

*Shabiyeva Aida*  
Baku Eurasian University

## STRUCTURAL AND PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF IMPERATIVE SENTENCES IN ENGLISH

*The purpose of the article is to provide a detailed definition of imperative sentence form as well as a thorough examination of the semantic and pragmatic elements of imperative sentences in current English.*

*Methodology and methods used: The following research methods were used, depending on the tasks: structural-semantic analysis, field analysis, component analysis of sentence structure, linguistic description, contextual and pragmalinguistic analysis, and contextual and pragmalinguistic analysis, all of which took into account the linguistic and pragmatic parameters of communication processes.*

*The main scientific innovation put forward: The significance of this study is that it is the first to use a cognitive-ontological approach to the study and construction of models of the semantic structures of motivating sentences-statements in English, as well as to identify the main parameters of speaker selection and their dependence on extralinguistic reality.*

*Imperative constructions are more closely associated with the communicative situation and participants in the speech act of communication, particularly with the addressee – the listener, than other structurally communicative types of sentences, and thus belong to the pragmatic sphere of the language. Furthermore, imperative sentences are a direct, implicit way of expressing a directive due to the linguistic non-conventional semantics of these types.*

*Research results: Imperative sentences are a part of the incentive system and a way for it to be expressed. The following are the primary models of imperative utterances in English that were discovered while studying on the structure of imperative utterances:*

- 1) *positive imperative negative imperative sentence;*
- 2) *emphatic imperative sentence;*
- 3) *imperative clause concerning let;*
- 4) *verbless imperative phrase;*
- 5) *negative imperative sentence;*

*The research found that imperative constructs don't need a second component (i.e. subject).*

*However, when it comes to two-part imperative formulations, the dilemma of whether or not to utilize the second composition arises.*

**Key words:** *imperative sentence, communicative types of sentences, pragmalinguistic analysis.*

**1. Introduction.** Imperative sentences are an important aspect of a person's speech output since they serve to manage social and productive activities. Linguists, on the other hand, were uninterested in the concept of motivation until the 1970s and 1980s. To begin with, this is owing to the fact that the conventional method predominated in the first half of the twentieth century: the most popular in linguistics were theories in which language was treated as a system largely independent of the speaker. Scientists were first and foremost concerned in the language's formal structure, rather than the difficulties of human language usage. The study of imperative phrases, which have a rather straightforward form, did not pique their interest.

**Main material.** Incentive sentences have traditionally been considered as imperative sentences

in numerous theoretical publications and descriptive grammars. The imperative, on the other hand, is one of the mood categories – a grammatical type in the verb system that reflects the speaker's perspective on the action's relationship to reality [1].

So, according to G. Sweet, mood is a grammatical category that acts as a link between the subject and the predicate, and the following are the basic moods in English: fact mood, or indicative mood; mood of thought (thought-mood), or subjunctive mood; and inclination of will (will-mood), or imperative mood [2; 3]. According to the linguist, the imperative mood, like most other moods, indicates the relationship between the subject and the predicate, but it pays particular attention to the mood of the will, exhortation, and call (hortation). The imperative is

more than simply a declaration of the order; it also directs it to someone else (the listener). As a result, the imperative mood is always connected with the second person; as a result, the imperative mood verb does not require the pronoun “you” to denote a person: Nevertheless, extra words in a phrase, such as pronouns, addresses, and others, might be utilized to draw the listener’s focus. For example:

“Drink, Sam!”

“Drink, you boys!”

According to O. Jespersen, the imperative generally belongs to the second individual, as seen by the following sentences.

“Oh, please, someone go in and tell her”

“And bring out my hat, somebody, will you?” (Dickens).

According to the scientist, the final version, in which the second person is specifically indicated in the extra phrase using the pronoun “you,” is very effective. Nevertheless, in English, the form of the verb does not specify which person is being referred to [2].

