A representation is therefore:

{agent – create – (instrument) – object – representation – (recipient)}.

If the {object} is definite, it can be placed in topic position:

"The Prime Minister was photographed arriving at the conference."
"The book was translated into Greek for the Greek market."
"The battle was commemorated by a monument."

An {agent} can represent himself as {object}:

"Rembrandt painted his self-portrait."

{agent\object – create – (instrument) – representation – (recipient)}.

The representation sentence also includes the concept of significance or implication. In these, an event or information is interpreted to construct an implication:

"These figures mean that the company will case trading in five weeks."
"That sky means that it will rain tomorrow."

The interpretation is the creative act or {create}. The {object} is that which is interpreted, in these instances the figures or the sky. The {representation} is the implication which is drawn, namely that the company will cease trading or that it will rain. Since it has not yet occurred the implication is indefinable, unlike the physical representation of a painting, photograph, translation, etc which is a new entity and therefore indefinite.

The Benefit Sentence

As explained in Chapter 12. (Benefit and Adversity), a *benefit* is the availability to a {beneficiary} of an opportunity or advantage. In these examples, the availability is underlined and the {beneficiary} is in brackets. The opportunity or advantage may be a possession:

"The bank account is accessible to John."	("John")
"The view was visible to our friends."	("our friends")
"We had the opportunity to see his paintings."	("we")
"She had the advantage of a good education."	("she")

Or an action or role:

"We had the good luck to arrive on time."	("we")
"He had great success as an estate agent."	("he")
"It was easy/simple for him to write the letter."	("him")
"It was convenient for him to write the letter."	("him")

Or a service:

"We have the benefit of the local park."	("we")

The opportunity or advantage can therefore take different forms, but in each case it is an object or action which exists or occurs or is expected to exist or occur. It is therefore {definite} or {indefinable}. If the benefit element is {benefit}, the structure of the benefit sentence is:

{beneficiary – benefit – definite/indefinable}.

A {benefit} does not express the effect on the {beneficiary} of the opportunity or advantage, as in "We were pleased/happy to see the paintings", nor whether the opportunity or advantage is realised. Nor does it refer to any ability or obligation of the {beneficiary}, such as "We could see the paintings" or "We should see the paintings". These are expressed by modal sentences (see below). It describes only the availability of the action or object to the {beneficiary}.

A {benefit} can be granted to the beneficiary by a third party, an {agent} or {instrument}:

"The bank manager made the account available to John."	("John")
"Our tickets gave us the opportunity to see the paintings."	("us")

The {benefit} may include the motive of the {agent} in granting it:

"You were very kind to answer my letter so promptly."	("me")
"She was very generous in allowing him to borrow her car."	("him")
"He was very polite to his friend in allowing him to stay."	("his friend")

We may therefore add the optional elements:

{beneficiary – benefit – definite/indefinable – (agent) – (instrument)}.

An {agent} may be his/her own {beneficiary}:

"She took the opportunity to see the paintings."	("she")
"He took advantage of the offer of a loan."	("he")
"He accessed his bank account."	("he")

"She succeeded in climbing the mountain." ("she")

{agent\beneficiary – benefit – definite/indefinite}.

A purpose in the mind of an {agent} is a human activity which benefits from another human activity:

"She took the car to the garage to be mended."
"He peeled the potatoes for lunch."
"He opened the dam to let out the flood water."
"She hung out the washing to dry."

It is therefore a {benefit} as we have described it. However, as in the above examples the {beneficiary} may be implied and not stated. Alternatively, the {beneficiary} of a purpose may be assumed to be the {agent}:

"She went for a walk." ("she")
"He wrote to his father to ask for money." ("he")

Or be a third party:

"The drawbridge was raised to let the ship pass." ("the ship")
"Come here so that I can see you." ("I")

A purpose is different from an intention, as described in the supposition sentence (above):

Italian: "Studia molto affinché possa vincere il premio."
"He's studying a great deal so as to win the prize."
[He-studies much so-that he-can $_{(subjunctive)}$ win the prize.]

An intention may or may not occur, and is therefore {indefinable}. A purpose is expected to occur at the time of the purposive action, and like other benefits is therefore either {definite}:

"The drawbridge was raised to let the ship pass."

or {indefinable}:

"He wrote to his father to ask for money."

A purpose is also different from a causation, as that occurs in the causative sentence (below):

"The noise made us jump." "The threat of fire caused us to flee."

A causation is an action which follows from another action, but the sentence states that it occurs and it may be intentional or not. As we have seen, a benefit sentence is not concerned with whether the benefit is realised or not, and a {benefit} is intentional.

We now turn to the discourse structure of a benefit sentence. In the first examples cited, the {benefit} is the verb of the sentence, with the {beneficiary} or the opportunity or advantage as subject:

"The bank account is accessible to John." "We had the opportunity to see his paintings."
"She had the advantage of a good education."
"We had the good luck to arrive on time."
"He had great success as an estate agent." "She succeeded in climbing the mountain."
"It was easy/simple for him to write the letter."
"You were very kind to answer my letter so promptly."

