

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18454/RULB.2021.28.4.8>**СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЕ ОТНОШЕНИЯ, ВЫРАЖЕННЫЕ СОЮЗОМ «BUT»**

Научная статья

Безземельная О.А.^{1*}, Бурханова Е.В.²^{1,2} Уфимский юридический институт МВД России, Уфа, Россия

* Корреспондирующий автор (olesik_2009[at]mail.ru)

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматриваются семантические отношения, выраженные союзом “but”. Выбор этого союза не случаен, так как является одним из наиболее употребительных сочинительных союзов в английском языке и уходит корнями в древнеанглийский период. Адверсативный союз “but” образует прототипическое ядро семантико-синтаксического поля сочинительных связей. Этот союз, как показал анализ, может реализовывать как конвенциональные, так и ситуативные связи и отношения. Конвенциональные связи и отношения, актуализируемые этим союзом, производны от семантики дискурсного фрейма, который сформирован на базе соединительных сочинительных отношений. В адверсативном оформлении эти отношения манифестируются как уступительные, противительно-сопоставительные и другие.

Ключевые слова: контрарность, контрадикторность, concessивность, контраст, семантика «обманутого ожидания», адверсативный, сравнительный.

SEMANTIC RELATIONS EXPRESSED BY THE CONJUNCTION “BUT”

Research article

Bezzemelnaya O.A.^{1*}, Burkhanova E.V.²^{1,2} Ufa Law Institute of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, Ufa, Russia

* Corresponding author (olesik_2009[at]mail.ru)

Abstract

This article discusses the semantic relations expressed by conjunction “but”. The choice of this conjunction is not accidental, since it is one of the most common coordinative conjunctions in the English language and is dated back to the Old English period. The adversative conjunction “but” forms the prototypical core of the semantic-syntactic field of coordinative relations. This conjunction, as the analysis has shown, can realize both conventional and situational relations. The conventional relations actualized by this conjunction are derived from the semantics of the discourse frame, which is formed on the basis of coordinative conjunctive relations. In an adversarial form, these relations are manifested as concessive, adversative-contrastive and so on.

Keywords: contrary, contradictory, concessivity, the semantics of “contrary to expectations”, adversative, contrastive.

Introduction

The English coordinative conjunction “but” is one of the most common coordinative conjunctions. According to the information presented in The Oxford English Dictionary [9, P. 152], it was used in the language since the Old English period.

As a typical coordinative conjunction, through which opposition relations are realized in the language, “but” is positioned in all English grammars. So, Barkhudarov L.S. and D.A. Shteling in their “Grammar of the English language” [3, P. 192], along with copulative and disjunctive conjunctions, base conjunctions and resultative conjunctions, they also note the presence of adversative conjunctions in the language, realizing in speech the relationship of opposition between concepts. In addition to the “but”, the grammar authors also include the “yet” conjunction here. These conjunctions are more often used in literary art works, in which this means of communication provides the logic of the development of the narrative, the relationship, or, on the contrary, the delimitation of specific judgments. In this case, adversative conjunctions are similar in their functions to units such as *moreover*, *however*, *nevertheless*. The differentiated semantics of the coordinative conjunctions is considered in the grammar of B.A. Ilyish [4, P. 262]. According to author, the “but” conjunction has a clearly expressed unambiguous adversative semantics, which practically cannot be implemented in a sentence by other means. The same point of view on the meaning of the conjunction “but” is also shared by the group of authors of “Grammar of the English language” consisting of E.A. Korneeva, M.I. Ossovskaya, K.A. Guzeeva [6, P. 179]. However, they add that as an adversative, this conjunction can express the semantics of contrast or contradictory.

First of all, one should turn to the relationship of contrary, that is, comparison or contrast between judgments, in which the truth of the previous statement is not refuted by the next one. Contradictory (opposite) is a logical relationship between two simple comparable judgments, which excludes their simultaneous truth, but does not exclude their simultaneous falsehood.

The statements “all trees are red” and “no tree is red” are contrary statements, since both exclude each other, and the statement is “only some trees are red”.

