Publishing House "ANALITIKA RODIS" (analitikarodis@yandex.ru) http://publishing-vak.ru/

Syntactic peculiarities of English texts
on aviation

Anna V. Mel'dianova

PhD in Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor of Department of Linguistics and Translation,
Moscow Aviation Institute
(National Research University),
125993, 4 Volokolamskoe hwy, Moscow, Russian Federation;
e-mail: meldianova_av@mail.ru

Abstract

In the article complex sentences are analyzed from different aspects, the main types of subordinate clauses in English aviations texts are considered on the basis of numerical analysis, the most prevalent structural types of complex sentences, which cause certain problems during the process of translation, are pointed out. The main difference between a simple and a composite sentence is revealed in the article. It consists in considering a simple sentence a monopredicative unit, characterized by one "noun-predicate" structure; and a complex sentence a polypredicative unit with more than one predication. The difference between these two types of sentences is shown in the article from formal and communicative points of view. The most prevalent types of complex sentences in modern English aviation texts are distinguished on the basis of a detailed analysis of articles on aviation subjects. Among mostly used complex structures are those with attributive relative limiting clauses, object clauses and adverbial clauses of reason and condition. In the article the recommendations how to translate multiple sentences, that may contain two or more independent clauses and two or more dependent clauses, are given, which can make the process of translation of complicated structures much easier.

Introduction

Lately the problem of the syntactic structure of English composite sentences has been drawing attention of many researchers. Among issues requiring detailed research are the questions of considering a composite sentence a separate unit of syntax and the questions of connection between the components of such a sentence. At the current stage of the language development subordinate constructions, their meaning and place are in the centre of attention of scholars from all over the world.

The need to communicate and express complicated ideas led to the formation in the language specific syntactic structures, consisting of several units. These syntactic formations are traditionally called composite sentences. A composite sentence usually consists of several simple sentences, expressing one complex or elaborate idea.

Composite sentence

Though the composite sentence is the fundamental unit of syntax, the term is hard to define. The intensive study of a composite sentence started in the first half of the 20th century. Scientists suggested different terms to define the notion. In general by a composite sentence we understand a syntactic unity, consisting of two or more predicative units. Separate sentences comprising it, on the one hand are similar to simple sentences, on the other hand – are different in a certain way. The similarity consists in the grammatical structure of both types of sentences. They both express predication, both may have main and secondary members. But they differ in the number of predications they have. A predication in English is usually a combination of two words united by predicativity, or, in other words, a predicative combination of words [Khaimovich, Rogovskaya, 1987, 238]. Simple sentences usually have one prediction. Those with more than one predication are composite sentences. In a composite sentence each predication together with the words attached is called a clause [Drugoveyko, Meldianova, 2016, 39].

Clauses are the principal structures of which sentences are composed [Leech, Svartvik, 1983, 191]. It should be noted that British and American grammar books tend to interpret the term "clause" far more loosely: it is generally applied to simple sentences regarded in their structural aspect, and also to various grammatically arranged constituents of which sentences are composed, including noun and verb phrases and predicative constructions with the verbals [Petrova, 2002, 5]. Predicative relations in a sentence may find their expression not only by means of the structure "noun-predicate", but by means of different complexes (participial, gerundial) [Shteling, 1996, 180].

So the main difference between a simple and a composite sentence is that from the formal point of view the former is a monopredicative unit, the latter – a polypredicative unit. Being a polypredicative construction, a composite sentence expresses a complicated act of thought, i. e. an act of mental activity which falls into two or more intellectual efforts closely combined with one another [Blokh, 1983, 314]. From the referential point of view, a composite sentence reflects a few elementary situations as a unity [Blokh, Semenova, Timofeeva, 2010, 359]. From communicative point of view both sentences (simple and composite) are distinguished by a contextually relevant communicative purpose and a certain intonation pattern. Both express a complete thought.

Composite sentences may be of two types. Composite sentences with coordinated clauses are compound sentences. Composite sentences containing subordinated clauses are complex ones.

The main *aim of investigation* in this article is the study of different structural kinds of composite sentences, mainly complex ones with various types of subordinate clauses in the English texts on aviation.

Complex sentences in aviation texts

Subordinate clauses can perform the function of various parts of the sentence (subject, object, attribute, adverbial modifier) [Gordon, Krylova, 1974, 324]. The most typical type of complex sentences in modern English aviation texts are sentences with attributive subordinate clauses. Attributive clauses serve in such sentences as an attribute to the noun or the pronoun within the main clause and are joined to the main clause with the help of relative pronouns and adverbs: *who, whose, how, why*, sometimes *where*: "We have two other viable programs at a stage where their future is equally important" [Aviation Week…, www].

Connection in this type of sentences may be also asyndetic, i. e. without any linking elements: "At this point, all our focus is on the existing aircraft we have launched and getting them through certification" [Aviation Week…, www].

While translating such a sentence into Russian, it is better to preserve a relative pronoun in the translated text.