Alternatively, the opportunity or advantage is the grammatical verb, and the {benefit} is an additional element. In that case, one possible interpretation is that the {benefit} is a qualifier, assigning an identity to an {object} which would otherwise be indefinite. The {benefit} is then a {circumstance}:

"Henry cooked lunch for his family."	("his family")
"We bought Simon a bicycle."	("Simon")
"An email for you has just come in."	("you")
"The treatment eased James' back pain."	("James")
"She took the car to the garage to be mended."	(no beneficiary)
"He peeled the potatoes for lunch."	(no beneficiary)
"She hung out the washing to dry."	(no beneficiary)
"She went for a walk."	("she")
"He wrote to his father to ask for money."	("he")
"Come here so that I can see you."	("I")

Another interpretation is that the opportunity or advantage which is expressed by the grammatical verb is the topic of the sentence, and the benefit is the comment. In that case, the above examples are to be understood as:

"Henry's lunch cooking was for his family."
"The bicycle we have bought was for Simon."
"The email which has just come in is for you."
"The back treatment was for James."

This construction is also applicable if the {object} is definite. The sentences:

"Henry cooked the lunch for his family";
"Sheila brought the accounts to good order for the Society";
"The drawbridge was raised to let the ship pass";
"He opened the dam to let out the flood water";

are to be understood as:

"Henry's cooking of the lunch was for his family."
"Sheila's ordering of the accounts was for the Society."
"The drawbridge raising was to let the ship pass."
"The dam opening was to let out the flood water."

This construction is called an *adverbial sentence*, and is discussed further in Chapter 17. (Adverbials).

The third interpretation is that the sentences are compound sentences, comprising the opportunity or advantage as one sentence and the benefit as another. This only applies if the {object} is definite. The above sentences mean:

"Henry cooked the lunch. It was for his family."
"Sheila ordered the accounts. They are the Society's."
"The drawbridge was raised, and the ship could pass."
"The dam was opened, and the flood waters were let out."

Chapter 12. also describes a sentence which conveys a disadvantage or misfortune (an adversity), so that a {beneficiary} is denied an opportunity or advantage:

"She had the disadvantage of a poor education."	("she")
"We had the misfortune to arrive late."	("we")
"He failed as an estate agent."	("he")
"It was hard for him to write the letter."	("him")
"It was inconvenient for him to write the letter."	("him")

The opportunity or advantage which the adversity denies to the {beneficiary} is again {definite} or {indefinite}, so that if we extend the scope of {benefit} to include an adversity, the sentence has the same structure:

{beneficiary – benefit – definite/indefinable}.

The adversity can again be effected by an agent or instrument:

"He was very rude in his behaviour towards his friend." ("his friend")
"Hitler was very cruel in his treatment of the Jews." ("the Jews")
"The ill luck of heavy traffic made us late." ("us")

{beneficiary – benefit – definite/indefinable – (agent) – (instrument)}.

As in the previous examples, the misfortune can be the main sentence, the adversity being an additional element with the implied meaning "to the disadvantage of":

"Henry's wife has run away from him." ("Henry")
"Mary had smoke blown on her." ("Mary")
"The knife cut him on the hand." ("him")

As we noted in Chapter 10., a {beneficiary} in topic position is often expressed by an indirect link:

German: "Es ist mir gelungen, zu kommen." "I succeeded in coming."
[It is to-me succeeded, to come.]

Italian: "Vi stenta consegnare il compito oggi."
"You'll find it hard to hand in the assignment today."
[To-you it-is-hard to-deliver the assignment today.]

Finnish: "Hänen oli vaikea selitää sitä." "It was difficult for him to explain that."
[Of-him it-was difficult to-explain that.][103]

Hungarian:
"Neki könnyű volt válaszolnia." "It was easy for her to answer."
[To-her easy was answering-her.]
"Sikerült neked elérned a főnököt?" "Did you manage to reach the boss?"
[Managed to-you reaching-your the boss?][104]

Irish: "Má dheinid a ndícheall, éireoidh leo." "If they do their best, they will succeed."
[If they-do their best, it-will-succeed with-them.]
"Theip orm an obair a dhéanamh." "I failed to do the work."
[It-failed on-me the work its doing.][105]

The Warranty Sentence

A warranty is an undertaking by an {agent} to a {beneficiary} who may be stated or implied:

"The manufacturer warranted the dishwasher (to the purchaser) for three years."
"I guarantee (to the management) that the project will be completed in six months."
"I guarantee that it will rain tomorrow."

The warranty is a {benefit} which relates to an {object} and specifies for it a particular {definite} quality, for example a constituent or occurrence. The elements of a warranty of this type are therefore:

{agent – benefit – object – definite – (beneficiary)}.

Alternatively, a warranty undertakes that an adversity will not arise or has not arisen. We can call this a negative warranty:

"The manufacturer warranted that the dishwasher would require no servicing for three years."

[103] Whitney, 215.
[104] Rounds, 278-9.
[105] Dillon & Ó Crónín, 97.

"I guarantee that the project will run no longer than six months."
"I guarantee that it will not rain tomorrow."

The negative warranty specifies that a particular constituent or occurrence will not apply to the {object}. The structure is therefore:

{agent – benefit – object – not – indefinable – (beneficiary)}.

Warranties of this negative type may be expressed in the subjunctive, indicating that they are {indefinable}:

Spanish: "No hay ninguna garantía de que vengan."
"There is no guarantee that they will come."
[Not there-is no guarantee of that they-come $_{(subjunctive)}$.][106]

It can be argued that a warranty is form of promise to the {beneficiary} and is therefore described within the responsibility sentence (above). The difference is that the responsibility sentence refers to the commitment on behalf of the responsibility-holder, while the warranty describes the benefit which results.

An insurance is a form of negative warranty in which the {beneficiary} obtains an undertaking from the guarantor of compensation, called the cover, if the adversity comes to pass:

"She insured her house against fire for £1 million."
"We took out public liability insurance for £10 million."

