

contains an immense number of words of foreign origin. The author seeks explanations for this fact in the history of the language. In the course of the research, the author draws a conclusion that etymological and stylistic characteristics of words are interrelated. Among learned words and terminology the foreign element dominates the native.

## HEAD NOUNS IN *THAT*-COMPLEMENT CLAUSES AS A MEANS OF CONVEYING STANCE: FUTURE RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

**Zeleňáková M.**

*Pavol Jozef Šafárik University, Košice*

Over the last several years, linguists have become increasingly interested in the mechanisms used by speakers or writers to convey their personal feelings: in linguistics, the semantic notion of *stance* refers to utterer's standpoints, value judgements or assessments. Stance expression conveys what attitude speakers or writers have about a particular piece of information, how certain they are about its veracity, how they obtained access to the information, and, likewise, what perspective they are taking. Stance may be conveyed via various devices, the first one being grammatical ones, e.g. noun *that*-complement clauses including head nouns that represent an object of our interest. Besides nouns, there is a wide range of other grammatical devices that serve this purpose, like verbs, adverbs and adjectives. Stance can be equally expressed to different extents through value-laden word choice and paralinguistic devices (Biber, 2006: 87-89).

A great number of researchers discuss the type of nouns occurring in noun *that*-complement clauses. Based on the category of *general nouns* first identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976), these are abstract nouns whose specific meaning must be supplied by the immediate co-text. Such nouns have been scrutinised from several different perspectives, using a number of different definitions and terms.

According to Charles (2007), the most comprehensive treatment to the date is that of Schmid (2000), who uses a corpus of 225 million words from the Bank of English in order to identify and describe *shell nouns* and examine them from both a theoretical and a functional perspective. He distinguishes shell nouns according to three criteria: semantically, they characterise chunks of information of clause length or longer; cognitively, they lead to temporary concept formation by the reader; finally, in terms of text connection, they form a link to the stretch of text they refer to and thereby carry out a discourse-organising function (Charles, 2007: 204). The term *shell nouns*, equally used by Charles (2007) to talk about nouns requiring lexicalisation (or lexical realisation) in their immediate context, is identically employed by Winter (1977), who

states that a word such as *allegation*, *theory* or *fact* requires some kind of expansion in the surrounding text.

Another authors, Biber *et al.* (1999), argue that it is an abstract *head noun* that can be followed by complements, which complete the meaning of the noun, especially *that*-clauses and infinitive *to*-clauses. They stress that modality is one of the main semantic features of such nouns. Complement *that*-clauses governed by nouns are used to express the speaker's stance towards the propositional content: the *that*-clause reports a proposition, while the head noun reports the author's stance towards the proposition. In expression such as *the assumption that the US have the right to invade in the first place*, the head noun *assumption* is the indicator of a stance towards the proposition, reported in the clause *the US have the right to invade in the first place*: the utterer takes a stand and expresses his position towards the clause (Biber *et al.*, 1999).

Kanté (2010) substantiates that modality is a common intrinsic feature to nouns that license complement *that*-clauses; which is to claim that head nouns are modal stance markers. In his study *Mood and modality in finite noun complement clauses: A French-English contrastive study*, he pinpoints cross-linguistic and semantic evidences to show that modality is one of the properties that enable nouns to govern *that*-clauses. He is right to remark that the link between *that*-clauses and modality has already been described in the literature, but the source of modality has not been fully identified. He makes use of the British National Corpus for English examples, and FRANTEXT for French ones. Then he searches his English corpus for twelve nouns, of which four are epistemic, four deontic and four alethic, considering them to be prototypical representatives of the three modality types (epistemic, deontic and alethic – the same modality types are presented by Chevalier & Léard (1996)). His postulate is that the unacceptability of nouns like *linguistics* to govern noun *that*-clauses is due to the fact that it has no evaluative property similar to the one e.g. *philosophy* has when it is a *that*-taking noun. One can understand that the word *philosophy* governs a *that*-clause thanks to its polysemic features, *study of* vs. *opinion* or *attitude*. But on the contrary, nouns like *linguistics*, *geography*, *chemistry*, which share with *philosophy* an apparent co-hyponymy, cannot license *that*-clauses because they lack the semantic feature *opinion* or *attitude*. The idea resulting from this observation is that head nouns intrinsically involve modal features that allow the speaker to express their opinions or attitudes: the presence of a modality feature is a common property of *that*-taking nouns.

