

voir p.ex. R.Jackendoff, An interpretive theory of negation, Foundations of language 5/1969, pp. 218-241. En général, si nous avons la phrase "Beaucoup de mathématiciens sont venus", on pourra avoir comme négation de prédicat "Beaucoup de mathématiciens ne sont pas venus" et comme négation de phrase "Il n'y a pas eu beaucoup de mathématiciens à être venus", qu'on pourra représenter en gros comme:

Beaucoup de mathématiciens (MEG venir)
et NEG (1 beaucoup de mathématiciens venir)
respectivement.

3/ Voir note 2.

4/ Dans l'article mentionné, Jackendoff le dit à propos d'une phrase où seul le complément d'objet serait quantifié. On peut le dire aussi à propos des phrases de II et de III. La différence ici est minime - Il donne à entendre qu'il existe des personnes à qui on pourrait attribuer le prédicat "venir" affirmatif, alors qu'on ne sera pas obligé de tirer un tel sous-entendu de III. Dans le cas de "tous les", la différence n'est plus minime, mais l'ambiguïté de la négation est toujours possible.

5/ Voir S.Karolak, Zasadnicza składni ogólna, PWN 1972

Streszczenie

Artykuł dotyczy zjawiska podziałkiiem "Des" o wartości specyficznie finijacej, undesozoznym przed rzeczownikim w pozycji podmiotu, np. Des enfants sont venus". W zdaniach tych niemożliwe jest zasłonięcie do czasownika "venir" negacji składnikowej, ani też zastosowanie czasowników modalnych odnoszących się wyjątkowo do czasownika, a nie do całego zdania, jak np. "móc" w znaczeniu: "być w stanie", a nie: "możliwe jest, że...". W zdaniach tych czasownik nie może komutować z orzeczeniem nominalnym / łącznik + orzecznik/, nie może też wchodzić w skład orzeczeń złożonych, typu "przyszedł, bo nie mógł". Ograniczenia te nie występują przy użyciu pozostałych determinantów i kwantyfikatorów. Z punktu widzenia tradycyjnej składni, zdania takie nie dają się więc rozłożyć na podmiot i orzeczenie. Z punktu widzenia składni semantycznej, konstrukcje typu "Des + rzeczownik + czasownik" można traktować jako predykaty semantyczne, których argumentami byłoby wyrażenie wskazujące, a kwantite w zdaniach lub domyślne.

Jerzy Adamko

Some Remarks on Tense and Aspect in Black English

A discussion of tense and aspect in Black English cannot be divorced from the background of Standard English which will serve as the basis of comparison between the two varieties. We shall therefore try first to summarize the status of tense and verbal aspect in Standard English.

On the problem of tense there seems to be little contention among linguists. Theoretical works recognize a two-way distinction of time relations in English: past and nonpast. On the formal plane the two are expressed by the -ed marker or root vowel change and by the verb base alone respectively.

Aspect involves a good deal more controversy. Some linguists raise the question whether aspect is an English grammatical category at all. Zandvoort 1962/. The contention arises because of different interpretations of the term aspect: a formal grammatical category or the type, the character, the mode of action. English has certainly no separate formal devices which would express aspect exclusively. This does not mean, though, that we should separate aspect from verbal forms altogether. Although some types of aspect like inception, iteration, termination or inchoation can be considered as part of the inherent meanings of some verbs /Friedrich 1974/, yet some other types are still marked with verbal forms. The problem should then perhaps be reversed: certain verbal forms in English express certain aspects.

Indeed, as we shall presently see, in their discussion of the English verb linguists distinguish aspects largely on the basis of verbal inflection.

Thus, Barbara Strang writes: "Aspect is any of the several

groups of forms in the conjugation of the verb which serve to indicate the manner in which "the action" denoted by the verb is considered as being carried out" /Strang 1968:143/. Strang recognizes two aspects in English: durative and perfective. Eva Edgren /1971:22-3/ names the following verbally marked aspects: perfectiveness which is expressed by the perfect form, duration which is expressed by the progressive form, and imminence. This last category is expressed by catenative verbs. Elizabeth Closs Traugott also distinguishes some aspects according to their manifestation in verb inflection or auxiliaries /1972:44/. The proposed categories are: distributive habitual, perfective and progressive. The perfective and progressive aspects have been also distinguished by others like Lyons /1968/, Palmer /1965/ or Quirk et al. /1972/ Palmer and Quirk recognize two sets of oppositions: progressive/non-progressive and perfect/non-perfect. Curme /1963/ introduces the progressive, terminate and point-of-action aspects, the last being divided into the ingressive and effective aspects. These are in fact differentiated by special verbs rather than by verbal inflection.

