

13. The Discourse Analysis of Sentence Structure

Summary

The purposes that a sentence fulfils in discourse are classified into seven discourse sentence types, expressed by a notation by which the sentence is described in terms of definite, indefinite, and indefinable entities, each represented by a variable called an element.

In this notation, elements are in the form {x}, meaning all entities which fulfil the function “x”. {definite}, {indefinite}, and {indefinable} are elements which are respectively definite, indefinite, and indefinable as defined in Chapter 2. {select} is a definite element which a sentence selects from a class of definite entities. {circumstance} is a definite restrictive qualifier which a sentence uses to identify an {indefinite} element from a class of indefinite entities. {not}, {but}, and {query} are discourse elements which are used for negation and enquiry.

An existential sentence introduces a new entity into a discourse.
{indefinite – circumstance₁ – (not – circumstance₂)}.

A statement provides new information concerning a topic, so that the information can be subsequently referred to. It either selects a definite entity in preference to other known entities (a selection statement), or identifies an indefinite entity by a restrictive qualifier (a circumstance statement). In either case the statement connects that entity to the topic.
{definite₁ – select – (not – definite₂)}
{definite₁ – indefinite – circumstance – (not – indefinable – definite₂)}.

A definite negative statement denies a connection between a topic and a known entity, possible selecting an alternative.
{definite₁ – not – definite₂ – (but – select)}.

An indefinite negative statement denies the existence of an entity in connection with a topic.
{definite – not – indefinable}.

A definite question asks whether a connection exists between a topic and a known entity, in preference to other known entities.
{definite₁ – query – select – (not – definite₂)} {definite – query – select – only}.

An indefinite question asks whether a known entity exists in connection with a topic.
{definite₁ – query – indefinable – (definite₂)}.

A hypothesis conjectures whether an entity may or may not exist in connection with a topic.
{definite – indefinable} {definite – not – indefinable} {definite – query – indefinable}.

Terms Defined or Introduced

Discourse element, discourse sentence type, discourse sentence structure, selection statement, circumstance statement, circumstance.

Introduction

This chapter proposes some general principles on which a sentence uses the tools of a language to convey meaning within discourse. The first 5 chapters have been designed to lay the foundations for such an analysis. Chapter 1. describes the purpose of a sentence in discourse, and shows that it either introduces new information or refers to known information (a topic). With regard to a topic, a sentence may connect known information or supply new information (a comment), or request information (an enquiry), or express a hypothesis. Chapter 2. shows that, if a topic is to be meaningful, it must exist and must refer to an entity or class of entities whose identity is known. If a comment contains new information, the sentence assigns an existence and identity to it.

Chapter 3. examines a negative comment, an enquiry, and a hypothesis. A negative comment or an enquiry may deny or question the connection of known information to the topic. Alternatively, a negative comment, an enquiry, or hypothesis may deny that an entity exists, or enquire whether it exists, or hypothesise whether it might exist in connection with a topic.

Chapters 4. and 5. explore some grammatical concepts which appear to be generally valid for all languages, including concept word and auxiliary, and aspect and tense.

Background

So far in this book, we have been using the terms “noun”, “verb”, “attribute”, “subject”, “verb”, and “object” in a conventional or empirical sense outlined in the Introduction. While their application is quite clear in particular sentences such as:

“I read your book today”; “She went to London by train”; “The train is late”;

or others of the almost unlimited number of sentences which any language can construct, it has proved difficult to generalise such concepts to all sentences and all languages. A set of basic linguistic terms, originally conceived to interpret the syntax of Latin and Ancient Greek, have been applied with reasonable success to analyse the languages of Western Europe. However, when linguists have attempted to employ the same concepts for other languages they have encountered difficulties, and could do so only by distorting or altering their meaning. Furthermore, a close analysis of some European languages encounters problems in applying the same ideas. For example, linguists have puzzled over what is the subject of the Italian:

“Mi piace cioccolato.” “I like chocolate.” [To-me pleases chocolate.]

Is it “chocolate”, which is in object position, or “mi”, which is a pronoun in dative case? On the same argument, what is the subject of the Japanese:

“Watashi wa Eigo ga wakaru.” “I understand English.”
[I _(topic) English _(subject) is-understandable.]¹

or the subject or verb of the Russian:

“U menya kniga.” “I have a book.” [With me book.]?

More examples of similar constructions are given in Chapter 8. Chapter 6. (The Ergative Construction) gives examples of languages which mark an agent with an “ergative” case, and in which the object is unmarked and the verb may show grammatical agreement with it:

Basque: “Elinek hondo hitzegiten du euskaraz.” “Elin speaks Basque well.”
[Elin _(agent) well speaking has in-Basque.]²

Hindi: “usne kitāb likhī” “He wrote the book.” [He _(agent) book written.]³

Inuit: “Akkam-ma aataaq aallaavaa.” “My uncle shot the harp-seal.”
[Uncle-my _(agent) harpseal shot-he-it.]⁴

Our definition of “subject” is not sufficiently robust to state what is the subject of such ergative sentences. They do not fit readily into the subject-verb-object pattern of European languages, in which the subject is unmarked, the object is often marked, and the verb may show agreement with the subject.

If we now examine the concept of “verb”, we find that in many languages an adjective or locative can act as a predicate without the auxiliary “be”:

¹ Makino & Tsutsui, 525.

² King & Elordi, 114.

³ McGregor, 71.

⁴ Fortescue, 210.

Arabic: “al-ḡawḡu nāṣiṡun” “The light [is] clear.”⁵

Turkish: “Vesika kasada.” “The document is in the safe.” [Document safe-in.]⁶

Indonesian:

“Dia amat sangat kaya.” “He [is] exceedingly rich.”⁷

Chinese: “Zhè ge fāngjiān shí mǐ kuān.” “This room is ten metres wide.”
[This unit room ten metre wide.]⁸

Japanese:

“Hon wa takai.” “The book is expensive.” [Book_(topic) expensive.]

