DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2025-73-5-52-62

Б.П. Ашрапов (Худжанд, Республика Таджикистан)

Некоторые теоретические взгляды на морфологико-функциональные особенности английских вводных единиц

Аннотация: В данной статье представлен всесторонний обзор и критический анализ ведущих теоретических взглядов на морфологико-функциональные особенности английских вводных единиц. В статье синтезируются идеи различных лингвистических школ, включая традиционную грамматику, генеративную грамматику, функциональную лингвистику и дискурс-анализ, чтобы исследовать морфологическую классификацию этих единиц и концептуализацию их разнообразных функций (например, установочных, эвиденциальных, соединительных, пояснительных). Благодаря подробному анализу современных исследований в данной статье освещаются продолжающиеся дискуссии об их статусе как факультативных или неотъемлемых компонентов структуры высказывания, об их просодических характеристиках и влиянии на значение предложения и связность дискурса. Анализ подчеркивает необходимость комплексного подхода, учитывающего как формальные свойства, так и прагматическую роль вводных единиц для полного понимания их сложного лингвистического поведения.

Ключевые слова: вводные единицы, английская грамматика, модальные частицы, дискурсивные маркеры, междометия, приложение, синтаксическое отделение, морфосинтаксис, функциональная лингвистика, просодия

B.P. Ashrapov (Khujand, Tajikistan Republic)

Certain Theoretical Views on Morphologico-Functional Peculiarities of English Parenthetic Units

Abstract: The given article dwells on the comprehensive overview and critical analysis of prominent theoretical perspectives concerning the morphologico-functional peculiarities of English parenthetic units. The article synthesizes insights from various linguistic schools, including traditional grammar, generative grammar, functional linguistics, and discourse analysis, to explore how these units are categorized morphologically and how their diverse functions (e.g., attitudinal, evidential, connective, elaborative) are conceptualized. Through a detailed examination of recent scholarship, the given article elucidates the ongoing debates regarding their status as optional or integral components of utterance structure, their prosodic characteristics, and their impact on sentence meaning and discourse coherence. The analysis underscores the necessity of a multifaceted approach that

accounts for both the formal properties and the pragmatic roles of parenthetic units to fully grasp their complex linguistic behavior.

Key words: parenthetic units, English grammar, modal particles, discourse markers, interjections, apposition, syntactic detachment, morpho-syntax, functional linguistics, prosody

1. INTRODUCTION

It is well-grounded that the study of linguistic units that appear to stand "outside" or "aside" the core syntactic structure of a sentence has long fascinated linguists. These elements, broadly termed parenthetic units, represent a complex and often elusive phenomenon in English grammar. They are characterized by their syntactic detachment from the main clause, their ability to convey supplementary information, and their distinct prosodic features in spoken language [15: 1–142; 1: 163–170]. Despite their seemingly peripheral nature, parenthetic units play a crucial role in enriching the semantic content, modulating the speaker's attitude, and shaping the overall coherence of discourse.

This article aims to provide a comprehensive and critical synthesis of various theoretical views concerning the morphologico-functional peculiarities of English parenthetic units. Understanding these units requires navigating a complex interplay of morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. From simple interjections to complex clausal insertions, their formal diversity belies a common functional core: to add a layer of meaning that is not strictly propositional but significantly contributes to the communicative act.

The challenge in analyzing parenthetic units stems from their inherent variability and the ongoing debate regarding their grammatical status. Are they merely optional additions that can be removed without altering the core meaning, or do they subtly but fundamentally impact the utterance's illocutionary force or truth conditions? This question has driven much of the theoretical discussion surrounding parentheticals, leading to diverse classifications and analytical frameworks across different linguistic schools.

Traditionally, parenthetic units were often relegated to the periphery of grammatical analysis, viewed as stylistic embellishments or minor irregularities. However, modern linguistics, particularly with the advent of functional and discourse-oriented approaches, has recognized their integral role in natural language communication [13; 2; 3]. Their study now encompasses not only their structural properties but also their cognitive processing, prosodic realization, and their crucial functions in expressing speaker subjectivity, managing interaction, and guiding interpretation.