There is no imperative paradigm in the English language, according to the morphological method. Hence, only one imperative type of the “take” form can be recognized in English, which is given through an imperative verb. Nevertheless, as A.I. Smirnitsky points out, this form is hard to differentiate from others, such as the infinitive [4]. O. Jespersen further mentions the infinitive’s closeness to the imperative mood in English; however, he also mentions a comparable use in many languages, indicating that they are imperative mood forms (for example, in German, Danish, French, Latin, Greek) [2].

## II. Structural aspects of imperative sentences.

The imperative mood, as you may know, communicates a direct statement of will directed at the listener, that can also take the shape of an order, a request, a warning, and so on. As a result, the imperative mood, like the subjunctive, entails the expression of desire in its meaning. The imperative mood differs from the subjunctive mood in that it suggests the “immediate” realization of a wish, inquiry, or other request. At the same time, the action’s execution is not in dispute, but the subjunctive mood implies that the action will not be performed and that its implementation will be discussed [5].

Imperative formulations are the most prevalent way of expressing will in English. Imperative phrases, which have tremendous emotional and forceful potential, are commonly utilized in speaking and, as such, are an intriguing research topic.

Experts looked at the four problems while analyzing imperative sentences: what role do

imperative expressions play in the language system, what is its structure, and if imperative sentences are an expression of a certain mood. The reality that the imperative form exactly resembles the infinitive and the Present Indefinite form, varying only in the third person singular, as well as the system of forms of the verb “to be”, causes the conflicts.

As previously stated, contemporary language literature promotes the viewpoint that the imperative is not a distinct mood.

The imperative forms were established by pre-normative grammarians; nevertheless, academic grammar just characterizes rather than explains them. The imperative has a structure that is similar to the indicative and patterns of the Present Subjunctive, and in certain situations, the imperative may be thought of as an infinitive (O. Jespersen): *Do come! Don’t come! Take your seat, will you?* A.I. Smirnitsky, on the other hand, believes these forms to be homonymous. When comparing the negative forms of the imperative and the infinitive (Don’t be silent! ; To be or not to be!), as well as the non-equivalence of the meanings of the imperative and subjunctive moods (incitement and statement of an unreal action) and the absence of a subject, which is characteristic of the imperative, the difference between them becomes clear.

Scientists (V. V. Buzarov, G. P. Molchanova, L. S. Barkhudarov, D. A. Shteling) define imperative sentences as single-element sentences using the structural method. They frequently fall into the category of one-part sentences with a predicate group in this way. Simultaneously, the verbal portion of the imperative sentence lacks inflection and, as a result, grammatical verbal categories: there is no differentiation of verbal forms in time, and they do not vary in persons or numbers in the imperative.

According to some authors (V. V. Buzarov, M. P. Semenyuk, D. A. Shteling), the verbal element of an imperative sentence is a linguistic form of expressing the listener’s will and including intonation and paralinguistic methods of communication (a share, a steadfast or imploring face expression, a gesture, etc) [6]. The imperative, as a compelling word-sentence, expresses the will. Its fundamental, primary form undividedly communicates the drive.

J. Kerm broadens the imperative verb paradigm to include the perfect form of the imperative, which is employed to “...highlight the completeness of the action” [7].

“Have done with such anonsense” (= Stop immediately) [7].

In current English, however, this form is uncommon.

In his paradigm of imperative verb forms, R. Kwerk adds a passive form, which is constructed with the assistance of the auxiliary verbs “be” and “get”:

“Get wasted!” [8].

These constructs have a limited range of use; they are only present in a few steady phrases:

“Be prepared. Be seated. Be reassured by me” [9].

In the imperative mood, the author also points out that there is a continuing form of the verb in English:

“Be preparing the dinner when he comes in” [9].

When discussing the structural characteristics of imperative sentences, one cannot help but notice the occurrences of the subject, as well as the morphological ways in which it is expressed.

Because there are words in use that indicate the person executing the action, the authors’ assumptions concerning the presence of a subject in an imperative sentence appear to be quite compelling. These aspects are expressed morphologically in a variety of ways, including indefinite and personal pronouns. These elements can be given a topic definition in context of sentence members.