Are these adjectives verbs, or are they adjectives acting as a predicate? European languages solve this conceptual problem by categorising “be” as a verb, so bringing this type of sentence in conformity with the “subject-verb-complement” pattern. However, that solution is not available for the examples above. Taking the illustration further, a number of languages do not use “be” even for identification expressions:

Arabic: “hāḡulāḡi hunna banāṡi” “These are my daughters.” [These they daughters-my.]⁹

Indonesian:

“Ini keputusan saya.” “This is my decision.” [This decision me.]¹⁰

Akkadian had a form of the noun for use as a predicate. The following example is formed from the noun “šarrum” (“king”) and the suffix “-āta” (“thou art”):

“šarrāta” “Thou art king.” [King-thou].¹¹

In such a sentence, is “daughters” or “decision” or “king” a verb, or is it a noun acting as a predicate? How is it to be reconciled with the concept of “verb” as generally understood?

Similarly, many European languages possess a verb “have”, but others employ a different construction for this concept. In these constructions, the subject and verb may not be evident:

Finnish: “Rasiilla on outo historia.” “The box has a strange history.”
[Box-at there-is strange history.]

Hungarian:

“Jóska feleségének jó állása van.” “Joska’s wife has a good job.”
[Joska wife-his-to good job-her is.]

Welsh: “Y mae’r fased gan Mair.” “Mary has the basket.”
[There-is the basket with Mary.]

Irish: “Tá gúna nua ag Eibhlín.” “Eileen has a new dress.”
[Is new dress at Eileen.]

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

Arabic: “lahu banūna fī l-jāmiṡati” “He has sons in the University.”

⁵ Badawi et al, 542.

⁶ Lewis, 97.

⁷ Sneddon, 178.

⁸ Yuan & Church, 570.

⁹ Badawi et al, 312

¹⁰ Sneddon, 233.

¹¹ Huenergard & Woods, 246.

[For-him sons in the-University.]

Hindi: “mere pās ek gārī hai” “I have a car.” [Me-with a car is.]

Maori: “He pōtae hou tō Hine.” “Hine has a new hat.” [A hat new the-of Hine.]¹²

Turning from the concepts of “subject”, “verb”, etc, similar problems are encountered with the one of the central principles of European sentence structure, the idea that a verb is either transitive or intransitive. We have already noted in Chapter 6. that a supposedly transitive verb may be categorised by whether or not it alters its object:

“Mary wrote the letter”, or not: “Mary obeyed the rules”

and have proposed confining “transitive” to the former category, which is sometimes called “factitive”. In Chapter 7. (The Participation Sentence), we saw that examples of the second type can take a direct object in one language and an indirect object in another:

French: “Je lui ai résisté.” “I resisted him.” [I to-him have resisted.]

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

Russian: “Ona igraet na pianino.” “She is playing [on the] piano.”

Persian: “bar došmanan taxtand” “They attacked the enemy.” [On enemy they-attacked.]

Hindi: “hamne dušman par hamlā kiyā” “We attacked the enemy.”
[By-us enemy-on attack made.]

Samoan: “Sa e va’ai ia Malia i le asō?” “Have you seen [to] Mary today?”¹³

Moreover, the same meaning can be conveyed with either a “transitive” or “intransitive” sentence in English:

“She met her friend.”	“She met with her friend.”
“We attended the meeting.”	“We came to the meeting.”
“She tackled the problem.”	“She dealt with the problem.”
“I processed the batch.”	“I worked on the batch.”
“She visited her neighbour.”	“She called on her neighbour.”

These inconsistencies bring into question the concept of “object”. Is an object a target towards which the verb is working, or a patient which it alters?

Our contention is that resolution of the problem does not lie with searching for a yet more recondite general definition of “subject”, “verb”, etc. The terms are of course meaningful, but only with respect to particular functional sentence types. As we shall discuss in Chapter 15., there are about 37 such functional sentence types. Each one is made up of a number of different functional elements, and there is a minimum complement of functional elements for the sentence to be meaningful. For each sentence type, “subject”, “verb”, “object”, etc have a different function, not necessarily the same in another sentence type. A “transitive” sentence such as:

“Mary planted the tree”

has no more in common with another “transitive” sentence such as:

“John’s arrival pleased Mary” or “Mary heard a sudden noise”

¹² Foster, 82.

¹³ Marsack, 122.

than it has with an “intransitive” sentence such as “Mary got up” or “Mary felt ill” or “Mary has fair hair”. The five sentences convey different things, and their elements have different functions.

Moreover, use of the terms “subject”, “verb”, “object” etc, has been confused with two other considerations. One arises from the fact that, in most sentences, the subject is the topic and the verb is the leading element in the comment. Definitions have accordingly attempted to reconcile “subject” as a topic, “subject” as the agent of a transitive verb, and “subject” as the patient of an intransitive verb. This reconciliation is not possible. As we shall see, the topic-comment structure is independent of the functional elements which make a sentence up, such as agent, action, state, patient, etc.

The second cause of confusion is the fact that, in many sentences, a subject is a person, an object is a thing, and a verb is an action. Definitions have accordingly attempted to reconcile “subject” as a person with “subject” as the instigator of an action, and “object” as a thing with “object” as an entity undergoing some process. Definitions of “verb” have tried to reconcile “verb” as an action, with “verb” as an auxiliary such as “be” or “have” which connects the subject to a quality or possession. Again, we do not believe that such reconciliations can be achieved. According to the sentence type, “subject”, “verb”, and “object” may be a person, object, action, state, or relationship, as the analysis in Chapters 15. and 16. will try to show.

Overview

Our approach to this matter lies with recognising that construction and comprehension of a sentence occurs in five steps or layers, which in this analysis we take down to layer (iii) in Chapter 15.:

- (i) Discourse structure, which makes a sentence meaningful in the context of previous sentences and expected future sentences in the dialogue or narrative.
- (ii) An intervening step or layer which connects the discourse analysis with sentence function.
- (iii) The structure imposed by the functional character of each sentence, of which there about 37 different types.
- (iv) A further intervening step which step or layer, which realises the functional structure of the languages in grammar, vocabulary, and rules of word formation.
- (v) The sentence itself.

This separation is the source of the ambiguity which we observed on the elements “subject”, “verb”, and “object”. They have three purposes: marking the topic and comment (or other information), conveying the syntactic role of the word in the sentence, and referring to a person, object, action, possession, or state. These purposes are distinct and are performed differently in different sentences.

In this chapter, we are concerned with discourse analysis. Within a discourse, a sentence can have seven possible purposes, which have different effects on its analysis and the analysis of its elements:

- (a) To introduce a new topic for discussion: an existential sentence.
- (c) To make a statement about a topic which is already introduced or agreed.
- (d) To deny a statement about an agreed topic: a definite negative.
- (b) To deny the existence of an entity: an existential (or indefinite) negative.
- (e) To ask a question as to whether a statement is true: a definite question.
- (f) To ask a question as to whether an entity exists: an existential (or indefinite) question.
- (g) To hypothesise as whether an entity exists or a statement is true.