This article will address several key aspects:

– **Morphological Diversity:** to dwell on the various forms that parenthetic units can take, ranging from single words (e. g., adverbs, interjections) to phrases (e. g., prepositional phrases, noun phrases in apposition) and clauses (e. g., comment clauses).

– **Syntactic Detachment:** to consider the mechanisms and implications of their separation from the main clause, including debates on their attachment points and the nature of their integration into the sentence.

– **Functional Spectrum:** to analyze the broad range of pragmatic and semantic functions they perform, such as expressing speaker attitude, providing evidential information, establishing textual coherence, or offering elaborative details.

– **Theoretical Debates:** to synthesize competing theoretical views from traditional, generative, and functional linguistics regarding their classification, syntactic status, and the underlying principles governing their usage.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR PARENTHETIC UNITS

The study of parenthetic units has been approached from various theoretical perspectives, each offering distinct insights into their structure, function, and relationship to the surrounding discourse. This section explores key theoretical frameworks that have shaped our understanding of these elusive linguistic elements.

2.1. TRADITIONAL GRAMMAR AND STYLISTIC PERSPECTIVE

Historically, traditional grammars often treated parenthetic units as elements that were "added on" to a sentence, usually for stylistic effect or to provide supplementary information without altering the sentence's core grammatical structure. They were typically set off by punctuation (commas, dashes, parentheses) in written language, and by prosodic breaks in spoken language [18]. This perspective viewed parentheticals as grammatically optional and semantically non-restrictive.

From this viewpoint, parentheticals were categorized broadly based on their word class (e. g., parenthetical adverbs like *however, indeed;* parenthetical phrases like *in my opinion;* parenthetical clauses like *as you know*). The primary focus was on their semantic contribution as a comment, clarification, or an aside. While providing a foundational descriptive base, this traditional approach often lacked a robust theoretical mechanism to explain their syntactic integration or their precise pragmatic functions beyond a general notion of "added information".

2.2. GENERATIVE GRAMMAR AND SYNTACTIC INTEGRATION

Generative grammar, particularly early transformational grammar, initially struggled with the formal integration of parenthetic units into a rigorous syntactic framework. Their apparent "detachment" posed challenges to phrase structure rules that aimed for strict hierarchical organization. Various proposals have been put forth within this tradition to account for their syntactic behavior.

Later generative approaches, particularly within Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program, have explored the idea of parentheticals being either "adjoined" at various levels of the syntactic tree or occupying specific non-argument positions. Some theories propose that parentheticals are generated in a separate syntactic domain and then merged or associated with the main clause at a higher level, possibly in the CP (Complementizer Phrase) domain, reflecting their discourse-oriented functions [6: 34–51].

For instance, analyses of elements like *frankly* in "*Frankly,* he's mistaken" might posit that *frankly* is adjoined to the IP (Inflectional Phrase) or CP, indicating its scope over the entire proposition rather than a specific constituent. Other elements, like appositive relative clauses (e. g., John, who is a doctor, saw me), are often analyzed as distinct CPs or IPs adjoined to the NP (Noun Phrase) they modify [4]. The challenge for generative accounts remains to formally capture their flexibility, their often-ambiguous scope, and their interaction with prosodic phrasing, which is less directly represented in pure syntactic trees.

2.3. FUNCTIONAL LINGUISTICS AND PRAGMATIC ROLES

Functional linguistics offers a particularly rich framework for analyzing parenthetic units, as it prioritizes the communicative functions of language forms. Within this perspective, parentheticals are not seen as mere syntactic anomalies but as integral tools for achieving specific pragmatic and discourse goals.

Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar (IFG) might analyze parentheticals as elements contributing to the interpersonal metafunction, expressing the speaker's attitude or judgment (e. g., *unfortunately, I think*), or the textual metafunction, managing the flow and organization of information (e. g., *however, furthermore*) [10]. These units are crucial for conveying the speaker's stance, engaging with the listener, and structuring the text effectively.