The guarantor (the insurance company) is still the {agent} of the warranty, and the customer who asks for it is therefore the {causer}. The {causer} may take out the insurance in favour of a third party:

"She insured her son's house against fire for £1 million."

However, more usually the {beneficiary} seeks the insurance for him/herself, and is then the {causer\beneficiary}. If we include the cover within the {benefit} element, an insurance sentence is:

{causer\beneficiary – $benefit_1$ – object – not – indefinable – (agent)} {$object_1$ – attribute}.

The premium paid by the insurer is an exchange, described by the exchange sentence (above):

{$agent_1$ – $possession_1$ – $object_1$ – $object_2$ – $recipient_1$} {$agent_1$ = $recipient_2$}
{$agent_2$ – $possession_2$ – $object_2$ – $object_1$ – $recipient_2$} {$agent_2$ = $recipient_1$}

The Ability Sentence

Chapter 13. (Hypothesis) describes a sentence of the form {definite – indefinable}, which states a hypothesis which may or may not be true. In English, such sentences can be constructed with "may":

"The computer may operate." "The mountains may be seen."

If the sentence is not agential, "can" or its equivalent has the same meaning:

"The computer can operate." "The mountains can be seen."

If the English sentences are agential, "can" or "cannot" has the meaning "possess the ability to" or "does not possess the ability to":

"Mr Smith can/cannot go to work by train." "Mr Smith can/cannot pay the invoice."
"Mr Smith can/cannot speak French." "Mr Smith can/cannot ride a bicycle."

[106] Harrap, 203.

Such a sentence is still a hypothesis, since it does not state that an action has taken place, only that Mr Smith does or does not have the ability to perform it. Moreover, since the sentences do not describe an action by Mr Smith, he is not the agent. They describe an ability which he possesses, and he is therefore the {recipient}. The ability is {indefinable}. It may operate on an {object} which is definite or not definite:

"Mr Smith can drive his car." "Mr Smith can drive a car."
"Mr Smith can pay the invoice." "Mr Smith can pay bills."

If the {object} is not definite, then since the ability is a hypothetical {indefinable} activity, the {object} is also {indefinable}. If we use {able} as the element for ability, the sentences have the structure:

{recipient – able – object – indefinable} {recipient – not – able – object – indefinable}.

In sentences such as "Mr Smith can go home" and "Mr Smith can speak French", the {object} which the ability operates on is the {recipient}, in that case Mr Smith himself:

{recipient\object – able – indefinable} {recipient\object – not – able – indefinable}.

The non-agential nature of the {recipient} of an ability is shown in topic-comment constructions:

Japanese:
"Okamoto-san wa roshiago ga dekiru." "Mr Okamoto can speak Russian."
[Okamoto-Mr $_{(topic)}$ Russian $_{(subject)}$ is-possible.][107]

The {indefinable} nature of an ability is shown in those languages which express it as a verb. It is then often in the subjunctive:

Greek: "Μπορούσε να φάει δέκα αβγά για πρωινό." "He could eat ten eggs for breakfast."
[He-could that he-eat $_{(subjunctive)}$ ten eggs for breakfast.][108]

Arabic: "qadi staṭāʕa ʔan yajida l-ḥalla l-ṣaḥīḥa" "He was able to find the right solution."
[He was-able that he found $_{(subjunctive)}$ the solution the-right.][109]

Persian: "mitavanam beravam" "I can go." [I-can I-go $_{(subjunctive)}$.][110]

An ability can be the result of an action to give or deny it to the {recipient}. This can be agential or instrumental:

"Mrs Smith taught Mr Smith to speak French."
→ "Mr Smith can speak French."
"We helped Mr Smith to pay the invoice."
→ "Mr Smith can pay the invoice."
"His funds prevented Mr Smith from paying the invoice."
→ "Mr Smith could not pay the invoice."
"His boss permitted Mr Smith to take the day off"
→ "Mr Smith could take the day off."

In many languages, the {recipient} in such a sentence is marked with "to" or its equivalent dative case:

German: "Ich habe ihr geholfen, den schweren Korb zu tragen."
"I helped her to carry the heavy basket."
[I have to-her helped, the heavy basket to carry.]

Italian: "Il tempo gli ha impedito a venire oggi."

[107] Makino & Tsutsui, 201.
[108] Holton et al, 202.
[109] Badawi et al, 421.
[110] Lambton, 54.

"The weather prevented him from coming today."
[The weather to-him has prevented to come today.]

Russian: "Vy ne pomozhete mne naiti moi veshchi?" "Will you help me find my things?"
[You not help to-me to-find my things?]
"Den'gi dali emu vozmozhnost' puteshestvovat'."
"The money enabled him to travel." [Money gave to-him ability to-travel.][111]

The elements can therefore include an {agent} or {instrument}:

{{recipient – able – object – indefinable – (agent) – (instrument)}
{{recipient – not – able – object – indefinable – (agent) – (instrument)}.

The adoptive construction of an ability sentence expresses the concepts "try", "prepare to", or "hesitate to", in which an {agent} gives or fails to give him/herself an ability:

"Mr Smith tried to/prepared to ride a bicycle." "Mr Smith hesitated to ride a bicycle."

Such sentences have the structure:

{agent\recipient – able – object – indefinable}
{agent\recipient – not – able – object – indefinable}.

As with other adoptives, an adoptive ability can be expressed by a dative reflexive:

Italian: "S'è preparata ad avviarsi." "She got ready to set out."
[Herself she-is prepared to set-out.]
"S'è azzardata ad avviarsi." "She ventured to set out."
[Herself she-is ventured to set-out.]