Some of these purposes can be mixed. A question can be posed concerning a hypothesis, a statement can be made that a hypothesis exists, and a hypothesis can be supposed or proposed. This apparently complicated structure is simplified by the fact that all the meaningful elements in a sentence – which we called in Chapter 4. concept words – have to receive an *identity* in order to fulfil their purpose. An identity means that an element refers to an individual person, object, action, or state. Chapters 2. and 3. showed that there are three forms of identity:

- *definite*: an entity is known to exist and is identified;
- *indefinite*: an entity is known to exist, but is not identified;
- *indefinable*: an entity is not known to exist.

We now introduce a formal notation which we will use for the rest of this chapter and the four following: {x} refers to all that class of words (called elements) which fulfils the purpose “x”. This notation assumes that {x} is a clearly defined functional class, which can appear as an element in a sentence. All those functional classes to which the notation applies are defined in the Glossary at the end of this book.

{x – y – z...} represents a sentence whose elements are {x}, {y}, {z}, etc. Some elements are optional, and these are 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...}.

In a sentence {x – y – z...}, each of the elements {x}, {y}, {z}, etc perform a different function. 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. Some sentence types contain the same functional class in two different capacities, and these are represented {x₁}, {x₂}, etc.

Applying this notation, we denote as {definite}, {indefinite}, and {indefinable} all those words which are respectively definite, indefinite, and indefinable, and we call them *discourse elements*. However, these three elements do not adequately describe an existential sentence or a statement. We observe that in any existential sentence and in any statement concerning a topic, the speaker is selecting one or more entities from a class of possible entities for which the sentence might be true. To cover these purposes we introduce two further discourse elements:

- {select} a definite entity which is selected from a class of possible definite entities;
- {circumstance} a definite restrictive qualifier which identifies an indefinite entity from a class of hitherto unidentified entities.

These five discourse elements are not dependent on word order. Five further discourse elements {not}, {but}, {query}, and {infer} are dependent on word order. The seven structures of sentences in discourse analysis can be summarised in terms of these ten elements. We may term these seven structures the *discourse sentence types*:

existential sentence	{indefinite – circumstance ₁ – (not – circumstance ₂)}
statement	{definite ₁ – select – (not – definite ₂)} or {definite ₁ – indefinite – circumstance – (not – indefinable – definite ₂)}
definite negative	{definite ₁ – not – definite ₂ – (but – select)}
indefinite (existential) negative	{definite – not – indefinable}
definite question	{definite ₁ – query – select – (not – definite ₂)}
indefinite (existential) question	{definite ₁ – query – indefinable – (definite ₂)}
hypothesis	{definite – indefinable}

{not} denies a connection between an element and a topic. {but} asserts that a connection exists between an element and a topic, while {not} applies to other elements. {only} asserts that no {not} exists. {query} enquires whether a connection exists or does not exist between an element and a topic. {infer} is an inference derived from another sentence (See Chapter 14., Inference).

Except for an existential sentence, {definite} is in each sentence type because every sentence other than an existential sentence has to have some connection with a previous one. A sentence cannot comprise only {definite} elements because then it would supply no new information. A negative sentence, a negative question, and a hypothesis cannot refer to something which exists but whose identity is not known, and therefore cannot include an {indefinite}, only an {indefinable}.

This summary reflects the material presented in Chapter 1., 2., and 3. Chapter 2. showed that {definite} includes a defined class of entities, that is a class of entities which is clearly distinguished

from other classes, called generic. {Indefinite} includes a class of entities not so distinguished, called nonspecific. The distinction can be illustrated by “eggs” in:

“I like eggs.” (generic)
“I ate eggs for breakfast.” (nonspecific)

The distinction can be of semantic importance, as we see with “Fridays” in:

“On Fridays, meetings take place.” (generic)
“Meetings take place on Fridays.” (nonspecific)

When an entity is qualified by a quantity, it is {definite} if the quantity is {definite}, and {indefinite} if the quantity is {indefinite}. A quantity is {definite} if the entities which comprise it are identified, for example:

“my five sisters”; “the six books which you borrowed”; “the whole of the cake”.

A quantity is {indefinite} if the entities which comprise it are not identified from other entities, for example:

“five of my sisters”; “six of the books which you borrowed”; “two-thirds of the cake”.

In this way, discourse analysis leads to the identification of all concept words as {definite}, {indefinite}, and {indefinable}. For this purpose, concept words cannot be distinguished from auxiliary words which alter the function of concept words between person, thing, action, and state, for example:

“take a look” is the same as “look”;
“at rest” is the same as “resting”;
“have inside” is the same as “contain”;
“go for a walk” is the same as “walk”;
“be in haste” is the same as “hasten”.

Discourse analysis also leads to the assigning of aspect to verbs. As shown in Chapter 5., aspect relates the occurrence of one sentence to the occurrence of a previous sentence or an immediately succeeding one:

“Mary was writing a letter when John came in.”
“The weather having improved, Mary went out.”
“Mary had just written the letter when John came in.”
“Mary was about to write the letter when John came in.”

Chapter 5. also shows that tense is a subsidiary function to aspect. All languages have some aspectual functions, but many do not indicate tense at all.

We now discuss the seven types of sentences in discourse analysis, and in particular how each type is realised in assigning an identity to concept words. We shall see that discourse analysis is a firm base for the analysis of sentence structure. In Chapter 14., we discuss how discourse structure both within and between sentences is realised through grammatical rules. In Chapter 15., we summarise the 37 or so different functional sentence types, and in Chapters 16. and 17. we shall find that our investigations have given us definitions of “subject”, “verb”, and “object” which should stand up to more robust scrutiny.

Existential Sentence

Sentences can be divided into those which introduce an object for discourse, and those which discuss the object as a subject whose existence and identity are already understood, or believed to be understood, between the speaker and hearer. The first type of sentence is called *existential*. In the second, the object of the existential sentence has become the topic of a sentence which discusses it.

The discussion on the topic can take the form of a statement (comment), a question (enquiry), or a hypothesis.