Many linguists, however, accept that most imperative phrases lack an unambiguous subject (V. V. Buzarov, L. S. Barkhudarov, D. A. Shteling, I. A. Smirnitsky, D. Bolinger, O. Jespersen and others).

The lack of a subject is the rule for imperative sentences, according to V.V. Buzarov therefore they can scarcely be assigned to the elliptical kind of phrases. Rather than being omitted, the unstated subject should be considered as inferred [9].

### III. Pragmatic aspects of imperative sentences.

There are different explanations of pragmatics in the linguistic literary works; however, there are no significant variations in the meaning of this theory because all explanations take into consideration the factor of language units’ consequences on the people taking part in the communication process (V. G. Gak, G. P. Grice, V. Z. Demyankov, and others).

“... one of the elements of the study of language, stressing and examining the parts of the language in their connection to the person or individuals who use the language,” according to O. S. Akhmanova’s dictionary of linguistic terminology [10].

R. S. Stolnaker characterizes pragmatics as “a study that analyzes the language in connection to people who use it” [11] while V.G. Gak explains pragmatics as “a science that represents the realities of language... in the form of life action” [12].

V. Z. Demyankov’s writings provide a more correct explanation of the phrase “pragmatics.” The author of the paper “Pragmatic Foundations of the

Interpretation of a Statement” compares pragmatics to “semantic application theory,” putting it beyond the bounds of grammar, i.e. adequate language competency. This pragmatics “explains the interplay of context with sentence construction, as shown in the explanation of the meaning of a speech under particular communication situations” [13].

The assignment of goals that pragmatics should fulfill, according to linguists, is one of the most contentious aspects of pragmatic analysis of language components.

As a result, N.D. Arutyunova thinks that pragmatics’ major goal is to provide norms for “interface of an utterance and context” [13].

The major practical objective of pragmatics, according to R. S. Stolnaker, is “uncovering the required and enough circumstances for the effective enforcement of a speech act” [11].

T.A.van Dijk proposes a number of difficulties that pragmatics should address, including:

1) determining the requirements for the effectiveness of a speech act;

2) determining what data is required to define speech actions; and

3) establishing relationships between utterances and other sorts of interaction.

There are studies in the scientific literature related to pragmatic problem-solving techniques. The work of H.P. communication, which corresponds to the agreed-upon aim and direction of the dialogue, is of particular interest [14]. The “principle of civility,” which is entirely related to language etiquette, is no less fundamental [15].

The idea of “illocutionary strength of the speech” is intimately tied to pragmatics’ second job. “Pragmatic comprehension is a succession of processes, the substance of which is the attribution of particular typical elements – illocutionary forces” (T. A. van Dijk) to communication participants’ speech, according to Teun A. van Dijk [16].

Furthermore, the third objective – “to form linkages between assertions” on the one hand, and “different sorts of communication” on the other – might be regarded “the sole objective of the pragmatic theory of language,” according to T. A. van Dyck, because it is only solved if the previous two goals are completed.

When it comes to pragmatics, academics focus on its interaction with semantics. Some writers (V. G. Gak, Z. Vendler, M. V. Nikitin, J. Austin, and others) claim that semantics is subjective, or that it becomes increasingly subject-oriented as a result of which it surpasses the conventional topic of pragmatics.

Linguists note a definite difficulty in making a distinction between semantics and pragmatics, based on the definitions of semantics as a scientific research that focuses on the interaction of a symbol to denotation and signification, and pragmatics as a science that takes into account the association between indications and their users.

M. V. Nikitin, for example, claims that semantics relates to the side of speech activity that generates symbolic analogues of the universe and serves to apply speech acts, i.e. that semantics essentially integrates with pragmatics, the part of speech activity that extends the world expressed by perception and language. The author gets to the assumption that semantics and pragmatics are not mutually incompatible sorts of interpretations [17].