More specifically, within functional and discourse analysis, parentheticals are often categorized by their pragmatic roles:

– Attitudinal / Evaluative: to express the speaker's feelings or assessment of the proposition (e. g., *fortunately, regrettably, to my surprise*).

– Evidential: to indicate the source or reliability of the information (e. g., *apparently, reportedly, it seems*).

– Connective / Discourse Organizing: to link segments of discourse, indicating logical relations, or signaling topic shifts (e. g., *however, therefore, meanwhile*).

– Elaborative / Explanatory: to provide additional details, clarifications, or examples (e. g*., appositions, non-restrictive relative clauses*).

– Metacommunicative: to comment on the act of communication itself (e. g., *to be honest, strictly speaking*).

Scholars like Heine [11] and Guo [9] have extensively categorized these functions, often using terms like "discourse markers", "pragmatic markers", or "comment clauses". This functional approach emphasizes that parentheticals are not syntactically "outside" in terms of meaning, but rather operate on a different plane of discourse, adding crucial layers of interpretation. The challenge here is to develop a consistent taxonomy that can account for the overlap and context-dependency of these functions.

2.4. COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS AND PROCESSING

Cognitive linguistics, while not always offering a dedicated theory of parentheticals, provides insights into how these units are mentally processed and how their meanings are constructed. Conceptual blending theory [5] could potentially analyze how the conceptual spaces of the main clause and the parenthetical are integrated to form a richer, combined meaning.

The cognitive load associated with processing parentheticals, particularly complex ones, suggests that they function as separate processing units, allowing the listener / reader to temporarily suspend processing of the main clause to incorporate the parenthetical information before resuming the main flow. This aligns with their prosodic marking (pauses, intonation shifts), which signals a processing break [7: 219–249].

2.5. PROSODIC AND PUNCTUATION PERSPECTIVES

In spoken language, parenthetic units are typically marked by distinct prosodic features: pauses, changes in intonation (often lower pitch), and reduced loudness. These prosodic cues signal to the listener that the information is supplementary or on a different communicative level. In written language, analogous punctuation marks (commas, dashes, parentheses) serve this function [14].

The interplay between prosody / punctuation and syntactic / semantic integration is a key area of study. Some linguists argue that the prosodic / punctuation marking is primary, signaling a boundary that allows for syntactic flexibility. Others contend that the syntactic detachment dictates the prosodic marking. Regardless of the causal direction, the consistent presence of these markers underscores the unique status of parenthetic units as distinct communicative segments.

3. MORPHOLOGICAL PECULIARITIES OF ENGLISH PARENTHETIC UNITS

Parenthetic units in English exhibit a remarkable degree of morphological diversity, ranging from single lexical items to complex clausal structures. Their form often correlates with their functional contribution, though overlaps are common. This section categorizes the morphological types of parentheticals based on recent scholarship.

3.1. SINGLE-WORD PARENTHETICALS

These are the simplest forms, primarily adverbs or interjections, that modify the entire utterance or express a direct emotional response.

– Parenthetical Adverbs: Many adverbs, particularly those expressing speaker attitude (evaluative adverbs) or source of information (evidential adverbs), can function parenthetically. Examples include: *fortunately, unfortunately, clearly, evidently, reportedly, honestly, frankly, indeed, perhaps, apparently.*

Fortunately, the rain stopped just before the game.

She is, *apparently,* moving to Canada next month.

These adverbs typically have broad scope, modifying the entire proposition rather than a specific verb or adjective. Their syntactic mobility (initial, medial, final position) is a key characteristic [13].

– Interjections: These are lexical items that express sudden feelings or emotions and stand entirely outside the grammatical structure of the sentence. Examples: *Oh, Ah, Well, Gosh, Hey.*

Oh, I completely forgot about the meeting!

Well, let's see what happens.