An existential sentence therefore consists of an object and some background information which provides a context to the object and its existence. This background information or context can be a state, action, or relationship. In a language with an indefinite article such as English, an indefinite object is an alternative to a special existential auxiliary (“there is”):

“A pheasant is in the garden/is walking about in the garden/has taken up residence in the garden.”

“There is a pheasant in the garden/walking about in the garden/which has taken up residence in the garden.”

An existential object is {indefinite} by its nature. We cannot say: **“There is a London which is capital of Britain”*.

In a subsequent statement, the object of the existential sentence can become a {definite} topic:

“It [the pheasant] is a cock-pheasant/is under the trees/is eating the grass/has a companion.”

Alternatively, subsequent sentences can be an enquiry or a hypothesis on the {definite} topic:

“When did it arrive?” “It may have come from Lord X’s estate.”

Since the object of an existential sentence is new information, it is by its nature {indefinite}. The purpose of the background information or context is to select the object from a class of possible indefinite entities, and in so doing to justify its existence. It can be paraphrased as “in these circumstances”. We could call it {definite}, but that would not adequately describe its purpose, and we therefore require for it the different notation {circumstance}. An existential sentence can be represented:

{indefinite – circumstance}.

By its nature, {circumstance} is definite. The previous examples are not equivalent to:

*“A pheasant is in a garden/is walking about in a garden/has taken up residence in a garden.”

Such a sentence introduces both the pheasant and the garden, and lacks clear meaning since no {circumstance} is present.

An existential sentence may also imply that the object does not exist in some other context:

“There is a pheasant in the garden, not in the wood.”

“There is a meeting in the conference room, not the lecture hall.”

The context that the {circumstance} expresses is therefore selected by the speaker from possible alternative contexts. However, the alternative contexts are not themselves selected, but rejected. They are therefore {definite}. The structure can be extended to:

{indefinite – circumstance – (not – definite)}.

As we have seen, the {indefinite} object of an existential sentence has the same position in an English sentence as the {definite} topic of a statement. It was pointed out in Chapter 2. that any statement which contains an indefinite entity can be reformulated as existential:

“The meeting took place in a conference room” can reformulated existentially as
“There was a conference room in which the meeting took place.”

“I saw an article in the paper on linguistics” can be reformulated as
“There was an article I saw in the paper on linguistics.”

The difference between these sentences is not that the balance between existing and new information is different, but that one discusses existing information while the other introduces new information. As we shall see below (Statement), a statement with an {indefinite} comment has the discourse structure {definite – indefinite – circumstance}, the difference from an existential sentence being the addition of the {definite} topic.

The object of an existential sentence can be specific or general. If general, it states that the object exists as a class:

“There is a sixpenny-piece in your pudding.” (specific)
 “There is gold in those hills.” (general)

Like English, many languages indicate that a sentence is existential by placing the {indefinite} element in topic position:

Italian: “Piove.” “It is raining.” [Rains.]

Finnish: “Ruokaa on pöydällä.” “There is some food on the table.”
 [Food (partitive) is table-on.]¹⁴

Welsh: “Y mae llyfr ar y bwrdd.” “There is a book on the table. [Is book on the table.]¹⁵

Irish: “Tá scoil nua ar bharr an choic.” “There is a new school on top of the hill.”
 [Is school new on top of-the hill.]¹⁶

Arabic: “ʔasbābun ʕadīdatun ʔaddat ʔilā l-ʔirjaʔi”
 “There are numerous reasons which led to the postponement.”
 [Reasons numerous (indefinite) led to the-postponement.]¹⁷

Chinese: “Xià yǔ le.” “It is raining.” [Fall rain now.]¹⁸

Others formulate the {circumstance} as a locative, and place that in topic position. This reverses the order to {circumstance – indefinite}:

Hindi: “Mez par pustak hai.” “There is a book on the table.” [Table-on book is.]¹⁹

Russian: “Na stole vaza.” “There is a vase on the table.” [On table vase.]²⁰

Maori: “He wāhine kei roto i tērā rūma.” “There are women in that room.”
 [Some women at inside of that room.]²¹

In order to distinguish an existential sentence from a locative sentence, many languages employ a specialist existential auxiliary, often originally a locative:

French: “Il y a beaucoup d’eau.” “There is plenty of water.”

German: “Es gibt fünf Bücher auf dem Tisch.” “There are five books on the table.”
 “Es wurde noch lange diskutiert.” “Discussion continued for a long time.”²²

¹⁴ Whitney, 255.

¹⁵ Bowen & Rhys Jones, 40.

¹⁶ Dillon & Ó Cróinín, 42.

¹⁷ Badawi et al, 349.

¹⁸ Yip & Rimmington, 140.

¹⁹ McGregor, 4.

²⁰ Wade, 523.

²¹ Foster, 90. Maori is verb-initial.

²² Durrell, 204.

Spanish: “Hay un gato en el tejado.” “There is a cat on the roof.”²³

Italian: “C’è qualcuno alla porta.” “There’s someone at the door.”

Turkish: “Köşede bir kahve var.” “There is a café on the corner.”
[Corner-at a café there-is.]²⁴

Malay: “Di seberang sungai ada rumah.” “Across the river there is a house.”
[Across river there-is house.]²⁵

Chinese: “Jingzi pángbiān yǒu yī pén huā.” “There is a pot of flowers besides the mirror.”
[Mirror besides there-is one pot flower.]²⁶

Japanese:

“Kono machi ni wa nihonjin ga takusan imasu.”

“In this town there are many Japanese.”

[This town-in _(topic) Japanese-people _(subject) many there-are.]²⁷

By its nature, an existential sentence is stative. If it introduces an action, that action is not perfective.

Existential Negatives and Questions

A negative existential sentence denies that an entity exists:

“There is no pheasant in the garden”; “There are no emails today”.

It does not introduce an object for subsequent discussion, but denies that it is available for discussion. The object whose existence is denied is therefore not indefinite but {indefinable}. In English, the indefinable element can be marked with “any”:

“There isn’t any pheasant in the garden”; “There aren’t any emails for you today”.

The background information of a negative existential does not provide the circumstances under which the existence is denied, but a {definite} background. The sentence therefore has the discourse structure:

{not – indefinable – definite}.

An existential question asks whether an entity exists:

“Is there a pheasant in the garden?” “Is there an email for you today?”

The entity whose existence is questioned is also {indefinable}, and the sentence contains a {definite} background as does the negative existential question. Its structure is therefore:

{query – indefinable – definite}.

