

УДК 802.0-5:801.564=111

О.В.Павлова (4 курс, ФИЯ), Н.И.Лавримова, ст. преп.

## НЕПРАВИЛЬНОЕ ПРИСОЕДИНЕНИЕ ПРИЧАСТНЫХ ОБОРОТОВ С ТОЧКИ ЗРЕНИЯ СТИЛИСТИКИ

Неправильное присоединение причастных оборотов – во многих случаях допустимый, даже общепринятый приём. В некоторых случаях грамматисты не имеют единого мнения о том, как рассматривать неправильное присоединение: как допустимое отклонение от нормы или как грубую грамматическую ошибку. Более того, один и тот же оборот в разной степени допустим в устной и в письменной речи.

The problem in question is misrelated participial constructions and their acceptability in oral and written speech.

Introductory modifying phrases are understood to refer to the subject of the clause to which they are attached (Waiting for his wife, he grew impatient). The rule still applies when the participle is preceded by a conjunction or preposition (While dancing, she sprained her foot).

It is a common fault to attach such phrases to an inappropriate subject. Such sentences are often ludicrous. 'Being in a dilapidated condition, I was able to buy the house very cheap'.

A participle phrase may follow the clause to which it is attached and still refer to the subject. 'Lying on the beach, he caught sunstroke. = He caught sunstroke, lying on the beach'.

But if a following participle phrase is not adverbial but adjectival, it refers to the object of the preceding clause. (1) 'Lying on the beach, he saw a naked girl'. (2) 'He saw a naked girl lying on the beach'. In (1) 'lying' refers to the subject 'he' and has the adverbial sense 'while (he was) lying'. In (2) 'lying' qualifies the object, 'a naked girl', and has the adjectival sense 'who was lying'.

In practice the attachment rule is often breached with participles, even by good writers. This faulty construction, one of the commonest in the language, is most accurately described as a misrelated participle. The terms 'dangling' or 'floating' participle, which are often used, are misnomers since such a participle neither dangles nor floats; on the contrary it is attached, but to the wrong word.

Participle phrases beginning with 'based on' and 'born in' are often misrelated (Born in London, Max's first instrument was the flute). It is Max, not his first instrument, that was born in London. In addition, the sentence contains a non sequitur, suggesting as it does that if Max had been born elsewhere he might have taken up some other musical instrument first. This turn of phrase, in which two unconnected pieces of information are jammed together in such a way as to appear linked, is a journalistic device, one often found in obituaries. The defect can be remedied either by using a connective (Max was born in London and his first instrument was the flute) or by incorporating one of the facts in a relative clause (Max, who was born in London, took up the flute as his first instrument).

Participle phrases beginning with 'far from', 'instead of' and 'rather than' are often misattached (Far from reducing the interest rate, it should be raised). This may be reconstructed in either of two ways: Far from reducing the interest rate, they should raise it.

'Far from being reduced, the interest rate should be raised'

The participle 'being', followed by an expression of time or weather, is often misattached in colloquial speech (Being a wet day, she took her umbrella). Here three variants are possible: 'The day being wet'. Like 'It being a wet day', this is an absolute participle construction, i.e. one with its own subject and juxtaposed to but not grammatically related to a main clause. Absolute constructions with being allow a dummy subject, as in 'It being Friday, he went to the bank' and

'There being no further business, the meeting closed'. But the combinations 'being as' and 'being that' are regarded as illiterate substitutes for the conjunction 'since' or 'seeing that'.

Participles can be used as absolutes, i.e. independently of the subject, in adverbial commenting phrases. 'Putting it mildly, he is not co-operative'.

In this and similar expressions (generally/personally/roughly/strictly/frankly speaking) the participle does not relate to the subject but forms part of a subjective comment by the speaker. Such absolute usage is readily granted acceptability.

A similar status, but one of more questionable validity, has been acquired by what are called loose participle constructions. For example: 'Speaking of food', 'do you fancy a sandwich?'

The participle phrase 'Speaking of food' is here an elliptical form of 'While we are speaking of food'. Similar expressions, mostly marking a change of topic or time focus, follow the same pattern. Usually an intermediate phrase has been dropped: 'Knowing him, [I can say that] this was no surprise'.

Such omissions are quite admissible in casual speech, but in writing, especially in formal style, the missing links should be supplied in order to legitimize the use of the participles.

'Taking all things into consideration, this was a good move'. This would be accepted by most grammarians today because the reference is general and indefinite; 'Taking' is equivalent to 'If one takes'. Better than this pseudo-absolute phrase, however, is the real absolute participle phrase 'All things considered'.

In this area of grammar usage is divided and so too is opinion about the acceptability of loose participles. Through long use they have won general acceptance, but they are appropriate to informal style only. As there is always a more exact expression available, this will be preferred by careful speakers and writers.

Participle phrases may be used with an impersonal expression if the sentence has a generalized meaning. 'On leaving, there is no need to lock the door (you do not need or one does not need)'. By contrast, participle phrases should not be attached to impersonal expressions relating to specific occasions (After buying the flat, there wasn't any money left). These sentences need to be personalized by bringing in the absent agents. Alter the first part to read '(we) hadn't any money left'.

Participles that have been converted into prepositions and conjunctions are exempt from the rule of attachment since their reference is indefinite and they no longer require the peg of a noun or pronoun subject on which to hang. Such prepositions are: 'assuming, concerning, considering, (not) counting, excluding, failing, given, granted/granting', and so on. Compound prepositions in this class are 'allowing for, beginning with, depending on, judging by/from, leaving aside, owing to' and 'referring to'.

The transition from participle to preposition is easily made. (3) 'He wrote me a letter concerning my friend'. (4) 'He wrote to me concerning my friend'. In (3) 'concerning is an adjectival participle meaning 'which concerns' and synonymous with the preposition 'about'. In (4) 'concerning' has no participial function and is now a preposition.

Conjunctions of participial origin are 'allowing, assuming, considering, given, granted, provided/providing, seeing' and 'supposing', all of which may be used with 'that', which adds a touch of formality. (Considering (that) she is over eighty, she walks very well). Here the conjunction may be paraphrased as follows: 'When one considers that'. The conjunctions 'granted (that) and provided (that)' are elliptical forms of the absolute phrases 'it being granted that' and 'it being provided that'.

Some kinds of false attachment are more acceptable in oral and informal speech than in written and formal accordingly whereas some kinds of false attachment are considered to be illiterate in any kind of speech. Also false attachment can be a journalistic device often found in obituaries: it is implied in order to intensify the feeling of loss within readers.