The diversity of terminology and attitudes towards the nouns as a means of conveying stance can be further demonstrated by the research of Ballier (2007) who talks about the function of head nouns as a testimonial cursor that enables the speaker to express their stance about the modal status and the plausibility of the state of affairs expressed in the *that*-clause (2007: 69). He uses the term *noms recteurs* to refer to such nouns. Palmer (1986: 126-131) is convinced that complement clauses are used to imply the attitudes or opinions of the speaker. For Halliday (1994), the above-mentioned *fact* belongs to the class of *nouns of simple facts* (Halliday 1994: 267), and structures such as *the fact is that* would be related to *ordinary modalised propositions*. Another terms that have not been mentioned here are that of *advance* and *retrospective labels*, discussed by Francis (1994), who founds his assumptions on behavioural patterns associated with these words; *signalling nouns* (Flowerdew, 2003), concentrating on their connective

function, on the way in which they create textual links, both across and within clauses; and *unspecific nouns* (Winter, 1982), *carrier nouns* (Ivanič, 1991), *complement that-taking nouns*, plus several other denominations of various origin.

In contrast to the ideas of linguists presented in these paragraphs, Quirk *et al.* (1985) talk about *marginal subordinator* – thus stressing the syntactic function of head nouns over and above their semantics. Quirk *et al.* (1985: 1231, 1260-61), but also Huddleston *et al.* (2002: 965), differ in their perception of the issue in question, putting forward their view that the ability of the nouns discussed to govern a *that*-clause is justified by either their abstractness, or by their semantic relation to verbs or adjectives they are derived from. Quirk *et al.* (1985) maintain that to govern such a clause, the noun phrase has to contain a general abstract noun. Huddleston *et al.* (2002) offer a sample of some sixty nouns, claiming that they are either derived from verbs and adjectives or are *morphologically derivative*, indicating that nouns govern *that*-clauses simply because they are derived from syntactic categories which are *that*-taking structures themselves.

We argue that these accounts might not be fully adequate since neither all the head nouns are abstract (e.g. *picture, sign, slogan*, etc.), nor all of them are derived from verbs or adjectives: a good number of the nouns governing *that*-clauses are non-deverbal, which simply means that they are not derived from verbs (*idea, fact, story, hypothesis, reason, principle, opinion, news, rider*, etc.). The theories by Quirk *et al.* and Huddleston *et al.* are thus not fully satisfactory and need further re-evaluation. For our research purposes, we need to compile and analyse a massive parallel bilingual corpus of EU texts from the area of civil law, as published in the Official Journal of the European Union and on <http://www.eur-lex.europa.eu/>. The documents that can be found there are commonly referred to as *acquis communautaire*. Having finished this preliminary stage, we shall strive to find out what properties allow nouns to introduce *that*-clauses. We intend to observe the noun *that*-pattern in stance constructions to find out whether nouns licensing *that*-clauses are possible modal stance markers. We shall base our research on a presupposition that nouns governing *that*-clauses are nominalised expressions of modality. Our hypothesis finds its theoretical grounds in the works by Biber *et al.* (1999), Ballier (2007), Chevalier & Léard (1996), Palmer (1986), Halliday (1994), Kanté (2010) and several other scholars tackled in the paper.

We shall equally deal with the question whether there are any specific nouns that govern noun *that*-complement clauses in EU legal texts, given the fact that the discourse in question falls within the domain of ESP: legal texts contain specific head nouns that do not occur in other genres, e.g. *rider (that)*. Such nouns and their collocations may provide legally significant shades of meaning. The interaction between the text genre and the syntactic position of the structure in question might be of intriguing consequences as well: in legal texts, noun *that*-complement clauses do not occupy the position of subject, typical of other text genres. Another interesting issues to focus on are systematic translation techniques and possible co-occurrence constraints in EU legal translations as related to the structure under scrutiny. We shall equally ask whether there is any distortion in the expression of stance engendered during the translation process itself, given the fact that English is a EU pivot language.