The existential verb is part of the {indefinable} element and may therefore be expressed as a hypothesis:

French: “Soit qu’il y a un faisan dans le jardin?”
“Might there be a pheasant in the garden?”²⁸

²³ Harrap, 258.

²⁴ Lewis, 142.

²⁵ Dodds, 67.

²⁶ Yip & Rimmington, 62.

²⁷ Makino & Tsutsui, 153.

²⁸ Private information.

Statement

Intuitively, any speaker knows that a sentence is “about” something, which we call the topic, and that a statement refers to what it is “about” and conveys new information (the comment) concerning it. The topic can be implied if its identification is fully understood. “It’s raining” need contain no topic if spoken between people in the same time and place. If spoken between people in different times or places, it needs a topic:

“It’s raining in Droitwich”; “It was raining that afternoon.”

We showed at the start of this chapter some of the difficulties which arise from the rigorous use of “subject”, “verb”, and “object”. While the conventional interpretation of these terms are clear for particular statements, they are not clear for others. Discourse analysis of a sentence does not have this disadvantage. Every statement has a topic and a comment, and the boundary between them is always discernable. The complication is that discerning it requires an understanding, not only of the sentence in isolation, but of its role in a particular discourse. To illustrate this, we need to divide statements into two types:

- Those comprising elements which are already identified in the mind of the speaker and hearer.
- Those which introduce an element not previously identified.

For the first type, our example is the spoken statement “I’m going off to work now”:

- (i) Uttered without emphasis, the statement has the topic “I” and comment “going to work now”, and means “that’s what I’m doing rather than anything else”.

Uttered with emphasis on a word, as indicated here by an accent, it can acquire at least three further meanings:

- (ii) “I’m going off to work now” means “It’s me rather than anyone else who is going”. The topic is “going to work now” and the comment is “I”.
- (iii) “I’m going off to wórk now” means “I’m going to work rather than shopping” (or the cinema, etc). The topic is “I’m going now” and the comment is “work”.
- (iv) “I’m going off to work nów” means “I’m off to work now rather in ten minutes’ time”, etc. The topic is “I’m going to work” and the comment is “now”.

If the order of the words is altered, further meanings can be achieved without using verbal emphasis:

- (v) “Now I’m going off to work” means “What I’m doing now is going off to work”. The topic is “now” and the comment is “I’m going to work”.
- (vi) “Work, I’m going off to it now” has the topic “work” and means “I’m going off to it now rather than not at all.”
- (vii) “I’m going off now to work” has the same meaning as the third example above. The topic is “I’m going now” and the comment is “work”.

The first of these examples is what is generally regarded as the “basic” meaning. However, all of the others are equally plausible. Together, they cover the principal purposes that the statement could fulfil in a real discourse between two or more people. They can be represented in terms of a grid:

<u>topic</u>	<u>comment</u>	<u>examples</u>
I	going off to work now	(i)
Going off now to work now	I’m	(ii)
I’m going off now	to work	(iii), (vii)
I’m going off to work	now	(iv)
Now	I’m going off to work	(v)

Work

I'm going off now to

(vi)

A speaker more usually envisages the statements as responses to a question, which may actually have occurred or may be hypothesised in the mind of the speaker:

- (i)/(v) What are you doing now?
- (ii) Who is going off to work now?
- (iii)/(vi) Where are you off to now?
- (iv)/(vi) When are you off to work?

In examples (ii), (iii), and (iv), in which a single word in the statement is the comment and the rest is the topic, the comment is what we called “focus” in Chapter 1. (Focus). In written English, the more usual way of expressing focus employs clefting:

“It’s I who am off to work now”; “It’s to work that I’m off to now”;
“It’s now that I’m off to work”.

The topic of this, as of all sentences, is a unique {definite} entity. The comment is constructed by selecting one instance from a class of possible entities, all of which are known and identified to the speaker and hearer. The statement links that selected comment to the topic. We may test this purpose of a comment by applying the phrase “rather than”. If we can say “rather than”, the element concerned is part of the comment. If we cannot say “rather than”, it is the topic.

In example (i), the topic is “I”. The statement means “I’m going off to work now rather than doing anything else (such as sitting in the garden)”. There exists a class of entities which is the things I might be doing, and the statement selects “going off to work” as the one that actually occurs.

In example (ii), there exist several people who might be off to work now. The topic is “off to work now”. The statement selects “I” as the person who actually engages in that action.

In example (iii), the speaker knows that I’m going off somewhere, so that “I’m going off now” is the topic. The statement means “I’m going off to work now rather than to anywhere else (such as the shops)”. There exists a class of locations to which I might be going, and the statement selects “work” as the actual one.

In example (iv), the speaker knows that I’m going to work at some time, so that “I’m going off to work” is the topic. The statement means “I’m going off to work now rather than some other time (such as in half an hour)”. There exists a class of times when I might be off to work, from which the statement selects “now”.

In example (v), the topic is “now”. There exist several things that might be happening now, such as having breakfast or reading the newspaper. The statement selects “I’m going off to work” as the actual occurrence.

In example (vi), the topic is “work”. There exist several things which might occur with respect to work, such as “I’ve just resigned from it” or “I’ve just been promoted”. The comment with regard to it is “I’m off there now”.

How do we represent the comment of these statements in the notation we have adopted? We cannot say that it is {indefinite}, since each element of the comment is already known to exist and is identified in the mind of the speaker and hearer. We cannot simply denote the comment as {definite}, since {definite – definite} does not accurately describe the purpose of the statement. We require a notation which indicates that the statement has selected one definite element from a class, for which we propose {select}. Each of the above statements therefore has the structure:

{definite – select}.

If the statement contains a “rather than” element, it means that there is a possible {definite} comment (or several possible {definite} comments) which have been rejected, and which we can denote by:

{definite₁ – select – (not – definite₂)}.

We may term such a statement a *selection statement*. The new information that it conveys is the connection between the topic and comment, which can then be referred to in a subsequent sentence: “I’ll be on time to catch the bus” or “I’ll have to do some overtime”.

The word “only”, in the sense of “excluding all other options”, applies exclusively to the definite element of comments. In the case of selection statements, this means {select}. “I’m going only to work now”, means “I’m not going anywhere else”; “work” is the comment and “I’m going to” is the topic. “Only I am going to work now” means the no-one else is going to work; “I” is the comment and “going to work now” is the topic. The selection statement can be expanded to:

{definite – select – only}.