Russian: "Chelovek popytalsya vstat'." "The man tried to stand up."
[Man tried-himself to-stand-up.]
"Ne stesnyaites' sprashivat'." "Don't hesitate to ask."
[Not hesitate-yourself to-ask.][112]

An adoptive ability, being {indefinable}, can again be in the subjunctive:

Greek: "Προσπάθησα να του αποφύγω." "I tried to avoid him."
[I-tried that him I-avoid $_{(subjunctive)}$.][113]

Hungarian:
"Arra törekszik, hogy új állást kapjon." "He's trying to get a new job."
[Onto-that he-tries, that new job he-gets $_{(subjunctive)}$.][114]

Arabic: "ḥāwaltu ʔan ʔuʕalliqa bi-biḍʕi kalimātin" "I tried to add a few words."
[I-tried that I-add $_{(subjunctive)}$ in few words.][115]

The Necessity Sentence

It was remarked in Chapter 11. (The Facilitative and Modal Functions) that an ability and a necessity are related in the following way:

"He is not able not to write the letter" = "He must/ought to write the letter";
"He is not obliged not to write the letter" = "He can/may write the letter".

[111] Folomkina & Weiser, 151, 216.
[112] Folomkina & Weiser, 218, 548.
[113] Holton et al, 454.
[114] Rounds, 43.
[115] Badawi et al, 613.

A person who is not able to avoid doing something is under a compulsion to do it. A person who is not under a compulsion not to do something has the freedom to do it. Since having the freedom to do something is not the same as having the ability to do it, it is the first of these double negatives which is useful for functional analysis:

"Mr Smith is not able not to pay the invoice" means "Mr Smith must pay the invoice".
"Mr Smith is not able not to ride a bicycle" means "Mr Smith must ride a bicycle".

We may therefore construct these sentences with the same element {able} as for an ability, but with a double negative:

{recipient – not – able – not – object – indefinable}.

The {recipient} nature of the possessor of a necessity is shown in those languages which express it with a locative in topic position:

Russian: "Emu ne nuzhno govorit' dvazhdy." "He doesn't need to be told twice."
[To-him not need to-tell twice.][116]
"Vam nado budet mnogo pisat'." "You will have to do a lot of writing."
[To-you necessary will-be much writing.]

Hungarian:
"Gábornak tanulnia kell ma este." "Gábor must study this evening."
[To-Gábor studying-his must today evening.][117]

Welsh: "Bydd yn rhaid i mi godi." "I shall have to get up."
[Will-be in necessity to me rise.][118]

Hindi: "apkō apnī cābī lānī paṛegī" "You'll have to bring your own key."
[You-to own key bringing will-fall.][119]

Swahili: "Yanibidi kusema hivi." "I must say this." [It to-me is-obliged to-say this.][120]

A necessity, like an ability, is not an event whose occurrence is certain, and is therefore {indefinable}. It applies to an {object} which can be definite or hypothetical. This is shown by those languages which express a necessity with a subjunctive:

Italian: "Bisogna che tu venga presto domani." "You need to come early tomorrow."
[It-is-necessary that you come $_{(subjunctive)}$ early tomorrow.]

Greek: "Πρέπει να κόψεις το τσιγάρο." "You must give up smoking."
[It-is-necessary that you-give-up $_{(subjunctive)}$ the smoking.][121]

Arabic: "yajibu ʕalā l-ṣāʔimi ʔan yamtaniʕa ʕani l-tadxīni"
"The fasting person must refrain from smoking."
[It-is-incumbent on the-faster that he-refrains $_{(subjunctive)}$ from the-smoking.][122]

Persian: "bayad beravam" "I must go." [It-is-necessary I-go $_{(subjunctive)}$.][123]

As the last example shows, the {object} of a necessity can be the same as the {recipient}:

[116] Folomkina & Weiser, 326.
[117] Rounds, 113.
[118] Bowen & Rhys Jones, 116.
[119] McGregor, 80.
[120] Perrott, 57.
[121] Holton at al, 200.
[122] Badawi et al, 179.
[123] Lambton, 55.

{recipient\object – not – able – not – indefinable}.

A necessity, like an ability, can arise from an action to give it to the {recipient}:

"His health obliged Mr Smith to give up smoking."
"His wife forced Mr Smith to give up smoking."

The construction is therefore:

{recipient – not – able – not – object – indefinable – (agent) – (instrument)}.

However, this sentence type only applies if the necessity is hypothetical. If it is real, then the sentence is a causative or preventive, discussed below.

The Responsibility Sentence

A necessity is an external compulsion on a recipient which he or she cannot avoid. A responsibility is an obligation which a person possesses to fulfil or not to fulfil some task, which he or she may choose to carry out or not:

"She has to complete the project." "She has an obligation to bring up the children."
"She ought to pay for the damage." "She ought to have come to the lecture."

This distinction is expressed approximately in English by the auxiliaries "must" for a necessity and "should", and "ought to" for a responsibility, but is often blurred. In German, it is expressed more precisely by "müssen" which is generally a necessity, and "sollen" which is generally a responsibility:

"Man mußte zuerst fragen." "One had to ask first." [One had-to first ask.]
"Man soll viel obst essen." "One should eat plenty of fruit." [One should much fruit eat.]

A responsibility refers to either a future or a past action. We consider first a responsibility for a future action. Since its fulfilment is not certain, it is {indefinable}. Since it is possessed by the responsibility-holder, that person is the {recipient}. The task for which the {recipient} is responsible operates on an {object}. If we use the element {ought} for the responsibility, the structure of the sentence is therefore:

{recipient – ought – object – indefinable}.