The most prevalent type among attributive clauses in the texts on aviation are attributive relative limiting clauses which in theoretical literature are also called defining, restrictive, or essential. Relative clauses always follow its antecedent, the member of the sentence to which it relates [Close, 1979, 51]. Relative limiting clauses limit, or restrict the semantics of the defined word. They are essential to the meaning and structure of the sentence, contain the most important information without which the sentence makes no point; and thus could not be eliminated compared to relative non-limiting clauses.

Though the majority of the analyzed aviation sentences are relative limiting, still sometimes non-limiting ones may occur in aviation texts, though they are rare. Attributive relative non-limiting clauses provide additional information about a person or thing they define; they are not important and may be easily left out.

The second prevalent type of complex sentences in the analyzed texts is object clauses joined asyndetically and syndetically. As usual such clauses relate to a verb or an adjective of the main sentence: "Now that Egypt has made what some consider a surprising choice, other air forces such as Qatar and Malaysia could follow" [Aviation Week…, www].

After object clauses follow adverbial clauses; mostly numerous are adverbial clauses of time, such as: "Perhaps an error was made 20 years ago when military authorities, jointly with the air force and navy in an effort to cost effectively produce aircraft decided to replace seven aircraft types with one" [ibid.].

The next widely used types are adverbial clauses of reason introduced by the subordinators *because, as, since*; conditional clauses with conjunctions *if, unless*; adverbial clauses of concession joined by *though* and adverbial clauses of manner (*how, as, as if)* and comparison. Adverbial clauses of comparison are always introduced by means of correlative subordinators, with an endorsing item in the main clause. The endorsing item can be an adverb (*as, more, less, better*) or a morpheme (*er*) [Petrova, 2002, 71]: "Euro fighter's Parker says the company "is ready to of era proposal" to the UAE, "and is in a much better position than we were" [Aviation Week…, www].

Adverbial clauses of comparison are innumerous in English aviation texts as well as Adverbial clauses of place (*where, wherever*) and result with conjunction *so*.

Rare in aviation texts are also Predicative clauses which are used as a predicative which is a part of compound nominal predicate: "The rationale was that this would simplify the inventory and streamline the supply chain" [ibid.].

A predicative clause is the type of dependent clause that serves as predicative, complementing as it does a linking verb in the main clause. If the predicative clause were eliminated from a sentence, the

main clause would be structurally deficient. A predicative clause always follow the main clause, as it performs the function of predicative and, therefore, invariably stands after a link verb, chiefly *be, feel, look, seem, taste, sound, become, remain*.

Into the Russian language such sentences are translated by predicative clauses with an appropriate conjunction.

The last place among different complex sentences in the texts on aviation in English according to our estimates is occupied by Subject clauses which are the most difficult for translation from English into Russian. In this type of sentence, the main clause is structurally deficient, in that it would make little or no sense if the subordinate clause were removed from it. It is obvious that these clauses function as subjects in their respective sentences because they could be replaced by the pronoun *this* or *that* to produce a complete simple sentence [Petrova, 2002, 24].

"But what I foresee right now is that ... over the course of the next couple of months we will really refine what we want Block 4 to look like" [Aviation Week…, www].

Sentences containing an emphatic *what*-clause are of great interest on the part of translation. Subject clauses with *what* as their own subject are used to focus on the thing that the speaker is talking about.

In the Russian translation the change of the whole structure is required. The emphasis made in the English sentence is rendered in the Russian sentence lexically: the emphasized sentence introduced in English by means of *what* is shifted in the translated sentence to the end.

Such clause will often be translated into Russian by introductory phrases such as "it is required, it is necessary, it is demanded".

Sometimes a clause may interfere into the main sentence:

At the Pentagon, *the powerful Joint Requirements Oversight Council* (JROC) – **a multiservice group that vets all requirements before they are considered valid** – *is reviewing* plans for Block 4, says USAF Maj. Gen. Jeffrey Harrigian, director of the service's F-35 Integration Office [ibid.].

In this complex sentence above, the subject and the predicate of the main clause are separated by a sentence, which may cause problems during the process of translation. The main task of the translator in such case is to define the subject and the predicate of the main clause correctly.

There are also multiple sentences that may contain two or more independent clauses and two or more dependent clauses:

"The United Arab Emirates (UAE) has spent billions of dollars on Lockheed Martin F-16 Block 60s, so it seems odd that a country that prides itself on buying advanced weaponry is also investing in rather more austere platforms—partly for its own special operations units but also to support its near neighbors" [ibid.].

This sentence is characterized by different levels of subordination: a subordinate clause of result presents here the first level of subordination; the first syndetic object clause presents the second level of subordination; and the second object clause with conjunction *that* makes the third level. When starting the translation of sentences of this type it is necessary to understand to what member of the sentence each dependent clause refers.

Rules of translating complex sentences from English into Russian

In general when translating complex multiple sentences one should stick to the following rules.
1) It is better to start translating from the end of a sentence.
2) It is necessary to define the number of clauses the sentence consists of by singling out all subjects and predicates.