Joos /1964/, Twaddell /1960/ and Nelson Francis /1953/ discuss the perfective as under the heading of phase /current or simple versus perfect phase/. Joos distinguishes the generic /unmarked aspect expressed by the verb base and temporary aspect/be + -ing/. Francis recognizes the simple /verb base/ aspect and progressive /be + -ing/ and inchoative /set + -ing/ aspects.

Verkuyl /1971/, in his treatment of aspect in Dutch and in English, demonstrates that the two languages have the durative and some other aspects but these categories are shown to be expressed not by the verb alone, but by its combinations with other constituents of the sentence such as subject, object, prepositional adjunct etc.

As we can see, two aspectual types stand out from among those marked by verbal forms: the durative or progressive aspect and the perfective or perfect aspect. The two aspects are formally marked by be + VING and have + VEN respectively. For other types of aspect like habitual, effective etc. there are no formal devices in the English verb inflection. These latter categories have been mainly distinguished either on the basis of the meaning of some auxiliary verbs e.g. Francis' inchoative is determined by the inchoative meaning of set or on the basis of the accompanying adver-

bials of time e.g. whenever, again and again typically mark the habitual aspect.

In fact, even though progressive and perfect aspects are manifested in verbal inflection, the role of the accompanying temporal adverbs is greatly emphasized. Palmer points out that it is the choice of adverbial rather than verbal form that determines the type of aspect or tense /Palmer 1965:74-6/. E.C. Traugott insists that there must be least an underlying time adverbial associated with a given type of aspect /Traugott 1972:45, and Edgren 1971 and Dillion 1973/.

Paul Friedrich in his general discussion of aspect maintains that "aspect is always in part handled by a system of preverbs, auxiliaries or adverbial elements with linear or punctual meanings. Adverbial elements of this kind are part of the underlying verb phrase" /Friedrich 1974:54/.

The importance of adverbials for the meaning of verbal forms has been likewise stressed by Crystal. Verb form alone does not permit us to interpret it correctly. It can be interpreted only in collocation with adverbials: "the adverbial reinforces the verb's potential for referring in the general direction of a particular temporal aspect and specifies this aspect further" /Crystal 1966: 5/. Mary Gallagher goes even farther when she contends that tense in English is not a separate grammatical entity because it is predicted by adverbs of time which are themselves optional. Hence in the underlying structure verbs are tenseless. Tense is assigned to some verbs by an adverb of time, while verbs, for which adverbs of time have not been presupposed, assume the morphological indications of tense found in the preceding clauses. Such tenses are therefore not true tenses. /Gallagher 1970:220-21/ Gallagher rejects then Chomsky's rule that Aux-- Ta/W//have+en//be+ing/ and other models where tense is thought of as an obligatory constituent. Instead, adverbs of time will determine the morphological indications of tense, which are obligatorily marked on the surface. It follows logically from Gallagher's argument that aspect is also determined only by the underlying adverbs of time, that is neither the progressive nor the perfect appear in deep structure but are only obligatorily marked on the surface, having been predicted by temporal adverbials.

Such notions of tense and aspect seem to have explanatory value in dealing with Black English where tenses and aspects typical

ly co-occur with temporal adverbials which appear in Standard English. Unfortunately, the drawback of the proposal is that it introduces undue complexities. We would have to postulate obligatorily underlying adverbials that would predict tense and aspect. The immediate problem would be which adverbs predict which tense and aspect.

We shall therefore follow the models where tense and aspect appear in the underlying structure but we shall adopt the division into deep and surface or logical and formal tenses / Huddleston 1971/. Deep or logical tense and aspect exist in the underlying structure while surface or formal tenses and aspects represent the actual manifestations of the underlying structure on the surface. From the logical point of view, tense marking on the surface is redundant when time adverbials or other contexts presupposing temporal relations are present because these become the exponents of the logical /deep/ tense and aspect. This approach will prove valuable for our discussion of tense and aspect in Black English.

The problem of tense and aspect in Black English is itself part of the controversial issue whether Black English derives mainly from Standard English and shares the same underlying structure with it or the outward similarity is only superficial because the origins of Black English should be traced back to some West African languages, creoles and pidgins. Consequently, Black English has different deep structure from Standard English.