In general, a responsibility applies to an {object} which has already been assigned, and which is therefore definite as in most of the examples cited. However, it can be not definite, and in that case it is not shown to exist and is indefinable:

"They ought to buy a car." "She should learn a foreign language."

The {object} may be the same as the {recipient}:

"They ought to go home." "They ought to obey the rules."

{recipient\object – ought – indefinable}.

Responsibilities can also be expressed with a recipient participle:

"She is in charge of completing the project."
"She has care of the upbringing of the children."
"She is liable to her neighbours for the damage."

The {recipient} nature of the holder of an unfulfilled responsibility is shown in those languages which employ a locative recipient construction:

Italian: “Vi spetta consegnare il compito oggi.”
“It’s up to you to hand in the assignment today.”
[To-you it-is-due to-deliver the assignment today.]

Finnish: “Hänen täytyi lähteä kouluun.” “She had to set off for school.”
[Of-her it-ought to-set-off to-school.][124]

Arabic: “‘alayhi ʔan yafiya bi-waʕdihi” “He has to fulfil his promise.”
[On-him that he-fulfils (subjunctive) at promise-his.]

Hindi: “usko yah nahĩ̃ karnā cāhie thā” “He ought not to have done this.”
[Him-to this not doing needed was.][125]

Swahili: “Inanipasa kurudi sasa.” “I ought to go back now.” [It to-me is-right to-return now.]
“Yafaa tuondoke sasa.” “We had better go now.”
[It-is-good we-go (subjunctive) now.][126]

The {indefinable} nature of a responsibility is shown in those languages which employ a subjunctive for it:

Greek: “Θα έπρετε να φύγουμε πιο νωρίς.” “We should have left earlier.”
[It-would-be-necessary that we-leave (subjunctive) more early.][127]

Arabic: “yanbaγī ʔan nuyassirahā lahā” “We ought to make it easier for it.”
[It-is-desirable that we-make-easier-it (subjunctive) for it.][128]
“‘alayhi ʔan yafiya bi-waʕdihi” “He has to fulfil his promise.”
[On-him that he-fulfils (subjunctive) at promise-his.][129]

A responsibility can be the outcome of a dative sentence in which a person or body assigns it to the holder:

“Her manager made her responsible for completion of the project.”
“Her manager put her in charge of the project.”
“The Court gave her care of the five children.”
“Her neighbours held her liable for the damage.”

More generally, every responsibility is in principle due to some person or body who has assigned it, whether that person is expressed or not. It cannot be due, as a necessity can be, to an impersonal compulsion. The more complete structure is therefore:

{recipient – ought – (definite) – indefinable – (agent)}.

A responsibility can be voluntarily accepted as an obligation by the holder:

“She took/accepted responsibility for completion of the project.”
“She took/accepted charge of the project.”
“She took/accepted care of the five children.”
“She took/accepted liability for the damage.”

In that case, the {agent} and the {recipient} are the same:

{agent\recipient – ought – (definite) – indefinable}.

[124] Whitney, 214.
[125] McGregor, 79.
[126] Perrott, 57.
[127] Holton et al, 209.
[128] Badawi et al, 395.
[129] Badawi et al, 167

As with other adoptive constructions, this may be expressed with a dative reflexive:

Italian: "S'è assunta responsibiltà per il progetto."
"She assumed responsibility for the project."
[Herself she-is assumed responsibility for the project.]
"S'è presa cura dei cinque bambini." "She took care of the five children."
[Herself she-is taken care of the five children.]

Russian: "Zabotilas' o roditelyakh." "She took care of her parents."
[She-cared-herself about parents.]

The voluntary acceptance of a responsibility can be made to a third party, to whom the holder remains responsible for its performance:

"She promised to her manager that the project would be completed."
"She undertook charge of the project on behalf of her manager."
"She took care of the five children on behalf of the Court."
"She accepted liability to the aggrieved party."

Such a sentence therefore has two {recipient}, the responsibility holder who is also the {agent} in that he/she accepted it voluntarily, and the person to whom the responsibility is accepted to be due:

{agent\recipient$_1$ – ought – (definite) – indefinable – recipient$_2$}.

The dative and adoptive sentences can include the denial or withdrawal of the responsibility:

"Her manager withdrew from her responsibility for the project."
→ "She was no longer responsible for the project."
"She refused to her manager to be responsible for the project."
→ "She was not responsible to her manager for the project."
"She declined liability for the damage."
→ "She was not liable for the damage."

The structure then includes the element {not}:

{recipient – not – ought – (definite) – indefinable – (agent)}
{agent\recipient – not – ought – (definite) – indefinable}
{agent\recipient$_1$ – not – ought – (definite) – indefinable – recipient$_2$}.

Language is also concerned with a past action for which a person held a responsibility, generally because the action did not occur:

"You should have greeted your guests";

or because the action did occur and should not have:

"You should not have been rude to your guests."

A responsibility which should have been carried out has an {agent} who is also the {recipient} of the responsibility. If the responsibility has not been carried out, it is {indefinable}. The {object} to which it relates can be definite, as in the above example, or indefinable:

"You should have greeted your guests"; "You should have greeted some guests".

The responsibility can be towards a third party:

"You promised me that you would greet the guests/some guests."

The functional structure of an unfulfilled responsibility for a past action is therefore the same as for a future action:

{agent\recipient$_1$ – ought – object – indefinable – recipient$_2$}.

A different functional structure applies for an action which was carried out, but should not have been. In that case, the responsibility and the {object} to which it relates are already identified and therefore {definite}:

"Jack was guilty of stealing the tarts."