3) After that it would be essential to distinguish all the connectives and define their type, which will help to understand the kind of a subordinate clause you deal with. Here it is vital to keep in mind that in the English language sentences are often connected asyndetically.

4) At the last stage the task of a translator is to find all secondary members of the main and dependent clauses.

Conclusion

On the basis of linguistic analysis made in this article it may be concluded that in the aviation texts in English the most numerous are attributive clauses, they constitute 24% of all complex sentences. The second place is taken by object clauses – 22,5%. Adverbial clauses of time make up 11,5%. Then follow adverbial clauses of reason with 10% of cases, adverbial clauses of condition with 9%, adverbial clauses of manner and comparison with 7%; of concession – 5%, of place – 3, 5% and of result – 2,5% less in number in English aviation texts are complex sentences with predicative clauses (3%) and subject clauses (2%). Though being innumerous, subject and predicative clauses cause the main problems for translators and interpreters alongside with complex sentences with several levels of subordination.

References

1. *Aviation Week & Space Technology (*2005). March. Available at:http://www.aviationweek.ru/ www.aviationweek.ru [Accessed 13/10/2017].
2. Blokh M. (1983) *Teoreticheskaya grammatika angliiskogo yazyka* [Theoretical grammar of the English language]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola Publ.
3. Blokh M., Semenova T.N., Timofeeva S.V. (2010) *Praktikum po teoreticheskoi grammatike angliiskogo yazyka* [Theoretical English Grammar]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola Publ.
4. Close R.A. (1979) *A Reference Grammar for students of English*. Moscow: Longman.
5. Drugoveyko N.A., Meldianova A.V. (2016) *Syntax of Modern English*. M., 2016.
6. Gordon E.M., Krylova L.P. (1974) *A Grammar of Present-Day English*. Moscow: Feniks Publ.
7. Khaimovich B.S., Rogovskaya B.I. (1987) *A course in English Grammar*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola Publ.
8. Leech J., Svartvik J. (1983) *A communicative Grammar of English*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye Publ.
9. Petrova E. (2002) *English Grammar in Use*. Moscow.
10. Shteling D.A. (1996) *Grammaticheskaya semantika angliiskogo yazyka* [The semantics of English Grammar]. Moscow: MGIMO University Publ.

Синтаксические особенности англоязычных авиационных текстов

Мельдианова Анна Валерьевна

Кандидат филологических наук,
доцент кафедры лингвистики и переводоведения,
Московский авиационный институт
(Национальный исследовательский университет),
125993, Российская Федерация, Москва, Волоколамское шоссе, 4;
e-mail: meldianova_av@mail.ru

Аннотация

В статье анализируются сложноподчиненные предложения с точки зрения различных аспектов; рассматриваются основные типы придаточных предложений в англоязычных авиационных текстах на основе количественного анализа, выделяются структурные типы сложноподчиненных предложений, представляющие трудность при переводе на русский язык. В статье раскрывается основное различие между простым и сложным предложением. Оно состоит в рассмотрении простого предложения в качестве монопредативной единицы, характеризующейся одной структурой «существительное-предикат»; и сложное предложение – полипредикативная единица с более чем одним предикатом. Разница между этими двумя типами предложений показана в статье с формальной и коммуникативной точек зрения. Наиболее распространенные типы сложных предложений в современных английских авиационных текстах выделяются на основе детального анализа статей авиационной тематики. В статье даны рекомендации по переводу предложений, которые могут содержать два или более независимых предложения и два или придаточных предложения, что значительно облегчает процесс перевода сложных структур.

Ключевые слова

Сложное предложение, сложноподчиненное предложение, монопредикативная конструкция, полипредикативная конструкция, бессоюзное соединение, союзное соединение.

Библиография

1. Блох М.Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 1983. 383 с.
2. Блох М.Я., Семенова Т.Н., Тимофеева С.В. Практикум по теоретической грамматике английского языка. М.: Высшая школа, 2010. 471 с.
3. Штелинг Д.А. Грамматическая семантика английского языка. М.: МГИМО, 1996. 254 с.
4. *Aviation Week & Space Technology (*2005). March. URL:http://www.aviationweek.ru/ www.aviationweek.ru
5. Close R.A. A Reference Grammar for students of English. M.: Longman, 1979. 356 p.
6. Drugoveyko N.A., Meldianova A.V. Syntax of Modern English. Moscow, 2016.
7. Gordon E.M., Krylova L.P. A Grammar of Present-Day English. M.: Feniks, 1974. 448 p.
8. Khaimovich B.S., Rogovskaya B.I. A course in English Grammar. M.: Vysshaya shkola, 1987. 298 p.
9. Leech J., Svartvik J. A communicative Grammar of English. M.: Prosveshcheniye, 1983. 204 p.
10. Petrova E. English Grammar in Use. M., 2002.