One of the pragmatic challenges, as previously said, is to construct a typology of speaking acts. Many scholars (V. G. Gak, G. G. Pozeptsov, E. N. Starikova) have worked on this issue, but there is still no universal explanation of the many sorts of speech actions. The writers, on the other hand, separate pragmatic sorts of sentences based on their intent.

**IV. Conclusion.** Questions of labeling and the quantity of moods are still contentious in theoretical linguistics. The issues surrounding the categorical properties of the imperative have yet to be fully resolved. The imperative is traditionally classified as an autonomous form of verbal, alongside the indicative and subjunctive, as component of the mood category. However, the idea that the imperative is deprived the status of an autonomous categorical form has a certain spread throughout linguistics. We consider the imperative as a distinct grammatical category that conveys an action that is not accomplished at the time of utterance and obtains linguistic expression in imperative sentences as supporters of the conventional direction.

Most imperative sentences include the following structural features:

- the existence of a verb in the imperative mood;
- the customary (*albeit optional*) lack of a subject; and the possibility of using 2nd person singular pronouns;
- the specific production of negative forms with the use of the auxiliary verb “do” (even with the verb “be”) and, in some situations, the adverb “never”;
- the peculiar use of the nominal imperative with the verb “to be” and the adjective.

In terms of pragmatics, all imperative statements are classified as order to achieve the right on their communicative goal and expected reaction from the addressee. The main subtypes of directive sentences, particularly regarding:

- a) proposals expressing a request or request;
- b) sentences in which the impulse to coordinated efforts is expressed;
- c) imperative sentences with the meaning of prayer;
- d) offers-invitations;
- e) advisative – a proposal-advice, or recommendation, are distinguished by major differences in the strength of motivation and the level of obligatory or optional performance of an action.

Pragmatic transference is the usage of sentences in pragmatic roles that are atypical for them, and it is related with the transfer from one communication type to the next.

There is a significant correlation between the pragmatic and cognitive paradigms in modern scientific study. The need of experts to enhance traditional forensic linguistics with a definition of the cognitive processing, interpretation, and reproducing of speech has led to an outreach to the cognitive side of language unit study.

The idea of model is linked to the process of classification, or the assignment of one or more real-world objects to a category based on information about the world. As a result, categorisation is an attempt to portray the unknown via the familiar.

According to this notion, a category is more than simply a collection of units; it's a structure with a central component, known as the prototype, and additional members that link to it in various ways.

A prototype is defined as a set of reference samples that communicate our thoughts about real-world items.

According to the cognitive method, it is considered that the analyzed phrases serve as the primary way of verbalizing the idea of “will,” which has a prototype structure and is defined by the broad categorical definition of an enticement to execute an action.

According to the cognitive method, it is considered that the analyzed phrases serve as the primary way of verbalizing the idea of “will,” which has a prototype structure and is defined by the broad categorical meaning of an enticement to execute an action.

It's impossible to talk about the cognitive features of imperative sentences without mentioning concepts like the participants in the situation: agens, patiens, goal, instrument, locative, and so on, which are the actant parts of the predicate verbalized in the sentences under concern by the verb. As a result, the following part of the dissertation study is devoted to the examination of verbal predicates, which are the most common in motivational situations.