We now turn to the second type of statement, in which a comment is introduced which is {indefinite}. It belongs to a class of entities which is known to exist but has not previously been identified from that class. The purpose of the sentence is to assign an identity to the comment:

“The professor gave a lecture.”

At first sight, this statement has the structure {definite – indefinite}. However, it is not very informative, as it does not contain sufficient information to distinguish the lecture from any other lecture which might be given. This can be supplied by a restrictive qualifier:

“The professor gave a lecture in the medieval French curriculum”, or
“The professor gave a lecture at 10.30 in Hall A”.

“Lecture” can now be the topic of a subsequent sentence, which without the qualifier it could not: “The lecture lasted an hour”; “She handed out some notes”, etc. The qualifier performs this by selecting one piece of background information from a class, and implies therefore that alternative background information has been rejected:

“The professor gave a lecture in the medieval French curriculum (rather than in the modern French curriculum).”
“The professor gave a lecture at 10.30 in Hall A (not a tutorial at 11.00 in her study).”

The qualifier is therefore definite, and has the same purpose {circumstance} as the background of an existential sentence. If we disregard the rejected information, the sentence has the structure:

{definite – indefinite – circumstance}.

We may term such a statement a *circumstance statement*. The new information that it conveys is again the connection between the topic and the comment, but unlike a selection statement the comment is identified by the statement and not previously. The {definite} topic distinguishes a circumstance statement from an existential sentence, which only has {indefinite – circumstance}, for example if the above sentences are expressed existentially:

“There was a lecture which the professor gave in the medieval French curriculum”;
“There was a lecture which the professor gave at 10.30 in Hall A”.

We now consider the information which is potentially rejected in a circumstance statement. This can be an alternative circumstance:

“The professor gave a lecture in the medieval French curriculum, rather than in the modern French curriculum.”
“The professor gave a lecture at 10.30 in Hall A, not at 11.00 in her study.”

However, this alternative circumstance is not selected from a range of possible alternatives. The sentence is simply saying that the event did not occur in that connection, which is therefore not {circumstance} but {definite}. Such a sentence is therefore:

{definite₁ – indefinite – circumstance – (not – definite₂)}.

Or, the rejected information can be an alternative indefinite comment with the same {circumstance}:

“The professor gave a lecture, not a tutorial, in the medieval French curriculum.”
“The professor gave a lecture, not a seminar, at 10.30 in Hall A.”

In that case, since the rejected information (the tutorial or seminar) is not shown to exist, it is {indefinable}, and the sentence is:

{definite – indefinite – (not – indefinable) – circumstance}.

Or, the rejected information can be both an alternative indefinite comment and an alternative circumstance:

“The professor gave a lecture in the medieval French curriculum, not a tutorial in the modern French curriculum.”
“The professor gave a lecture at 10.30 in Hall A, not a seminar at 11.00 in her study.”

The full structure is accordingly:

{definite₁ – indefinite – circumstance – (not – indefinable – definite₂)}.

We now revert to our earlier theme, the boundary between the topic and comment of a circumstance statement. As with a selection statement, the boundary can be discerned by considering to what question (real or hypothetical) the statements are a reply. If the question is:

“What did the professor do?”,

the topic of the statement is “the professor” and the remainder is the comment. In that case, “professor” is {definite} and both “gave” and “lecture” are {indefinite}. If the question is:

“What lecture did the professor give?”,

the topic of the statement is “the professor gave” and the remainder is the comment. In that case, both “professor” and “gave” are {definite} and “lecture” is {indefinite}.

We have remarked that “only”, in the sense of “excluding all other options”, applies exclusively to the definite element of comments. In the case of circumstance statements, this means {circumstance}. “The professor gave a lecture only in the medieval French curriculum” means that he/she did not give a lecture in any other curriculum, and has the structure:

{definite – indefinite – circumstance – only}.

“Only the professor gave a lecture in the medieval French curriculum” is only meaningful if there is only one lecture in that curriculum, and the professor has been identified. “The professor gave only a lecture in the medieval French curriculum” employs “only” in the different sense of “merely”.

It can be argued that there are many circumstance statements where the {circumstance} element is omitted:

“She picked up her pen.” “She went for a walk.”

However, these statements generally anticipate or follow other statements which provide the {circumstance}:

“She picked up her pen and started to write.” “She went for a walk as she did every evening.”

Similarly, there are statements in which the identity of the object is unimportant:

[Can be-to-you helpful we.]
 “Sua moglie è venuta a rispondermi.” “Your wife came to reply to me.”
 [Your wife is come to reply-me.]
 “È venuta a rispondermi sua moglie.” “It was your wife who came to reply to me.”
 [Is come to reply-me your wife.]

In other languages such as Welsh, the comment occurs first, and the construction is similar to clefting in English:

“Collodd y dyn ei fag ar y trê'n ddoe.” “The man lost his bag on the train yesterday.”
 [Lost the man his bag on the train yesterday.]
 “Ei fag a gollodd y dyn ar y trê'n ddoe.”
 “It was his bag that the man lost on the train yesterday.”
 [His bag which lost the man on the train yesterday.]³²

In other languages such as Hungarian, the comment is placed in front of the verb:

“Én akarok beszélni Kristóffal.” “I want to talk [to] Christopher.”
 “Én beszélni akarok Kristóffal.” “I want to talk to Christopher.”
 [I to-talk want Christopher.]
 “Én Kristóffal akarok beszélni.” “I want to talk to Christopher.”
 [I Christopher want to-talk.]³³

Other languages such as Chinese do not depend on word order, but mark the focus with special words, again reminiscent of the clefting construction. “Shì means “be”, but is here a focussing particle:

“Wǒ zuótiān lái.” “I came yesterday.” [I yesterday came.]
 “Wǒ shì zuótiān lái de.” “I came yesterday.” [I (focus) yesterday came (focus).]³⁴

Negative Statement

A negative statement does not supply new information concerning a topic; it denies that some information regarding the topic is true. If the information might be true, but is not, then the information exists and can be identified, and the sentence is one we call a *definite negative* in Chapter 3. (Negatives). If the information cannot be true, then it does not exist, and the sentence is one we call an *indefinite negative* in that chapter.