The person guilty of performing the action which he/she should not have performed is both the {agent} and the holder or {recipient} of the obligation not to perform it:

{agent\recipient – ought – not – object – definite}.

Alternatively, the {agent\recipient} was not guilty of performing the offending action, assuming that the action took place but someone else was guilty of it:

"Jack was innocent of stealing the tarts."
{agent\recipient – not – ought – not – object – definite}.

It is possible that the supposed offending action did not take place:

"Jack was innocent of stealing any tarts."
{agent\recipient – not – ought – not – object – indefinable}.

Guilt or innocence can be determined by a third party {agent}:

"The magistrate found Jack guilty/innocent of stealing the tarts/any tarts."
{agent$_1$ – agent\recipient$_2$ – (not) – ought – not – object – definite/indefinable}.

We noted earlier that an obligation for a past action can have been made to a third party:

"You promised me that you would greet the guests."
{agent\recipient$_1$ – recipient$_2$ – ought – object – indefinable}.

If the action did not occur, the third party can relieve the responsibility-holder of the responsibility:

"I forgive you for not greeting the guests/any guests."

In that case, the third party is the {agent} of the forgiveness of a responsibility towards him/herself:

{agent\recipient$_1$ – agent\recipient$_2$ – not – ought – not – object – definite/indefinable}.

Alternatively, the third party can forgive the responsibility-holder for an action which he/she performed but should not have:

"I forgive you for being rude to the guests."
{agent\recipient$_1$ – agent\recipient$_2$ – not – ought – not – object – definite}.

The Causative and Preventive Sentences

In a causative sentence, an agent causes another agent, who may be omitted, to perform an action:

"He walked the dog." "He had his hair cut."
"She started the child riding on the bicycle."

French: "Je fais lire ce livre à mon fils." "I make my son read this book."

[I make read this book to my son.][130]

Hungarian:
"Kivasaltattam az ingemet a férjemmel." "I had my husband iron my shirt."
[Iron-caused-I the shirt-my (accusative) the husband-my-by.][131]

Turkish: "Mektubu müdüre imzalattım." "I got the director to sign the letter."
[Letter (accusative) director-to sign-caused-I.][132]

Hindi: "maiˇ apne bhāī se pustak chapvāūˇgā" "I shall get my brother to print the book."
[I my brother-by book print-cause-shall.][133]

Indonesian/Malay:
"Saya mencucikan pakaian pada wanita itu."
"I have my clothes washed by that woman."
[I wash-make clothes by woman that.][134]

Japanese:
"Tomodachi wa watashi ni chippu o harawaseta." "My friend made me leave a tip."
[Friend (topic) me-to tip (object) leave-caused.][135]

Swahili: "Wasimamishe watoto." "Make the children stand up."
[They-stand-cause (imperative) children.][136]

Since a causative sentence can have two agents, we may call the originating or initiating agent {causer}, and retain {agent} for the person actively engaged in the action. The element {causer} is therefore also suitable for someone who initiates or maintains an instrumental action in which he/she is not actively involved:

"She started the dishwasher." "She started the engine running."
"She kept the engine running."

Similarly, an instrument can be the originator of a voluntary or involuntary action by a person:

"The noise made us jump." "The threat of fire caused us to flee."

For an action not involving an {agent}, the same distinction can be made between an instrument which initiates the action and the {instrument} which carries it out:

"The wind broke the windshield with a branch."
"The clouds cleared, allowing the sun to dry the ground."

We may therefore extend the meaning of {causer} to include any human or inanimate initiator of an action which is performed by an agent or instrument. In principle, such an element should be possible for any dynamic sentence. If such a sentence is a statement, it will have the structure:

{causer – agent/instrument – (definite) – select} or
{causer – agent/instrument – (definite) – indefinite – circumstance}.

If such sentences are a question or negative, they will be of the form:

"Did he walk the dog?" "Did he have his hair cut?" "Did the noise make us jump?"

---

[130] Fraser & Squair, 216.
[131] Rounds, 62.
[132] Lewis, 146-7.
[133] McGregor, 113.
[134] Sneddon, 75.
[135] Makino & Tsutsui, 388.
[136] Perrott, 166.

"He did not walk the dog." "He did not have his hair cut."
"The noise did not make us jump."

The {query} or {not} relates to the action of the {causer}. The sentences are therefore:

{causer – query/not – agent/instrument – (definite$_1$) – definite$_2$}
{causer – query/not – agent/instrument – (definite) – indefinable}.

depending on whether the question or negative is definite or indefinite.

A variant of a causative sentence is one in which an action is prevented or stopped, so that it does not happen. We term this a preventive sentence:

"I prevented him going to work." → "He did not go to work."
"I stopped the letter being written." → "The letter was not written."
"I stopped him writing any letters." → "No letters were written."
"The dam stopped the water falling."
→ "The water did not fall."

The prevented action would, if it happened, have had an {agent} or {instrument}. The prevention is brought about by an animate or inanimate {causer}. The prevented action is either known {definite} or does not occur, and is hypothetical {indefinable}. The preventive sentence may therefore be summarised:

{causer – agent/instrument – (definite$_1$) – not – definite$_2$} or
{causer – agent/instrument – (definite) – not – indefinable}.

Preventive sentences are discussed further in Chapter 18. (The Complementary Sentence).

The Inchoative and Cessative Sentences

Chapter 11. (The Inchoative Function) considers sentences which describe the starting or continuing of an event, which we classify together as *inchoation*. The event can be an action:

"She began to write"; "She carried on writing";

or a state:

"She began to be happy"; "She went on being happy".