**Bibliography:**

1. Виноградов, В.В. Русский язык. Грамматическое учение о слове. М., 1947. 784 с.
2. Есперсен, О. Философия грамматики. М. : Издательство иностранной литературы, 1958. 400 с.
3. Sweet, H. A New English Grammar. Logical and Historical. Part I. Introduction, Phonology, and Accidence. Oxford : The Clarendon Press, 1900. 500 p.
4. Смирницкий, А.И: Морфология английского языка. М. : Литература на иностранных языках, 1959. 440 с.
5. Бурлакова, В.В. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка / В.В. Бурлакова. Л. : Изд-во Ленингр. ун-та, 1983. 253 с.
6. Семенюк, М.П. Категория императива в английском и русском языках. *Сопоставительное исследование грамматических категорий*. Свердловск, 1985. С. 27–33.
7. Curme, G. Parts of Speech and Accidence. Boston : D.C. Heath and company, 1935. 370 p.
8. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech G., Svartvik, J.A. A University Grammar of English. М., 1982. 392 p.
9. Buzarov, V.V. Essentials of Conversational English Syntax. М., 1981. P. 58–67.
10. Ахманова, О.С. Словарь лингвистических терминов. М., 1966. 606 с.
11. Столнейкер, Р.С. Прагматика. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М. : Прогресс, 1985. Вып. 16. С. 105–129.
12. Гак, В.Г. Прагматика, узус и грамматика речи. *Иностр. яз. вивк.* 1982. № 5. С. 11–17.
13. Демьянков, В.З. Прагматические основы интерпретации высказывания. *Известия РАН Сер. Литературы и языка*. 1981. Т. 4. № 4. С. 368–377.
14. Грайс, Г.П. Логика и речевое общение. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М. : Прогресс, 1985. Вып. 16. С. 217–239.
15. Лич, Д., Свартвик Е. Коммуникативная грамматика английского языка. М. : Просвещение, 1983. 304 с.
16. Дейк, ван Т. А. Вопросы прагматика текста. Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. М. : Прогресс, 1978. Вып. 8. С. 229–236.
17. Никитин, М.В. Заметки к теории речевых актов. *Проблемы лингвистического описания разноуровневых языковых единиц*. Межвузовский сборник научных трудов. Уссурийск, 1998. С. 4–22.

### **Шабієва А. СТРУКТУРНО-ПРАГМАТИЧНІ АСПЕКТИ ІМПЕРАТИВНИХ ПРОПОЗИЦІЙ В АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ**

*Мета статті – є багатостороннє представлення структури наказових речень, а також багатостороннє дослідження смислової та прагматичної країв наказових речень у сучасній англійській мові.*

*Використані методологія та методи: Залежно від поставлених завдань використовувалися такі методи дослідження: метод лінгвістичного опису, метод компонентного аналізу структури речення, метод структурно-семантичного аналізу, метод польового аналізу, а також методи контекстуального та прагмалінгвістичного аналізу, що враховують мовні та прагматичні параметри процесів спілкування .*

*Залежно від поставлених проблем використовувалися належні методи дослідження: метод мовознавчого опису, метод компонентного аналізу текстури пропозиції, метод структурно-семантичного аналізу, спосіб польового аналізу, також методи контекстуального і прагмалінгвістичного аналізу, що враховують мовні та прагматичні норми процесів спілкування.*

*Основне висунуте наукове нововведення: цього дослідження полягає в тому, що в ньому вперше застосовується когнітивно-онтологічний підхід до дослідження та побудови моделей семантичних структур спонукальних пропозицій-висловлювань в англійській мові, а також виявлення їх основних параметрів відбору мовцем та їх залежності від екстралінгвістичної реальності.*

*Стан наказових систем до прагматичної сфери мови визначено тим, що цей характер речень більшою мірою, ніж інші комунікативні види речень поєднані з комунікативною обстановкою та співучасниками мовного акту спілкування, особлива з адресатом – слухачом. Крім того, наказовий речення являє собою прямий, імпліцитний засіб формулювання директивної вказівки, що обумовлено мовною конвенційною семантикою даних форм.*

*Результати дослідження: Імперативні пропозиції входять до системи спонукальності і є засобом її вираження. У процесі роботи над структурою імперативних висловлювань було встановлено, що основними моделями імперативних висловлювань англійською є такі:*

- 1) ствердна форма імперативної пропозиції;
- 2) негативно-імперативна пропозиція;

- 3) імперативна пропозиція про *let*;
- 4) бездієслівна імперативна пропозиція;
- 5) емпатична імперативна пропозиція.

Дослідження показало, що імперативні конструкції не обов'язково повинні включати другий компонент (тобто підлягає).

Однак питання про вживання другого складу також має місце, і двоскладові імперативні конструкції є винятками.

**Ключові слова:** спонукальні пропозиції, імперативні конструкції, структурно-семантичний аналіз.