Those who espouse the latter view point to the Black English verbal categories as the area which evidences the difference between the two varieties. Of the works available to the author so far, the ones by Dillard /1973/ and Fickett /1972/ deal most extensively with the Black English verb.

Dillard contends that the difference between the verb in Standard English and Black English lies in the treatment of tense/aspect categories and in the types of aspect. Black English verbal forms are non-redundantly marked for tense which is an optional category. The Black English speaker may or may not mark the tense, the more so if the context gives the necessary time cues like temporal adverbs or verbal forms marked for tense. However, the rules of Black English require that the speaker should obligatorily mark the verb for aspect.

Dillard names the following aspects in Black English: momentary

/V/, progressive /Ving/, immediate perfective /done + V or Ven/ and remote perfective /been + V or Ven/. In the obligatoriness of aspect marking, the contrast between the perfective and remote perfective and in the use of done as an auxiliary Black English closely resembles creoles and West African languages / Dillard 1973:42-47/.

Fickett distinguishes three aspects: punctuative or momentary /V/, imperfect /Ving/, and perfect /Ven/, four relative past tenses and two future tenses. The tenses denote the degrees of past and futurity in relation to the present: Inceptive /do+V/, present /did+V/, recent /done+Ven/, present /beet+Ven/, immediate /a-V/, postimmediate /a-gonna + V/.

Both Dillard and Fickett and all other linguists dealing with Black English recognize a verbal form which is said to be clearly distinct from Standard English and to have a different underlying structure. This is the distributive be or the unconjugated form of be + Ving which expresses habitual distributive actions and typically occurs with adverbs of frequency. /Dillard 1973, Wolfram 1969 and 1971, Fasold 1972, Fickett 1972/.

Despite the claims of the differences on the deeper level between Standard and Black English, we shall attempt to demonstrate that at least some verbal categories in the two are reducible to the same underlying structure.

If we admit the notions of deep /logical/ and surface /formal/ tense and aspect, then the apparent lack of tense marking is only a surface phenomenon: in Standard English deep tenses are brought into the surface as formal or surface tenses. In Black English tense may be left formally unexpressed, the deep tense being preserved as far as on the surface. This is also the case with the tense/aspect combination in Standard and Black English. In the former, if aspect has been chosen along with tense, both must surmount in appropriate forms. In the latter the formal indication of tense can be omitted, only aspect must be marked. The difference will be that in Black English some aspect types can assume formal markers while their Standard English counterparts will not. Thus Ving can function as a finite form in Black English expressing aspect only, tense being signalled by the accompanying adverbials or other linguistic or extralinguistic context. In Standard English, Ving is also neutral with regard to tense, but in a finite

verb phrase it must appear with some formal tense marker. Conversely, the distributive habitual actions are not marked but with the adverbs of frequency in Standard English, whereas in Black English adverbs of frequency are actually redundant because the form of uninflected be + Ving expresses the distributive aspect sufficiently. In both Standard and Black English the distributive aspect appears then in the underlying structure. The difference is therefore one of the surface marking, which indeed is a problem. It is not clear why the expression of the distributive aspect in Black English should take on the form of the uninflected be + Ving, which bears a striking resemblance to the Standard English progressive aspect. It is difficult to offer a convincing explanation at this stage. Attention may be drawn to the fact that the progressive in Standard English expresses certain types of habitual actions. Also, in Old English and Middle English beg and weg were contrasted, beg being used with distributive meanings, and cases of beg with present participle which have distributive meanings can be found /Traugott 1972/. This cannot be pursued too far, though.

More of a problem are the forms done + V or Ven and been + V or Ven which express immediate and remote perfectives respectively. Although forms done + Ven can be found in dialects which could not have possibly been influenced by creolisms or pidgins /Traugott 1972/ there is no one-to-one correspondence between white nonstandard done + Ven which stands for the perfective in Standard English and done + Ven and been + Ven in Black English /Dillard 1973, Fickett 1972/.

The author has at present only scanty Black English material to offer conclusive statements on the relation between tense and aspect in Standard and Black English. It appears, though, that some directions for the form the analysis might take have been suggested.

