

NEW APPROACHES TO SCIENTIFIC THEORETICAL IDEAS ABOUT THE PART OF SPEECH CALLED "PARTICLE" IN MODERN ENGLISH

Nuriyeva S.

*Doctor of Philosophy in Philological Sciences, associate professor
Azerbaijan University of Languages, Department of English Grammar
(Orcid id: 0000-0002-8366-8019)
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14577672>*

Abstract

The article deals with "The Particle" that has gained status as a structural part of speech in modern English, its research, and different approaches of linguists to it. For the first time, the researcher, acting from a different position, tries to clarify the question of whether "Particle" is a structural or a free part of speech, and in this matter, the author relies on the Azerbaijani linguist O.I. Musayev's classification of parts of speech. He classifies parts of speech into notional (main), structural (functional) and free (independent) parts of speech. [O.I. Musayev, 2009, p.9] In this paper "Particle" is determined as a free part of speech, not as a structural part of speech. Besides it, unlike other grammarians, the researcher considers "The Particle" one of the ways of expressing modality. She bases on the fact that this part of speech emotionally emphasizes the word it belongs to in the sentence and expresses more modality. "The particle" is analyzed according to the following characteristics, which are the basis for the classification of parts of speech.

1. lexical-grammatical meaning
2. grammatical category
3. right-hand and left-combinability with words in a sentence
4. syntactic function
5. morphological characteristics (elements that make up the foundation)
6. its place in the word order;

In order to determine which group of parts of speech the particle belongs to, different classifications of parts of speech given by well-known scientists are addressed. As a result, for the first time in linguistics, "The Particle" is included among free speech parts.

Another main point of the article is the analysis and justification of 'The Particle' as a means of expression of the category of modality. This opinion is supported by the evidence substantiated by the researcher. The researcher notes that 'Particle' like interjections and modal words also express modality. He emphasizes that negative sentences express negative modality by means of the negative particles "no" and "not". According to him, if exclamatory sentences express exclamatory modality, negative particles are also a means of creating negative modality. In the article, referring to the opinions of linguists conducting research on "The Particle", the attitude is reported and the results are systematized.

Keywords: particle, modality, free part of speech, functional part of speech, grammatical category, grammatical function

The main purpose of writing this article is to determine whether "The Particle" is a main, structural (functional) or free part of speech. In modern linguistics, linguists, namely B.S. Khaymovich and B.I. Rorogovskaya, M.A. Ganshina, N.M. Vasilyevskaya, V.L. Kaushanskaya, R.L. Kovner, N.A. Kobrina, I.P. Ivanova, V.V. Burlakova, G.G. Pocheptsova, L.S. Barkhudarov, D.A. Shteling, O.I. Musayev and others consider "The Particle" as a structural part of speech. [8;2;7;9;13;7;11;5;10]

Hajiye E.I. considers the particle as a structural part of speech basing on the classification of parts of speech given by the Azerbaijani Germanologist Musayev O.I. His classification bases on traditional criteria, i.e., form, meaning and function. Hajiye E.I. writes about this: "O.I. Musayev's classification is more appropriate and logical to the nature of language and its function. We also recognize that there are four auxiliary parts of speech in modern English. Those parts of speech are articles, prepositions, conjunctions and adverbs. [E.I.Hajiye 2006, p.26] Unlike E.I.Hajiye, we think that according to the principles of classification

of parts of speech (based on the classification of B.S. Khaymovich and B.I. Rorogovskaya), "The Particle" should be considered a free part of speech.

In the classification given by some linguists regarding the division of parts of speech, no information is given about "The Particle". For example, E.M. Gordon and I.P. Krylova in the book "A Grammar of Present Day English" divide the parts of speech into main and structural parts of speech. The book says: "The following parts of speech are to be treated as structural words: articles, prepositions and conjunctions." (The following parts of speech are structural parts of speech: article, preposition, conjunction) Apparently, "The Particle" is not among these parts of speech [E.M. Gordon 1986, p. 10].