All these issues are supposed to represent a preliminary constituent of our future research. The area of EU legal language from the perspective of stance and modality as such has not been properly covered in any linguistic research so far; by our thesis, we wish to contribute to the field in question and to help to fill in the obvious gap.

### Literature

1. Ballier, N. 2007. La complétive du nom dans le discours des linguistes. In D. Banks (eds.). *La coordination et la subordination dans le texte de spécialité*, Paris: l'Harmattan, pp. 55-76.
2. Biber *et al.* 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
3. Biber, D. 2006. *University Language. A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
4. Charles, M. 2007. Argument or evidence? Disciplinary variation in the use of the Noun *that* pattern in stance construction. In *English for Specific Purposes* (26), pp. 203-218.
5. Chevalier, G. & Léard, J-M. 1996. La subordination nominale: classes, sous-classes et types sémantiques. In *Linguistische Arbeiten* 351, pp. 53-65.
6. Francis, G. 1994. Labelling discourse: an aspect of nominal-group lexical cohesion. In M. Coulthard (eds.). *Advances in written text analysis*. London: Routledge, pp. 83-101.
7. Flowerdew, J. 2003. Signalling nouns in discourse. In *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, pp. 329-346.
8. Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
9. Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Edward Arnold.
10. Ivanič, R. 1991. Nouns in search of a context: a study of nouns with both open- and closed-system characteristics. In *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, XXIX (2), pp. 93-114.
11. Kanté, I. 2010. Head nouns as modal stance markers – academic texts vs. legal texts. In Boch, F. and Rinck, F. (eds.). *Enonciation et rhétorique dans l'écrit scientifique*. LIDIL 41. Grenoble: Ellug, pp. 121-135.
12. Palmer, F. 1986. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Quirk *et al.* 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
14. Schmid, H.-J. 2000. *English abstract nouns as conceptual shells*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
15. Winter, E. O. 1977. A clause-relational approach to English texts: a study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse. In *Instructional Science*, 6 (1), pp. 1-92.

## Summary

This paper briefly proposes future perspectives of our current research as a PhD student. Nouns under scrutiny have been analysed from very different perspectives, using a number of varying definitions and terms. Our research aims at demonstrating that head nouns occurring in complement *that*-clauses in *acquis communautaire* are not used only for the lexical meaning that they convey, but also for a calculated and particular modal meaning.

УДК 811.112.2'38

## СТИЛІСТИКА І КОМУНІКАТИВНА ПРАГМАТИКА

Іваненко С.М.

*Національний педагогічний університет імені М.П. Драгоманова*

Стилістику вважають відносно новою мовознавчою дисципліною. Її вік становить приблизно півтори сотні років. Але коло питань, які розглядаються в її межах, не виникли 150 років тому, вони існували тисячоліттями, і люди намагались дати відповіді на них. Це відбувалось у межах і сьогодні знаної науки/дисципліни риторики.

Саме поняття «стилістика» виникло приблизно за 100 років до того, як стилістика виокремилась у лінгвістичну дисципліну. У німецьку воно було запозичено з французької мови, де було відоме ще на початку ХУІІІ ст. Уважається, що вперше на німецьких теренах це поняття було вжито великим німецьким романтиком Новалісом (графом Георгом Філіпом Фрідріхом фон Харденбергом (Hardenberg) [10]. Інші стилісти пов'язують виникнення цього поняття в літературній критиці щодо оцінки літературної спадщини Новаліса. У всякому разі поняття виникло для характеристики сукупності стилістичних засобів стосовно літературного твору як конгломерат його складових, тобто для позначення характерних ознак стилю художнього твору.

**Метою** пропонованої статті є визначення спільних і відмінних ознак таких видів стилістики, як функціональна та комунікативно-прагматична. Поставлена мета статті вимагає вирішення наступних **завдань**:

1. Визначити витoki комунікативно-прагматичного і функціонально-стилістичного потенціалу стилістики в античній риторикі.
2. Окреслити спільні й відмінні риси функціональної і комунікативно-прагматичної стилістики сьогодення.