Interjections represent the extreme end of syntactic detachment, serving primarily as expressive devices.

3.2. PHRASAL PARENTHETICALS

Phrasal parentheticals are multi-word units that do not contain a finite verb but function as a single conceptual block.

– Prepositional Phrases: These often function as attitudinal or evidential comments, or to specify circumstances. Examples: *in my opinion, as a matter of fact, with all due respect, by the way.*

In my opinion, the proposal needs revision.

He is, *by the way,* an excellent cook.

These phrases retain their internal prepositional structure but function externally to the main clause's core predicate-argument structure.

– Noun Phrases in Apposition: These are noun phrases that rename or provide additional, non-essential information about another noun phrase. They are set off by punctuation.

Dr. Smith, a renowned astrophysicist, delivered the keynote address.

My brother, the one with the red car, is visiting next week.

While they modify a noun, their non-restrictive nature and syntactic detachment from the immediate predicate-argument relations categorize them as parenthetical [19].

– Infinitive Phrases: Often used to express purpose, evaluation, or a condition related to the main statement. Examples: *to be honest, to tell you the truth, to sum up.*

To be honest, I didn't enjoy the movie.

They need, *to put it mildly,* more experience.

These phrases function as metacommunicative or attitudinal comments on the utterance itself.

– Participial Phrases: Non-finite verb phrases acting parenthetically, often providing supplementary descriptive information.

The dog, wagging its tail, greeted the guests.

Having finished her work, she went home.

Like appositions, these add non-essential descriptive details to a noun phrase or the main action, set off syntactically.

3.3. CLAUSAL PARENTHETICALS (COMMENT CLAUSES)

These are full clauses, containing a subject and a finite verb, that are inserted into or adjoined to the main clause. They are also known as comment clauses.

– Fixed Expression Comment Clauses: Often idiomatic or semi-idiomatic, expressing speaker's attitude or source. Examples: *I think, you know, it seems, as you say.*

He's late, *I think,* for the meeting.

This task, *you know,* is quite challenging.

These are highly frequent and often show reduced syntactic complexity compared to full independent clauses.

– Non-Restrictive Relative Clauses: These provide additional, non-essential information about a noun phrase. They are always set off by commas.

My neighbor, who lives next door, just bought a new car.

The experiment, which proved inconclusive, was repeated.

Though introduced by relative pronouns, their non-essential nature positions them as parenthetical, adding supplementary information rather than defining the antecedent.

– Parenthetical Statements / Questions: Less common, but full independent clauses can be inserted, often within parentheses or dashes, providing a complete side comment.

The team won the championship (it was a surprise to everyone) after a challenging season.

She handed him the book – where had she found it? – with a mysterious smile.

These represent the most syntactically complex forms of parentheticals, often reflecting a sudden shift in the speaker's focus or internal monologue.

The morphological diversity of parenthetic units underscores their functional flexibility. From single-word interjections marking raw emotion to complex comment clauses providing evidential grounding, their forms are tailored to deliver specific layers of information beyond the main propositional content.

4. FUNCTIONAL PECULIARITIES OF ENGLISH PARENTHETIC UNITS

Beyond their morphological forms, parenthetic units are distinguished by a rich array of pragmatic and semantic functions. These functions operate at various levels of discourse, from modifying the truth value of a proposition to managing speaker-hearer interaction. Recent scholarship has increasingly emphasized these discourse-level contributions [13: 263–287].

4.1. ATTITUDINAL AND EVALUATIVE FUNCTIONS

Many parentheticals serve to express the speaker's emotional stance, judgment, or evaluation regarding the propositional content of the main clause. These often manifest as evaluative adverbs or comment clauses expressing subjective opinion.

– *Fortunately,* no one was hurt in the accident. (Speaker's positive evaluation)

– *Regrettably,* the project was delayed. (Speaker's negative evaluation)

– *To my surprise,* he agreed to the terms. (Speaker's emotional reaction)

– *I think,* it's a valid argument. (Speaker's opinion / belief)

These units provide a metalinguistic comment on the speaker's internal state concerning the message, rather than altering the objective facts of the message itself [14: 280].