Azerbaijani linguists O.I.Musayev, A.R.Rzayev, E.I.Hajiye also gave "Modal words" and "The Interjection" as free of parts speech in the book "A Practical Grammar of Contemporary English". "The Particle" is given as a structural part of speech. [O.I.Musayev, 2009, p.10]

E.I. Hajiyeu accepts the classification of parts of speech given by O.I. Musayev based on traditional criteria (meaning, form and function) without making any changes in his monograph "Functional-semantic characteristics of structural parts of speech in modern English and Azerbaijani languages". In this classification, The Particle is given as one of the structural parts of speech. [E.I.Hajiyeu 2006, p. 26]

In our opinion, in order to make a more correct decision, it is necessary to choose a more acceptable classification of speech parts. Scientific-theoretical opinions about the classification of parts of speech in world linguistics are diverse and controversial. If we summarize the results obtained during the conducted research, then we will see that three important problems attract attention in the classification of parts of speech:

1. The variety of criteria used in the classification of parts of speech. For example, a word's meaning, morphological feature, syntactic function, word order position in a sentence, related words, grammatical categories, answering any question, etc. Note that not all linguists consider all of these features when classifying parts of speech.

2. Type of speech parts: main, structural and free. By the way, it should be noted that the term free speech parts was first reflected in the original classification given by the Azerbaijani linguist O.I. Musayev.

3. The number of main, auxiliary and free speech parts separately.

It goes without saying that we have to pay special attention to the above-mentioned nuances, because the opinions of linguists about "The Particle" are completely different and controversial.

In our opinion, when emphasizing whether any part of speech is the main, auxiliary or free part of speech, it is absolutely necessary to be based on correct scientific theoretical principles and provisions. Considering this point, the explanations and comments given by A.R. Rzayev in his work entitled "Collection of Lectures on Theoretical Grammar of the English Language" can be considered acceptable. According to A.R. the words having an independent communicative function as well as being independent sentence members are notional parts of speech. [Hüseynov A.R., 2015, p. 21].

It would be good if the researcher paid particular attention to the fact that the notional parts of speech have grammatical categories, because the grammatical category is the main criterion that shows that each word has a grammatical meaning, along with the grammatical form. Grammatical category is one of the main factors that distinguish the notional part of speech from that of the structural part of speech.

A.R. Rzayev evaluates structural parts of speech as follows: "Other parts are words, for example, article, preposition, conjunction etc. since they do not have an independent nominative meaning, it cannot be an independent member in a sentence. These words that exist in the language are called structural parts of speech [Rzayev A.R. 2015., p.21] . O.I. Musayev emphasizes that structural parts of speech do not have free lexical meaning and independent syntactic function. It is diffi-

cult to agree with the opinions of both linguists. For example, both linguists consider the preposition to be a structural part of speech and emphasize that it has no lexical meaning. In our opinion, each lexeme reflected in the dictionary has a lexical meaning. For example, on the table, at the table, under the table, etc. What is said about a prepositional noun phrase can also be said about another part of speech-conjunction, for example, conjunctions such as "but" and "and" or "or" that connect the parts of a complex sentence differ precisely according to their lexical meaning. For this reason, in order to distinguish the notional parts of speech from structural parts of speech, their grammatical features should be taken into account.

O. Jespersen used the term "Particle" in "The Philosophy of Grammar". He notes that adverb, preposition, conjunction and interjection are presented as four different parts of speech. This leads to their being in the same situation as nouns, adjectives, pronouns and verbs. In this case, the dissimilarities between these parts of speech are exaggerated and the similarities remain in the shadows. O. Jespersen suggests that the term "Particles" used in the past should be re-applied and include adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections. [O. Jespersen, 2006, pp. 87-90]

It turns out that the term "particles" was previously included in the order of various parts of speech in linguistics. However, we cannot agree with it, because those parts of speech are completely different in terms of meaning, function, and form, and it is impossible to attribute them to one group.

Basing on the traditional method Ilyish B.A. like Jespersen O. classifies words in terms of meaning, form and function. Khaymovich B.S. and Rorogovskaya B.I. gave fourteen parts of speech in their classification, and one of them is "The Particle". [Khaymovich B.S., 1967, p.38] Ganshina M. and Vasilievskaya N. also classified "The particle" as a structural part of speech in their classification. [Ganshina M. and Vasilievskaya N., 1964, p.12] .