The inchoation can refer to a human subject, as in these examples, or to an inanimate one:

"The rain began to fall"; "The rain went on falling".
"The weather began to be hot"; "The weather went on being hot".

The common feature of these sentences is that they have a resultant action or state:

"She was writing/happy"; "The rain was falling"; "The weather was hot."

The inchoative verb "begin/continue" can have an aspect which reflects the aspect of the resultant action or state:

"She is beginning to write"; "She has begun to write".
"She is beginning to be happy"; "She has begun to be happy".

The inchoative verb can also be queried or negated, in a manner which independent of a query or negation of the resultant action or state although evidently related to it:

"Has she begun to write?" "She did not carry on writing"; "The rain did not stop falling."

It appears therefore that there is a distinct inchoative function {inchoate}. A person ("she") performs a function as {agent} so that he/she engages in or continues with a resultant action or state ("write"/"be happy"). Since the resultant action or state applies to the {agent}, then in these examples the {object} of the function is the same as the {agent} and the sentence is intransitive. Similarly, an inanimate subject ("rain"/"weather") undergoes a function as {instrument} so that it engages in or continues with a resultant action or state ("fall"/"be hot"). Since the {object} of the resultant action or state is the same as the {instrument}, the sentence is again intransitive.

Inchoation can apply to any selection or circumstance sentence, which may or may not have a separate topic:

"She began the letter that she had drafted/a letter to her friend."
"The wind continued to blow/continued as it had blown that morning."

If {definite} is the optional topic of the inchoation, we may summarise the inchoative structure:

{agent\object – inchoate – (definite) – select}
{agent\object – inchoate – (definite) – indefinite – circumstance}, or

{instrument\object – inchoate – (definite) – select}
{instrument\object – inchoate – (definite) – indefinite – circumstance}.

We observed in Chapter 11. that many inchoatives are intransitive verbs for which the resultant action is the complement:

French: "Elle a continué à écrire." "She continued to write."

German: "Sie haben begonnen zu lachen." "They began to laugh."

Russian: "Ona nachala nakryvat' na stol." "She began to set [onto] the table."[137]

Turkish: "Yürümeğe başladık." "We began to walk." [Walking-to we-began.][138]

Arabic: "sa-yuwāṣilu l-kitābata" "He will continue to write."
[He-will-continue the-writing.][139]

Persian: "šoruʔ kard be neveštan" "He began to write." [Beginning he-made to write.][140]

Hindi: "din lambe hone lage" "The days started getting long." [Days long be-to began.][141]

Others may be reflexive:

French: "Il s'est obstiné à venir." "He persisted in coming."
[He himself is persisted to come.]

Arabic: "istamarra yaʕdū ḥattā nqaṭaʕat ʔanfāsuhu"
"He continued running until his breath failed him."
[He-continued-himself he-ran until failed his-breath.][142]

Others modify the resultant verb:

Japanese:

[137] Folomkina & Weiser, 57.
[138] Lewis, 168.
[139] Badawi et al, 365.
[140] Lambton, 143.
[141] McGregor, 133.
[142] Badawi et al, 429.

"Sensei wa hon o kakihajimeta." "The teacher began to write a book."
[Teacher $_{(topic)}$ book $_{(object)}$ write-began.]
"Kyūni ame ga furidashita." "Suddenly it began to rain."
[Suddenly rain $_{(subject)}$ fall-began.][143]

Inuit: "Danmarkimili kalaallisut ilinnialirpuq."
"He began studying Greenlandic already in Denmark."
[Denmark-in-already Greenlandic study-began-he.][144]

All the above examples are intransitive. The inchoative function can also operate transitively:

"She started/kept the child riding on the bicycle."
"She started/kept the engine running."
"The network kept the lights on."

In these cases, the {object} "child", "engine", and "lights" are not the same as the {agent} or {instrument}. The resultant of the inchoation is again the action that the {object} commences or continues:

{agent – inchoate – object – select}
{agent – inchoate – object – indefinite – circumstance}
{instrument – inchoate – object – select}
{instrument – inchoate – object – indefinite – circumstance}.

We now consider a inchoative question or negative. As with other questions or negatives, the function which is subject to inchoation is either {definite} or {indefinable}, and cannot be indefinite. The sentence asks whether or denies that an identified action has been commenced or continued, or whether it exists:

"She has not begun to write the letter." Has she begun to write the letter?"
"She has not begun to write a letter." "Has she begun to write a letter?"

This may be represented:

{agent\object – query/not – inchoate – (definite$_1$) – definite$_2$}
{agent\object – query/not – inchoate – (definite) – indefinable} or

{instrument\object – query/not – inchoate – (definite$_1$) – definite$_2$}
{instrument\object – query/not – inchoate – (definite) – indefinable}.

Similarly, the verbs "avoid" or "fail" express the concept of an {agent\object} or {instrument\object} not proceeding with an action, whether known or hypothetical, and therefore are a negative inchoative:

"She avoided writing a letter/the letter." "He avoided getting into debt."
"He failed to read the book." "The water failed to boil."

Chapter 11. also discusses actions which result in an action being stopped, called *cessation*:

"She stopped writing." "She stopped being happy."
"The rain stopped falling." "The weather stopped being hot."