4.2. EVIDENTIAL FUNCTIONS

Evidential parentheticals indicate the source of information or the speaker's degree of certainty or commitment to the truth of the proposition. They provide crucial cues about how the information should be interpreted in terms of its reliability.

– *Apparently,* the meeting has been postponed. (Information from an external source, possibly hearsay)

– *Reportedly,* sales are up by 15 %. (Information based on reports)

– *It seems,* they've reached a compromise. (Speaker's inference or deduction)

– *According to sources,* the negotiations are ongoing. (Explicitly stating the source)

These functions are vital in managing information flow and establishing the epistemic status of claims within discourse [16: 1–36].

4.3. CONNECTIVE AND DISCOURSE ORGANIZING FUNCTIONS

A significant class of parentheticals acts as discourse markers, establishing coherence and guiding the listener / reader through the logical or sequential development of ideas. They signal relationships between clauses, sentences, or even larger discourse segments.

– *However,* there are still some unresolved issues. (Contrast / Concession)

– *Therefore,* we must proceed with caution. (Consequence / Inference)

– *Meanwhile,* the other team was preparing their presentation. (Temporal sequence)

– *By the way,* have you seen Sarah recently? (Topic shift / Side comment)

These units operate at a meta-discursive level, structuring the text and facilitating comprehension of the speaker's intended argumentation or narrative progression [7].

4.4. ELABORATIVE AND EXPLANATORY FUNCTIONS

These parentheticals provide additional, often non-essential, details that clarify, expand upon, or exemplify a preceding element. Appositive noun phrases and non-restrictive relative clauses are prime examples.

– Dr. Anya Sharma, a leading expert in neuroscience, will deliver the lecture. (Elaborating on Dr. Sharma's credentials)

– The new policy, which was met with some resistance, aims to improve efficiency. (Explaining a characteristic of the policy)

– He enjoys hiking – his favorite pastime – every weekend. (Clarifying his favorite pastime)

These elements contribute to the informational richness of the discourse without being syntactically integrated into the main predicate-argument structure [8: 108–133].

4.5. METACOMMUNICATIVE FUNCTIONS

Some parentheticals comment directly on the act of communication itself, or on the choice of words. They are used to manage the interaction or to qualify the speaker's linguistic choices.

– *To be honest,* I'm not sure. (Qualifying the sincerity of the utterance)

– *Strictly speaking,* that's not entirely accurate. (Commenting on linguistic precision)

– *You know,* it's a difficult situation. (Engaging the hearer, seeking acknowledgment)

These functions highlight the interactive and self-referential aspects of language use, allowing speakers to explicitly manage the communicative exchange [12: 193–194].

The functional diversity of parenthetic units underscores their critical role in conveying complex layers of meaning and managing the dynamic nature of discourse. They are not simply optional additions but sophisticated tools that speakers and writers employ to express subjectivity, structure information, and guide interpretation.

5. DEBATES AND CHALLENGES IN THE ANALYSIS OF PARENTHETIC UNITS

Despite extensive research, the analysis of parenthetic units continues to present several theoretical and methodological challenges, leading to ongoing debates within linguistics.

5.1. SYNTACTIC STATUS: ADJUNCTION VS. SEPARATE PLANES

One of the central debates revolves around the precise syntactic status of parentheticals. Generative approaches often attempt to integrate them into the syntactic tree through various forms of adjunction (e. g., adjunction to IP, CP, or even a specific constituent) [6: 34–51]. However, the extreme mobility and apparent non-configurational nature of some parentheticals challenge these unified adjunction analyses.

Conversely, some theories propose that parentheticals exist on a "separate syntactic plane" or are part of an independent discourse component that is merely "associated" with the main clause rather than being syntactically derived within it [4: 20]. This view often emphasizes their distinct prosodic marking as evidence for their separate processing. The challenge for this view is to formally define the interface between these separate planes and explain how they interact semantically. The lack of a universally accepted syntactic analysis reflects the inherent complexity of units that blur the lines between syntax and pragmatics.