Kobrina N.A. differs from other linguists by classifying the article together with the noun, but like other linguists he adds "The Particle" in the list of secondary parts of speech. [Kobrina N.A. 1985, p.5]

Barkhudarov L.S. and Shtelling D.A. also accepts "The Particle" as a secondary part of speech [Barkhudarov L.S., 1965, p. 272-273]

Musayev O.I., E.I. Hajiyeu, Huseynov A.R. present the "The Particle" as a secondary part of speech in the book "A Practical Grammar of Contemporary English", but differing from other linguists, they talk about its being homonymous with other parts of speech in the sentence and determine its position in the sentence according to the order of words. [Musayev O.I., 2009, p. 282-285] The following examples are from that book:

I **simply** don't understand you.

(The particle, emphasizes the meaning of the verb in the negative)

He did it quite **simple**.

(The adverb, expresses the manner of the action.)

Based on the above data, we can note that "The Particle" does not belong to the order of structural parts of speech. It can be considered a free part of speech.

The Particle is a part of speech that is mainly used to express an idea in an emphatic way and therefore expresses modality. It is no coincidence that Musayev O. classifies parts of speech into three groups: notional, structural and free part of speech. According to him modal words and interjection are free parts speech because they don't have grammatical categories, no syntactical function, negative left-hand and right-hand combinability with other parts of speech and they don't answer any questions. It should be mentioned that they both express modality and therefore they are considered to be the ways of expressing modality in linguistics. For this reason, Musayev O. names them free part of speech. The thing is "The Particle" has the features coinciding with the above-mentioned parts of speech. (Interjection and modal words) that is why we think we will not make a mistake if we include "The Particle" in the list of free parts of speech. For example,

He is young, **too**.

In this sentence, **too** is **a particle** and expresses affirmative modality. It comes at the end, is separated by a comma, does not become part of a sentence, does not answer a question, does not express any grammatical category, does not depend on any part of a sentence, it is free.

Note that particles can be removed from the sentence without violating the meaning of the sentence. One can find a lot of examples referring to it. [Musayev O., 2009, p.284]

Cf. **Only** you could do a thing like that. You could do a thing like that.

He **only** had six apples. He had six apples.

He **only** tapes the car. He tapes the car.

He lent the car to me **only**. He lent the car to me only.

Now let's take a look at the sentences in which "just" is used as a particle. For example,

Cf. Wasn't that **just** beautiful? Wasn't that beautiful?

The man lives **just** around the corner. The man lives round the corner.

She said **just** what she thought. She said what she thought.

In V.L. Kaushanskaya's classification of parts of speech, "The Particle" is given as a structural part of speech. [V.L. Kaushanskaya, p.13] It is interesting, based on what criteria these linguists assign "The Particle" as a structural part of speech. In the definition of structural parts of speech, V.L. Kaushanskaya emphasizes that structural parts of speech create a connection between words and sentences or emphasize the meaning of words or sentences. [V.L. Kaushanskaya, 1973, p.13] From the definition, it can be understood that "The Particle" emphasizes the meaning of words or sentences and conveys the idea expressed by the speaker to the listener in a more emotional way. [V.L. Kaushanskaya, 1973, p.219]

You can do **exactly** the same.

On Wikipedia, mutiny is described as a conspiracy among a group of people to openly oppose, change, or overthrow an authority to which they are subject, which is exactly what we are looking for, [V.L. Kaushanskaya, 1973, p.81]

The particle comes next to the word it belongs to, so it doesn't have a fixed place. For example, in the examples the particle "only" is used to emphasize the word it belongs to more prominently.

We **only** wish there was a real horse here for me to race with.

We can **only** do so much.

Only I noticed her standing in the door.

She is only thirteen years old.

We ate only the plainest food.

The particle "only" can be removed from each of these sentences, and the grammatical and lexical meaning of the sentences will not be violated. It indicates that "The particle" is a free part of speech.