A person ("she") performs a function as {agent} so that he/she ceases to engage in a known action or state ("write"/"be happy"), and the action or state no longer occurs. The ceased action or state applies to the {agent}, so the {object} of the function is the same as the {agent} and the sentence is intransitive. Similarly, an inanimate subject ("rain"/"weather") undergoes a function as {instrument} so that it ceases to engage in a known action or state ("fall"/"be hot"). The ceased action or state

[143] Makino & Tsutsui, 103, 132.
[144] Fortescue, 98.

applies to the {instrument}, so the {object} of the function is the same as the {instrument}and the sentence is again intransitive. We may use the same element {inchoate} to describe a cessation:

{agent\object – inchoate – (definite$_1$) – not – definite$_2$}
{instrument\object – inchoate – (definite$_1$) – not – definite$_2$}.

Cessative sentences are constructed in various languages according to the same pattern as inchoatives:

French: "Il s'est arrêté à venir." "He stopped coming." [He himself is stopped to come.]

Indonesian:
"Saya sudah berhenti merokok." "I've stopped smoking."[145]

Inuit: "Tassanngaannaq nirissaarpuq." "He suddenly stopped eating."
[Suddenly eat-stop-he.][146]

A cessative can also be transitive:

"She stopped the child riding on the bicycle."
"She stopped the engine running."
"The network turned the lights off."

Cessative sentences are discussed further in Chapter 18. (The Complementary Sentence).

The Error Sentence

An *error* can be an action or state. If it is an action, it is one which is contrary to the intention or expectation of an animate agent or causer:

"He turned left when he meant to turn right."
"He filed the paper in the wrong folder."
"She had the wrong car repaired."
"She missed the opportunity to apply for the job."

The agent or causer may be omitted. Nevertheless, the error sentence implies that there is an animate person who intended or expected other than what happened:

"The signpost showed left when it should have shown right."
"The paper was filed in the wrong folder."
"The wrong car was repaired."

Either the action, or the object or resultant of the action, can be in error:

"He filed the paper when he meant to shred it."
"He filed the wrong paper in the folder."
"He filed the paper in the wrong folder."

In an error which is a state, an animate recipient perceives something to be other than what it is:

"He misunderstood their silence to mean consent."
"She misheard what was said."
"He overestimated the quantity required."

Alternatively, a recipient possesses something other than what he or she intended or expected:

"She was sent the wrong item in the post."
"He has mislaid his spectacles."

[145] Sneddon, 270.
[146] Fortescue, 97.

An error cannot apply to a physical action or state where there is no animate intention or expectation:

*"The rain fell in the East when it should have fallen in the West."
*"The volcano erupted on Tuesday when it ought to have erupted on Wednesday."

These sentences only have meaning in the sense that there was an error in the mind of the vulcanologist or meteorologist who uttered them.

An error is an action or a state which already exists. It cannot apply to an action or state which has not yet arisen, since that can in principle be realised correctly. A benefit cannot therefore be in error:

*"We had the opportunity to mishear his remarks."
*"It was convenient for him to mislay his spectacles."

We may define an element {error} to means an action or state contrary to the intention or expectation of a person. It applies to an {object} which is definite, as in the above examples, or indefinite:

"He filed a wrong paper in the folder."
"He filed the paper in a wrong folder."
"She was sent a wrong item in the post."
"He has mislaid a pair of spectacles."

Since an {error} must apply to an actual entity, its {object} cannot be indefinable. For example, we cannot say:

*"Was there a paper which he filed in the wrong folder?"
*"There were no spectacles which he mislaid."

It will be seen that, except for the {object} of the {error}, the rest of the sentence must be {definite}, since otherwise it cannot be known that an {error} has occurred. We cannot have:

*"He filed the wrong paper in a folder."
*"He filed a paper in the wrong folder."
*"He mislaid the spectacles in a room."

In the first example, if the identity of the folder is not known, it cannot be said that the wrong paper had been filed in it. In the third example, if the identity of the room is not known, it cannot be said that the spectacles have been mislaid in it. We may therefore summarise an error sentence with the structure:

{definite – error – object}

where {definite} is the environment in which the {error} arises, and the {object} is definite or indefinite. An {error} can itself arise in the future, for example a risk:

"He is at risk of misdirecting the letter/losing his spectacles."

A supposition or proposal can be of an {error} that might occur in the future:

"He feared that he had misfiled the paper."
"We imagined that you had taken a wrong turning."
"He forecast that they would take the wrong turning."
"He claimed that they had misunderstood his remarks."

The future element in these sentences is described by an {indefinable}, but that {indefinable} is identified with an {error}, not with its {object}. For example, the risk of an {error} is:

$\{object – depend_1 – indefinable_2\}$ $\{definite_1 – error_2 – definite/indefinite\}$

and the supposition of an {error} is

{recipient – suppose – object$_1$ – indefinable$_2$} {definite$_1$ – error$_2$ – definite/indefinite}.

A further element in an error sentence can be the action which would have been taken, the state which would have occurred, or other entity which was missed when the erroneous action or state was undertaken:

"He turned left when he meant to turn right."
"He filed the paper in the actioned folder when he should have filed it in pending."
"He filed the paper when he meant to shred it."
"He misunderstood their silence to mean consent."

We may call this omitted action, state, or entity {correct}. It can be definite or indefinable:

"He used a pencil when he should have used the pen."
"He used a pencil when he should have used a pen."
"She mistook her friend for an enemy."
"She mistook a friend for an enemy."

The error sentence is therefore:

{definite – error – object – (correct)}.

We have so far been describing {error} which arise through accident. It may also occur to one person through the deliberate action of another:

"The salesman misinformed the customer on the benefits of the product."
"He misdirected her on the direction to the meeting."
"We were misled on the prospects of the company."

This adds a further possible element, {agent}:

{definite – error – object – (correct) – (agent)}.