The achievement of such an effect becomes possible due to the specific nature of contrary concepts, which are species of the same genus, however, one of them has certain characteristics, which the second does not deny, but instead they are replaced by others, contrasting. A situation arises when the semantics of contrary concepts includes extreme and mutually exclusive species characteristics, which, nevertheless, are conditioned and predetermining each other. The whole complex of contradictory concepts is in a relationship of contrary (Latin *contrarius* – opposite), that is, in relations arising between opposed or completely opposite statements in meaning (or concepts), the truth of which, like falsehood, cannot manifest itself simultaneously (if one thing is true, then the other is false). If the statement is known to be true, then, accordingly, the contrary

judgment will be false; however, the true falsity of a judgment does not imply a certain truth or falsity of a contrary statement, since it can be equally true or false.

It should also be noted that there is no general unity in the views of linguists on contrary relationship. So, V.N. Zhigadlo, I.P. Ivanova and L.L. Iofik define relations of this type as adversative-contrastive [10, P. 179]; R. Kwerk and S. Greenbaum include them in a number of contrastive ones, together with relations of contradictory [7, P. 217]; and the representative of London structuralism M.A.K. Halliday differentiates the relations of contrary, contradictory and concessivity and places them in the group of adversive relations [3, P. 152].

Contrary relations implement the semantics of comparative opposition, that is, the basis of a message that includes contrary is the presence of a difference or even contraposition in a pair of similar phenomena. At the same time, often the relations of contrary opposition, expressed by the conjunction under consideration, are combined with various kinds of conditionality relations, which will be discussed below.

Let's analyze the example below with the "but" conjunction:

The Richards were grown-up and old and don't count. But the Greys had some small children.

In this sentence, "but" acts as a means of communication between autonomous sentences, which, nevertheless, are in a relationship of contrary, the basis for which here is the presence of relations of antonymy, which are seen in the lexical content of the parts (*grown up* and *old* – on the one hand, and *children* – on another).

I went to work, but she went to the cinema.

I wish I could go but I am too busy.

Here is the contrastive conjunction is used to express the relations of opposition, inconsistency and difference.

The next type of relations of the contrary type, for the expression of which the conjunction "but" is used, are contrary-concessive. According to R. Lakoff, syntactic complexes containing relations of this type carry a certain hidden presupposition. Opportunities for the use of the conjunction "but" provides the compatibility between the functioning of the statement and the presupposition, and such examples are qualified by R. Lakoff as the denial of expectation "but" [8, P. 134].

Mercedes can go fast, but Opels are safe.

Mercedes can go fast, but Nick will never get a ticket for speeding.

In the first sentence, an oppositional meaning is realized through the conjunction but, since the characteristics of two cars are considered and compared here (Mercedes has one positive quality, Opel has another). In the second example, the semantic content of but is considered as "refuting the expected together with the presupposition and the conclusions that follow from it": 1. Nick is a Mercedes driver. 2. It is assumed that if you have the opportunity to go fast, then you will do so. 3. But in this case, you may also be subject to a fine for impermissibly exceeding the established speed limit.

Following him, the semantics of "contrary to expectations" in the conjunction "but" (the contrary-to-expectation "but") is also noted by another linguist L. Carlson [5, P. 277], and from his point of view, this is the most frequent meaning of this conjunction, it is synonymous meaning of the conjunction "yet" and can also be implemented using the words *although*, *despite*, which combine two fragments in a sentence. In our examples, the first part of the sentence includes an argument of an inductive nature, which is opposed to the semantic content of the second part, which is expressed by the word "but" with the semantics of "contrary to expectations".

1. *I love this, but I cannot afford it.*

2. *Ann is intelligent, but she is ugly.*

3. *He tried, but he failed.*

The whole set of the mentioned relations can be realized by means of a connection of this type, in which one can be realized through the other. Reverse causality is the inner essence of the concessive type of communication, it manifests itself in the fact that the first phenomenon, from which the non-verbalized second naturally follows, does not negate the third, which is opposed to the previous (second). The concessive meaning encloses the semantics of the previous fragment in a certain framework by recognizing the simultaneous existence of the opposite thought, action, fact along with what contradicts it, which has already been reported earlier. This is possible if in the subsequent fragment it is said about a changed condition, about some obstacle, or an amendment (counterargument, correction) is given here, causing doubts about the veracity of what is reported in the first part, or making it false at all. This, in our opinion, is the specificity of concessivity relations, distancing them from the relations of contrary and contradictory, we note, however, that the semantics of concessivity is closely interrelated with the oppositional relations, which also act in turn as an obligatory component of concessionary semantics.