Another disputable question about 'The Particle' is the different definitions given to it by various linguists. One of those definitions states: "A particle is a word that has a grammatical function but does not fit into the main parts of speech (i.e. noun, verb, adverb). Particles don't change." We also fully agree with the fact that "The Particle" is not the main part of speech and do not undergo any morphological changes. But what does the author mean by the grammatical function of "The Particle"? The researcher left this question unanswered. It is difficult to fully agree with this idea. [14]

E.I. Musayev in his monograph "Functional-semantic characteristics of structural parts of speech in modern English and Azerbaijani languages" gives the following definition of the particle: "particles don't have the function of naming, but they are used by the speaker to highlight any member of the sentence, to highlight that member, to give it additional emotional meaning." [Hacıyev E.İ. 2006, p. 82, 83] We also agree with this idea and come to the conclusion that the function of "The Particle" is to give different shades of meaning to a word or a sentence, to strengthen it.

In B.S. Khaimovich and Rogovskaya's book "A Course in English Grammar", "The Particle" is given as a part of speech expressing emphatic, one-way connection with various words, not having any grammatical category, not belonging to typical morphological features. [B.S. Khaimovich, 1967, p. 217]

It is known that since the English language has an analytical structure, the word order is the main factor in the formation of the meaning of the sentence. Changing the place of words can cause a change or distortion of the meaning. But does changing the place of particles in a sentence change the meaning of the sentence? The Particle, considered by most linguists as a "structural part of speech", is used to emotionally express the member of the sentence to which it belongs, and expresses modality to one degree or another, almost no different than exclamatory and modal words.

The speaker uses particles when he wants to express any word in a different way, in an emotional or emphatic form. For this reason, changing the place of particles does not cause a violation of the meaning in the sentence, but simply serves to increase the effectiveness of the word used next to the adverb, that is, to express it in a more emphatic way.

As a result, we can say that the place of free parts speech in the sentence is free. They have no syntactic

function in the sentence. It doesn't answer any questions. It does not have a grammatical category. Particle has all these features, emphasizes the word it belongs to, attracts the listener's attention to it, and restores modality. Particles can be removed from a sentence without affecting its meaning. All these characteristic features show that "The particle" can be included in the list of free parts of speech.

Thus, if we compare the free parts of speech- the interjection and modal words with the Particle, it turns out that all three of them have the same characteristics. Thus, "The Particle" is a free part of speech. For having the meaning of modality, we think "The Particle" should be added to the list of means of expression of the category of modality. In that case the list of ways of expressing modality will cover the followings: the category of mood of the verb, modal verbs, modal words, interjection, intonation and particle.

References:

1. Blokh M.Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. M., «Высшая школа» 2006, 421 p.
2. Ganshina M.A., Vasilyevskaya N.M. English Grammar. Moscow, Higher School Publishing House, 1964, 548 p.
3. Gordon E.M., Krylova I.P. A Grammar of Present-Day English. Москва «Высшая школа» 1986, 429 с.
4. Hacıyev E.İ. Müasir ingilis və Azərbaycan dillərində köməkçi nitq hissələrinin funksional-semantik xüsusiyyətləri. Bakı: Mütərcim, 2006, 272 s.
5. Hüseynov A.R. İngilis dilinin nəzəri qrammatikası üzrə mühazirələr toplusu. Bakı, "Mütərcim, 2015, 376 s.
6. Ilyish B.A. The Structure of Modern English, Leningrad: Prosveshcheniye, 1971, 363 p.
7. Kaushanskaya V.L. et al. A Grammar of the English Language. Leningrad: Prosveshcheniye, 1973, 319 p.
8. Khaimovich B.S., Rogovskaya B.I. A Course in English Grammar. Москва, Высшая школа, 1967, 298 p.
9. Kobrina N.A., et al. An English Grammar. Morphology. Moscow, Prosveshcheniye, 1985, 288 p.
10. Musayev O.I., E.İ.Hacıyev, Hüseynov A.R. "A Practical Grammar a of Contemporary English. Bakı, Qismət, 2009, 552 s.
11. Jespersen O. The Philosophy of Grammar. Routledge, October16, 2006. 362 p.
12. Sam Connif Allende. Be More Pirate. Portpolio Penguin Random House. UK. 2018, 306 p.
13. Бархударов Л.С. Штеллинг Д.А. Грамматика Английского языка. М., «Высшая школа» 1965, 423 p.
14. <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/professional-development/teachers/knowning-subject-np/particle>