If we take some examples of definite negatives, the topic and comment can be reversed without any change of meaning, although there is a change in their discourse function:

“Mr Smith is not Prime Minister.” “The Prime Minister is not Mr Smith.”
 “Mr Smith did not hear your remark.” “Your remark was not heard by Mr Smith.”
 “Mr Smith did not catch the 8.12 train.” “The 8.12 train was not caught by Mr Smith.”

The comment of the sentences is definite, but has not been selected from a class of possible entities. A definite negative therefore has the discourse structure:

{definite₁ – not – definite₂}

in which the two {definite} elements are distinguished by the use of {not}. The first of each of these sentences could be extended to be:

“Mr Smith is not Prime Minister, but Foreign Secretary”;
 “The Prime Minister is not Mr Smith, but Mr Jones”.

³² Bowen & Rhys-Jones, 134.

³³ Törkenczy, 104.

³⁴ Yip & Rimmington, 132.

The “not x, but y” of these sentences is the negative way of expressing the “x, rather than y” of a selection statement, which would be:

“Mr Smith is Foreign Secretary, not Prime Minister”;
“The Prime Minister is Mr Jones, not Mr Smith”.

If this {but} element is included, a definite negative is therefore:

{definite₁ – not – definite₂ – (but – select)}.

According to our approach, the sentence:

“Mr Smith is not only Prime Minister, but also Foreign Secretary”

involves two separate {definite – select} sentences: “Mr Smith is Prime Minister; Mr Smith is Foreign Secretary”.

If we take some examples of indefinite negatives, the topic and comment can only be reversed as a negative existential:

“Mr Smith is not a teacher.”	“There is no teacher who is Mr Smith.”
“Mr Smith did not go to work by train.”	“There is no train which Mr Smith took to work.”
“Mr Smith did not eat breakfast.”	“There is no breakfast which Mr Smith ate.”

Although the comments of these indefinite negatives are marked as indefinite, it is clear that they do not exist and are therefore {indefinable}. An indefinite negative therefore has the same discourse structure as a negative existential:

{definite – not – indefinable}.

Many languages use different constructions to distinguish a definite negative (first example) and indefinite negative (second example):

German: “Wir fahren morgen nicht ans Meer.” “We’re not driving to the sea tomorrow.”
[We drive tomorrow not to-the sea.]³⁵

“Sie will niemand Armen heiraten.” “She doesn’t want to marry anyone poor.”
[She wants no-one poor to-marry.]³⁶

Welsh: “Nid wyf i yn byw yn y wlad.” “I do not live in the country.”
[Not am-I in living in the country.]

“Nid oes dim car gennyf i.” “I haven’t a car.” [Not there-is no car with me.]³⁷

Russian: “Ya ne chitayu pis’ma.” “I am not reading a/the letter.” [I not read letter (genitive).]

“Ya ne videla nikogo iz moikh druzei.” “I saw none of my friends.”
[I not saw none (genitive) of my friends.]³⁸

Arabic: “lam ʔaltaqi bihi min qablu” “I have not met him before.”
[Not I-met with-him before.]

“lā ʕilma lahu bi-ʔasbābi hāḏihi l-muṣādarāti”
“He has no knowledge of the reasons for these confiscations.”
[No knowledge for-him at reasons these the-confiscations.]³⁹

Chinese: “Tā bā diǎn yǐqián zuò bù wán zuòyè.”
[He won’t be able to finish his homework by 8 o’clock.]

³⁵ Durrell, 237.

³⁶ Lockwood, 217.

³⁷ Bowen & Rhys Jones, 25,43.

³⁸ Folomkina & Weiser, 333.

³⁹ Badawi et al, 465, 473.

[He eight o'clock before do not finish homework.]
 “Wǒ méi qùguo Běijīng.” “I have never been to Beijing.”
 [I there-is-not going-have Beijing.]⁴⁰

The nature of an indefinite negative is shown by the use of the subjunctive when the indefinable element is qualified:

German: “Wir kennen niemanden, der jetzt in der Lage wäre, diese Aufgabe zu übernehmen.”
 “We know no one who is now in a position to take over this assignment.”
 [We know no-one, who now in the position would-be (subjunctive), this assignment to take-over.]⁴¹

Italian: “Non ha chi lo possa aiutare.” “He has nobody who can help him.”
 [Not he-has who him can (subjunctive) help.]⁴²

Hungarian:
 “Nincs kivel kártyázzak.” “I have nobody to play cards with.”
 [There-is-not who-with I-play-cards (subjunctive)-.]⁴³

Russian: “Ya ne vstrechal cheloveka, kotoryi by ne slykhal o Tolstom.”
 “I have never met a man who has not heard of Tolstoy.”
 [I not met man, who (subjunctive) not heard of Tolstoy.]⁴⁴

Questions

A question asks whether a statement concerning a topic is true. If the statement connects two definite entities, of which one is the topic, the question is whether that connection exists. Such a question is called a *definite question* in the terminology of Chapter 3. (Questions). If the statement introduces a new entity and asserts that it is connected with the topic, the question is whether that new entity exists, and it is an *indefinite question* in that chapter.

A definite question can be posed without any change of meaning (but with a change in its discourse function) if the topic and comment are reversed:

“Is Mr Smith Prime Minister?”	“Is the Prime Minister Mr Smith?”
“Did Mr Smith hear your remark?”	“Was your remark heard by Mr Smith?”
“Did Mr Smith catch the 8.12 train?”	“Was the 8.12 train caught by Mr Smith?”

The reply to such questions (if positive) is a selection statement:

“Mr Smith is Prime Minister.”	“The Prime Minister is Mr Smith.”
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------

We have seen that a selection statement implies an expressed or understood “rather than” function, which can also be part of the corresponding question:

“Is Mr Smith Prime Minister, not Foreign Secretary?”
“Is the Prime Minister Mr Smith, not Mr Jones?”

A definite question has therefore the same structure as a selection statement, but with the {query} element included:

{definite – query – select}, or
 {definite₁ – query – select – (not – definite₂)}.

⁴⁰ Yuan & Church, 14, 113.

⁴¹ Lockwood, 276.

⁴² Speight, 152.

⁴³ Rounds, 44.

⁴⁴ Wade, 338.

The enquirer may not know which of the possible alternative answers is correct:

“Is Mr Smith Prime Minister or Foreign Secretary?”
“Is the Prime Minister Mr Smith or Mr Jones?”