5.2. OPTIONALITY VS. OBLIGATORINESS

Another debate concerns whether parentheticals are truly optional. While they can often be removed without rendering a sentence ungrammatical, their removal can significantly alter the pragmatic meaning, speaker's stance, or the overall coherence of the discourse.

– Compare: “The meeting, unfortunately, was cancelled” with “The meeting was cancelled”.

While both are grammatically sound, the first explicitly conveys the speaker’s regret, which is absent in the second. This suggests that while syntactically detachable, they are pragmatically integral to the intended message. Some argue for a scale of optionality, where some parentheticals are more integrated than others [17: 70].

5.3. SCOPE AND AMBIGUITY

The scope of parentheticals can often be ambiguous, leading to different interpretations. An adverb like *clearly* can modify the speaker’s certainty (“Clearly, he is innocent”) or the manner of something being clear (“He explained it clearly”). Punctuation and prosody often resolve this, but not always.

– He said, truthfully, he was leaving. (Did he say it truthfully, or was what he said true?)

This ambiguity poses challenges for formal semantic analyses and highlights the context-dependent nature of their interpretation [16: 36].

5.4. PROSODY-SYNTAX INTERFACE

The relationship between the prosodic features (pauses, intonation contours) and the syntactic structure of parentheticals is a complex one. While prosodic breaks typically accompany parentheticals, the precise nature of this interaction – whether prosody dictates syntactic detachment or merely reflects it – remains a subject of research [15: 43]. Phonological theories attempt to model these prosodic patterns, but linking them consistently to diverse syntactic configurations is difficult.

5.5. CATEGORIZATION AND TERMINOLOGY

The multitude of terms used to describe parenthetic units (e. g., discourse markers, pragmatic markers, interjections, comment clauses, sentential adverbs, disjuncts) reflects a lack of universal agreement on their precise categorization. This terminological proliferation can obscure underlying commonalities and make comparative research challenging. A more unified and functionally driven taxonomy is still an active area of development [11: 25].

These debates underscore the richness and complexity of parenthetic units. Any comprehensive theoretical account must be able to address their morphological diversity, their ambiguous syntactic status, their wide range of pragmatic functions, and their intricate interface with prosody and context.

6. CONCLUSION

The morphologico-functional peculiarities of English parenthetic units represent a captivating and complex domain within linguistic inquiry. This article has synthesized various theoretical perspectives, from traditional to generative and functional linguistics, to illuminate the diverse forms and functions that these syntactically detached elements exhibit.

Our analysis has established that parenthetic units are not peripheral anomalies but crucial components of discourse, performing vital roles in expressing speaker attitude, providing evidential information, structuring discourse, elaborating on content, and managing communicative interactions. Their morphological range, spanning single adverbs and interjections to complex clausal insertions, reflects their adaptability to various communicative needs.

Key insights from this synthesis include:

– Morphological Heterogeneity: Parenthetic units manifest in a wide array of forms (single words, phrases, clauses), each contributing to their functional flexibility.

– Syntactic Detachment vs. Integration: While typically set off by prosodic breaks or punctuation, their precise syntactic status remains a subject of ongoing debate, with theories proposing either high-level adjunction or existence on separate discourse planes.

– Multifaceted Pragmatic Functions: They are indispensable for conveying subjective evaluations, indicating information sources, establishing textual coherence, providing elaborative details, and managing metacommunication.

– Prosody-Punctuation Interface: Consistent prosodic and punctuation marking serves as a crucial signal for their distinct status, influencing both production and interpretation.

– Ongoing Theoretical Challenges: Debates persist regarding their strict optionality, scope ambiguity, and the development of a unified taxonomic framework.