Thus, the concessionary meaning can manifest itself only when comparing a pair of opposing facts or phenomena, and one of them will exist regardless of the degree of opposition of the other, but the judgment expressed in the second part will be opposite in meaning to what was a natural consequence of the first part.

Conclusion

All of the above allows us to conclude that there is a special complex of conditioning relations, expressed through the conjunction "but", which can be classified as contrary-causal.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Список литературы / References

1. Бархударов Л.С. Грамматика английского языка / Бархударов Л.С., Штелинг Д.А. – М.: Изд-во литературы на иностранных языках, 1959. – 340 с.
2. Голукович А.Е. Концессивность в английской языковой картине мира / Голукович А.Е. // Известия Тульского

государственного университета. Серия «Филологические науки». – 2006. – № 6. – С. 47-56.

3. Halliday, M.A.K. Cohesion in English. /M.A.K. Halliday, R. Hasan – London: Longman. 1976. – 290 p.
4. Ильиш Б.А. Строй современного английского языка / Ильиш Б.А. – Л.: Просвещение, 1971. – 367 с.
5. Карлсон Л. Соединительный союз BUT / Карлсон Л. // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. Вып. XVIII: Логический анализ естественного языка. – М., 1986. – С. 277-300.
6. Корнеева Е.А. Грамматика английского языка: Морфология. Синтаксис / Корнеева Е.А., Оссовская М.И., Гузеева К.А. – М.: Союз, 1999. – 348 с.
7. Кверк Р. Грамматика современного английского языка для университетов / Кверк Р., Гринбаум С., Лич Дж. и др. – М.: Высш. школа, 1982. – 391 с.
8. Lakoff R. Ifs, ands and buts about conjunction. – Studies in Linguistic Semantics (Ed. by Ch. Fillmore and D. Langendoen). / R. Lakoff – New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971. – P. 134–140.
9. The Oxford English Dictionary. – Oxford, 1933.
10. Жигadlo В.Н. Современный английский язык: Теоретический курс грамматики. / В.Н. Жигadlo, И.П. Иванова, Л.Л. Иофик– М.: Издательство литературы на иностранных языках, 1956. – 359 с.

Список литературы на английском / References in English

1. Barhudarov L.S. Grammatika anglijskogo yazyka / L.S. Barhudarov, D.A. Shteling. – М.: Izd-vo literatury na inostrannyh yazykah, 1959. – 340 p. [in Russian]
2. Golukovich A.E. Koncessivnost' v anglijskoj yazykovoju kartine mira / A.E. Golukovich // Izvestiya Tul'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya «Filologicheskie nauki». – 2006. – № 6. – P. 47–56. [in Russian]
3. Halliday, M.A.K. Cohesion in English. /M.A.K. Halliday, R. Hasan – London: Longman. 1976. – 290 p.
4. Il'sh B.A. Stroj sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka / B.A. Il'sh – L.: Prosveshchenie, 1971. – 367 p. [in Russian]
5. Karlson L. Soedinitel'nyj soyuz BUT / L. Karlson // Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike. Iss. XVIII: Logicheskij analiz estestvennogo yazyka. – М., 1986. – P. 277–300. [in Russian]
6. Korneeva E.A. Grammatika anglijskogo yazyka: Morfologiya. Sintaksis / E.A. Korneeva, M.I. Ossovskaya, K.A. Guzeeva. – М.: Soyuz, 1999. – 348 p. [in Russian]
7. Kverk R. Grammatika sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka dlya universitetov / R. Kverk, S. Grinbaum, Dzh. Lich et al. – М.: Vyssh. shkola, 1982. – 391 p. [in Russian]
8. Lakoff R. Ifs, ands and buts about conjunction. – Studies in Linguistic Semantics (Ed. by Ch. Fillmore and D. Langendoen). / R. Lakoff – New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971. – P. 134–140.
9. The Oxford English Dictionary. – Oxford, 1933.
10. Zhigadlo V.N. Sovremennyj anglijskij yazyk: Teoreticheskij kurs grammatiki / V.N. Zhigadlo, I.P. Ivanova, L.L. Iofik – М.: Izdatel'stvo literatury na inostrannyh yazykah, 1956. – 359 p. [in Russian]