Such a question introduces the discourse element {or} which is discussed further in Chapter 14. (Alternative):

{definite – query – select₁ – or – select₂}.

This structure of a definite question is illustrated clearly by those questions which ask for the identification of a single element in the sentence:

“Whom did you see today?” “When does the meeting start?” “Whose is that umbrella?”
“Which book have you chosen?” “How did you find that out?” “Why did you agree?”

The part of these questions which is not the question word is believed by the enquirer to be known information (the topic), and is therefore {definite}. The respondent is invited to select from a list of possible definite answers, which may be large or small:

“I saw John and Ted, but not James.” “The umbrella belongs to Joan, not Susan.”

These questions therefore again have the structure {definite – query – select}, but cannot have the {not} element.

We now turn to the structure of an indefinite question. If the comment of an indefinite question is in topic position, it can only be posed in existential form:

“Is Mr Smith a teacher?”	“Is there a teacher who is Mr Smith?”
“Did Mr Smith go to work by train?”	“Was there a train which Mr Smith took to work?”
“Did Mr Smith eat breakfast?”	“Was there a breakfast which Mr Smith ate?”

Although the comments of these indefinite questions are marked as indefinite, it is not clear that they exist and they are therefore {indefinable}. An indefinite question therefore has the same discourse structure as an existential question:

{definite – query – indefinable}.

An indefinite question usually asks whether an {indefinable} entity exists in some {definite} context, which may be the topic but often is not:

“Is Mr Smith a teacher at the local school?” “Did Mr Smith go to his work by train?”

This is:

{definite₁ – query – indefinable – (definite₂)}.

An indefinite question may pose one or more alternatives:

“Is Mr Smith a teacher or an assistant at the local school?”
“Is Mr Smith a teacher at the local school or at the technical college?”
“Did Mr Smith go to his work by train or by bus?”
“Did Mr Smith go to his work or to the seaside by train?”

These questions use the element {or} which is discussed in the next chapter:

{definite₁ – query – indefinable₁ – or – indefinable₂ – definite₂}
{definite₁ – query – indefinable – definite₂ – or – definite₃}.

The nature of an indefinite question is shown by the use of the subjunctive when the indefinable element is qualified:

French: “As-tu un seul ami qui soit fidèle?” “Have you one friend who is (subjunctive) true?”⁴⁵

Italian: “Non c’è nessuno qui che sappia suonare il pianoforte?”
“Isn’t there anyone who can (subjunctive) play the piano?”⁴⁶

Spanish: “¿Sabes de alguien que tenga apellido en este país?”
“Do you know anyone in this country who has a surname?”
[Know-you of anyone who has (subjunctive) surname in this country?]⁴⁷

Any “yes”/“no” question, definite or indefinite, can be expressed in negative form, since by its nature it is posing a negative and a non-negative statement as alternatives: “Are you not getting off the bus?”. The only difference is that the questioner is expecting a negative reply.

Hypothesis

A *hypothesis* is an action, state, possession, or identification whose reality is uncertain at the time the sentence is uttered:

“We may have hit the jackpot.” “We may be rich.” “We have a large fortune.”
“We may be on the moon.” “We may be the lost tribes of Israel.”

The agent or object to which the hypothesis relates is usually stated; since it is the topic, it is {definite}. Even if no topic is stated, it is implied; “It may be raining” implies “It may be raining now”. Since the existence of a hypothesis is uncertain, it is {indefinable}, and the structure of a hypothesis is:

{definite – indefinable}.

The subjunctive is a construction available to some languages to indicate that an action or state is hypothetical:

Greek: “Μπορεί να πάμε αύριο να του δούμε.” “We may go to see him tomorrow.”
[It-may-be that we-go (subjunctive) tomorrow that him we-see (subjunctive)-.]

Persian: “šayad beravam” “Perhaps I shall go.” [Perhaps I-go (subjunctive)-.]

We have already noted that a hypothesis can be something whose existence is denied or questioned, whose sentence structures have the additional elements {not} and {query}:

{definite – not – indefinable} {definite – query – indefinable}.

In addition, a hypothesis can also be something whose occurrence is dependent on another hypothesis:

French: “Je viendrai au cas que je soit libre demain.”
“I shall come in case I am (subjunctive) free tomorrow.”⁴⁸

Spanish: “Si viniera, me quedaría.” “If he were to come (subjunctive), I’d stay (conditional).”⁴⁹

German: “Wir wären weggegangen, wenn wir daß gewußt hätten.”
“We would have (subjunctive) gone away if we had known (subjunctive) that.”⁵⁰

⁴⁵ Fraser & Squair, 192.

⁴⁶ Speight, 225.

⁴⁷ Butt & Benjamin, 240.

⁴⁸ Fraser & Squair, 194.

⁴⁹ Butt & Benjamin, 292.

⁵⁰ Lockwood, 263.

Italian: “Glielo venderò purché mi paghi bene.”
“I’ll sell it to him so long as he pays me well.”
[To-him-it I’ll-sell provided-that me he-pays (subjunctive) well.]⁵¹

Irish: “Dá bhfeicfinn é, do labharfainn leis.”
“If I saw (conditional) him, I would speak (conditional) to him.”/
“If I had seen him, I would have spoken to him.”⁵²

Greek: “Αν είχεσ πάρει λαχείο, μπορεί να είχεσ κερδίσει.”
“If you had bought a lottery ticket, you might have won.”
[If you-had bought lottery, it-is-possible that you had (subjunctive)won.]⁵³

Russian: “Esli by ya znala, ya by vam skazala.” “If I knew, I should tell you.”
[If (conditional) I knew, I (conditional) should you tell.]⁵⁴

Persian: “ta inra naxanid namifahmid” “You will not understand this until you read it.”
[Until this (object) not-you-read (subjunctive) not-you-understand.]⁵⁵

This construction, called a conditional, is analysed further in Chapter 14. (Condition).

Chapter 15. (The Dependency Sentence) and (The Relief Sentence) describe sentence types for the incurring and relief of hypothetical risks to an object or patient.

Chapter 15. (The Supposition Sentence) and (The Communication Sentence) describe sentence types whereby a person supposes or communicates a hypothesis concerning an object.

⁵¹ Speight, 157.

⁵² Dillon & Ó Cróinín, 93.

⁵³ Holton et al, 460.

⁵⁴ Folomkina & Weiser, 230.

⁵⁵ Lambton, 152.