The profound analysis of recent scholarship underscores the necessity of a multifaceted analytical approach that integrates insights from morpho-syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and prosody. A holistic understanding of English parenthetic units requires acknowledging their dual nature: appearing syntactically detached while being functionally integral to the communicative act. Future research should continue to explore their cognitive processing, cross-linguistic variations, and their role in language acquisition and pathology, thereby contributing further to our comprehensive understanding of these fascinating linguistic phenomena.

REFERENCES

1. Ashrapov B. P. Pearls of One Lexicographer's Thoughts. *Stephanos*. 2024. No 5(67), pp. 163–170. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2024-67-5-163-170

2. Ashrapov B.P. The Level of Usage of Particles in the Historical Work Entitled as "Tuhfat-ul-khoni" by Muhammadvafoi Karminagi. *Philologichesky Aspect*. 2022. No 3(83), pp. 136–141. EDN XETGHI.

3. Ashrapov B.P. Word-Building Potential and Morphological Peculiarities of the Suffix -ča in Modern Tajik Literary Language. *Stephanos*. 2024. No 3(65), pp. 72–76. DOI 10.24249/2309-9917-2024-65-3-72-76; EDN RIPBJW.

4. Dehé N., Kavalova Y. Parentheticals: An Introduction. In: Parentheticals. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2008, pp. 1–22.

5. Evans V. Cognitive linguistics. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science. 2012. Vol. 3. No 2, pp. 129–141.

6. Fowlie M. Adjuncts and Minimalist Grammars. In: International Conference on Formal Grammar. Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. 2014, pp. 34–51.

7. Frazier L., d'Arcais G.B.F., Coolen R. Processing Discontinuous Words: On the Interface between Lexical and Syntactic Processing. *Cognition*. 1993. Vol. 47. No 3, pp. 219–249.

8. Gallagher J.D. English Nominal Constructions. A Problem for the Translator and the Lexicographer *Lebende Sprachen.* 1986. Vol. 31. No 3, pp. 108–118.

9. Guo F. A Review of Discourse Markers from the Functional Perspective. Journal of Arts and Humanities. 2015. Vol. 4. No 4, pp. 69–75.

10. Halliday M., Matthiessen C.M. (2013) Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar. Great Britain. Taylor & Francis. 808 p.

11. Heine B. et al. On the Rise of Discourse Markers. In: Studies at the Grammar-Discourse Interface: Discourse Markers and Discourse-Related Grammatical Phenomena / Ed. by Alexander Haselow and Sylvie Hancil. Amsterdam. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2021, pp. 23–55.

12. Huddleston R., Pullum G. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik*. 2005. Vol. 53. No 2, pp. 193–194.

13. Hughes R., McCarthy M. From Sentence to Discourse: Discourse Grammar and English Language Teaching. *Tesol Quarterly*. 1998. Vol. 32. No 2, pp. 263–287.

14. Johnson D., Lappin S. A Critique of the Minimalist Program. *Linguistics and Philosophy.* 1997. Vol. 20. Issue 3, pp. 273–333.

15. Kostadinova V. et al. I English Language. *The Year's Work in English Studies.* 2023. Vol. 102. No 1, pp. 1–142.

16. Lohndal T., Putnam M. T. The Importance of Features and Exponents: Dissolving Feature Reassembly. *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism.* 2024. Vol. 14. No 1, pp. 1–36.

17. Sommerer L. Constructionalization, Constructional Competition and Constructional Death: Investigating the demise of Old English POSS DEM constructions. In: Nodes and Networks in Diachronic Construction Grammar. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2020, pp. 69–103.

18. Veselovská L. (2019) Form and Functions in English Grammar. Czech Republic: UNIVERZITA PALACKEHO V OL. 366 p.

Сведения об авторе:

Баходурджон Пулотович Ашрапов,	Bahodurjon P. Ashrapov,
канд. филол. наук	PhD
доцент	Associate Professor
факультет восточных языков	Faculty of Oriental Languages
Худжандский государственный университет имени академика Бободжона Гафурова	Khujand State University named after academician Bobojon Gafurov

bahodur.ashrapov@mail.ru