Streszczenie

Artykuł wskazuje na pewne kierunki analizy czasu i aspektu w Black English /angielszczyzna murzynskiej w USA/ wobec Standard English. Różnice między kategoriami czasu i aspektu w obu tych odmianach angielszczyzny wydają się zachodzić tylko w strukturze powierchniowej. O ile w Standard English czas /sam lub w połączeniu z aspektem/ musi być formalnie wyróżzony w strukturze po-

wierchniowej, to w Black English formalne wyróżzenie w tej strukturze jest obligatoryjne tylko dla aspektu. Natomiast w Standard English aspekt bez wyznacznika czasowego nie może wystąpić w strukturze powierchniowej jako tzw. finite verb. Struktura głęboka jeśli chodzi o czas i aspekt wydaje się być identyczna dla Black i Standard English.

Abbreviations

V- verb base Ving- Present Participle Ven- Past Participle

References

Crystal, D. 1966: Specification and English Tenses, "Journal of Linguistics" 2.
 Curme, O.G. 1963: English Grammar, New York; Barnes and Noble.
 Dillard, J.L. 1973: Black English. Its History and Usage in the United States, New York-Toronto; Random House.
 Dillon, G.L. 1973: Perfect and Other Aspects in a Case Grammar of English, "Journal of Linguistics" 9.
 Edgren, E. 1971: Temporal Clauses in English, Uppsala; Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
 Fasold, W. 1972: Tense Marking in Black English, Arlington, Va.; CAL
 Fickett, J. 1972: Tense and Aspect in Black English, "Journal of English Linguistics" 6.
 Francis, W.N. 1958: The Structure of American English, New York; The Ronald Press Co.
 Friedrich, P. 1974: On Aspect Theory and Homeric Aspect, "International Journal of American Linguistics" 40.
 Gallagher, M. 1970: Adverbs of Time and Tense. Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting Chicago Linguistic Society. April 16-18, 1970.
 Huddleston, R.D. 1971: Five Categories of Tense. Foundations of Language.
 Joos, M. 1964: The English Verb. Form and Meaning, Madison and Milwaukee; The University of Wisconsin Press.
 Lyons, J. 1968: Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, Cambridge University Press.
 Palmer, F.R. 1965: A Linguistic Study of the English Verb, London; Longmans.

Quirk, R. et al. 1972: A Grammar of Contemporary English, London; Longmans.

Strang, B. 1968: Modern English Structure, London; Edward Arnold.

Longmans.

Traugott, E. C. 1972: A History of English Syntax, New York; Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Twaddell, W. F. 1960: The English Verb Auxiliaries, Providence, R.I. Verkuyl, H. . 1972: On the Compositional Nature of Aspects, Dordrecht; Reidel Publishing Co.

Wolfram, W. 1969: A Sociolinguistic description of Detroit Negro Speech, Washington, D.C.; CAL.

Zandvoort, R. 1962: Is Aspect an English Verbal Category, "Gothenburg Studies in English" 14.

LUBELSKIE MATERIAŁY NEOFILOLOGICZNE • 1976

Bogdan Szymanek

English Sentences Referring to Weather Conditions
in View of Comparative Evidence

English sentences referring to weather conditions and natural phenomena are treated by most linguists on a par with other sentences containing the formal it subject. The intention of this paper is to show the structural and semantic uniqueness of the sentences under examination, by relating them to comparative evidence adduced from several Indo-European languages.

Here are some examples of sentences of that kind:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1a. <u>It's</u> raining. | 1b. Rain is falling. |
| 2a. <u>It's</u> snowing. | 2b. Snow is falling. |
| 3a. <u>It's</u> sleeting. | 3b. Sleet is falling. |
| 4. <u>It's</u> hailing. | |
| 5. <u>It's</u> thundering. | |
| 6. <u>It's</u> lightning. | |
| 7. <u>It's</u> blowing. | |
| 8. <u>It's</u> dawnning. | |
| 9a. <u>It's</u> duskning. | 9b. <u>It's</u> getting dusk. |
| 10a. <u>It's</u> darkening. | 10b. <u>It's</u> getting dark. |
| 11. <u>It's</u> freezing. | |
| 12. <u>It's</u> thawing. | |

There are also derivative constructions such as:

13. It is going to rain.
14. It threatens to rain.
15. It stopped raining., etc.

In some of such sentences the formal it subject is followed by ((be) Adj) construction, eg.:

16. It is hot (cold, warm) today.
17. It is fine this afternoon.
18. It is dark when the evening comes.

The reason why the class of sentences referring to weather conditions