Grammar versus Pragmatics: The Conceptual Problem in "A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language"

Baqir Jasim Mohammed, M.A. in Applied Linguistics
College of Arts/ University of Babylon

1. Introduction

From time to time, studies written in different disciplines are in need for some sort of critical rereading, or reconsideration, because no human scientific effort is beyond criticism. This is especially true in the diverse fields of humanities and even truer in the field of grammar because it is one of the controversial concepts. As a result, books that deal with grammar in general, or with the grammar of the English language, have been written according to a varying tenets, trends, and methodologies; therefore, they can be criticized from either a standpoint which is not adopted by the author, or authors themselves, i.e. their perspective itself will be discussed and reconsidered, or by checking the difference between their perspective and its application. These books of grammar are so numerous that they may take so many pages to only list their names. Yet, there is one book only which can stand out as a monument of the English grammar and it can be canonized as the most comprehensive treatise in its field. This book is "A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language" (henceforth, the *CGEL*) by Randolph Quirk, Sidney Geenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (henceforth, the authors). The *CGEL* is published in 1985, and has no rival treatise in its field till now. Yet, the close reading of it may reveal that it includes a problem concerning the authors' concepts of both grammar and pragmatics, and the way they manifest these two concepts in their book.

This problem has led to a kind of misconceptualization of these two concepts of grammar and pragmatics. Therefore, the aim of this paper is to build up this supposition on both linguistic and pragmatic bases through a critical reading of the book. Accordingly, this paper is devoted to discussing the concepts of 'grammar' in this book and finding out, what may be attributed either to linguistic reasons or methodological reasons, or both, has not been satisfactorily done.

The second section of this paper is devoted to surveying the history of writing the *CGEL* in order to show the great efforts of the authors in writing it and to depict its uniqueness and importance in the field of studying English grammar; whereas the third one is devoted to surveying its structure as briefly as possible to reveal how complex the book is. The main discussion of the book is presented in the fourth and fifth sections. Firstly, the authors' concept of grammar is pinpointed and then compared with the concept of grammar presented by some other scholars. Secondly, the authors' concept of pragmatics is surveyed and then compared with the concept of pragmatics as presented by some other scholar. In these two sections, the arts of situation of both grammar and pragmatics will be briefly surveyed. The paper is rounded off with the results and findings in the sixth section.

Key Words:-Conceptual Problem, Grammar, Grammatical Issues, Phonology, Morphology, Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics, Implicatures, Speech Acts, Locutionary Acts, Illocutionary Acts, Perlocutionary Acts, Significance,.

2. A Brief Account of the History of the *CGEL*

The *CGEL* has a spacious background. This has been for four reasons. First, it is written according to the rich experiences of its four authors who are well-known scholars in the field of contemporary grammar. Second, historically speaking, it is preceded by two previous attempts by the same scholars. Third, its manuscript has been further examined by many scholars from universities of many countries around the world. Fourth, it has taken about 20 years of onerous collective work. According to the "Preface" of the CGEL, the four scholars started collaborating as a team work in the 60s, putting in their minds that there are several types of grammars and they are obliged to select and adopt a certain concept of this term. In 1972, they published a book called "*A Grammar of Contemporary English*" (henceforth *GCE*) which was followed by two shorter works: "*A Communicative Grammar of English*" (henceforth *CGE*), and "*A University Grammar of English*" (henceforth *UGE*). The latter was published with some modifications in the United States with the title "*A Concise Grammar of Contemporary English*". The last two books, which were in part an abridgment of *GCE*, have been written with some pedagogical considerations; therefore, they have achieved a good reputation as reliable text books of grammar in undergraduate classes of English in different universities all over the world, and they are accompanied with a work book. Moreover, they have been deliberately different both from the parent book, i.e. *GCE*, and from each other. This is particularly obvious in the case of *CGE*, which looks at the whole grammar from a semantic communicative point of view. It is less obviously true of *UGE*, which follows the chapter divisions and in most cases the chapter titles of *GCE*, though in fact the abridgment was accompanied by a good deal fresh thinking and radical revision.

As far I know, publishing the *CGEL* in 1985 indicates the emergence of the most comprehensive grammar book of English which remains unique in its comprehensiveness and insightfulness till now. This is so because the authors have attempted something much more ambitious: a culmination of their joint work, which results in a grammar that is considerably larger and richer than *GCE* and hence super ordinate to it. Indeed, it is safe to state that it is larger and richer than any other book of grammar. The authors declared that *CGEL* incorporates their own further research on grammatical structures as well as the research of scholars world-wide who have contributed to the description of English and to developments in linguistic theory. They also benefited from the perceptive attention that *GCE*, *UGE* and *CGE* have received from reviewers throughout the world. In addition to all these scholars, a group of linguists put themselves willingly and generously at the disposal of the authors in giving detailed attention to earlier drafts of what has become *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. For example, the authors state that some few scholars have even undertaken the task of giving a detailed critique of the entire book in its earlier draft. These scholars include John Algeo, R. A. Close, and Robert de beaugrande.

The authors stated that many other scholars, such as V. Adams, B. Altenberg, E. Anderson, W-D. Bald, D. L. Bolinger, J. Coates, R. Cureton and some others, have helped them with one or more individual chapters or with specific problems in the description of grammar. The fact that some of these scholars are among the most eminent experts in the world on the American, British and other varieties of English has greatly contributed to the confidence with which the authors can assign such descriptive labels as

'AmE' and 'BrE'. They also expressed their special gratitude to David Crystal for his distinguished enhancement for the *CGEL*. His role has extended far beyond writing the index, which covers the pages 1665-1779 and which will make information retrieval possible; in addition he has contributed penetratingly to the correction of errors, standardization of terminology, and the improvement of presentation.

As admitted by the authors themselves, the gross work and publication of this book might not be possible without the financial aid presented by two groups: the first includes academic bodies such as University College of London, Lund University, the University of Lancaster, and the University of Wisconsin, the second includes the Leverhulme Trust, the Gulbenkian Foundation, the Social Science Research Council, the British Council, the British Academy, the Knut and Alice Allenberg Foundation, the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation, and the publishers company of Longman Group.

This short account of history of the book shows that it is a kind of collective scientific work which may not be recurrented in the near future. It also reveals the fact that its authors accept any critique if the comments included are scientific.

3. A Brief Survey of The *CGEL* Structure

Being a comprehensive grammar book of the English language, the *CGEL* covers, as capaciously as possible, almost all grammatical issues in this language bearing in mind that the attributive 'grammatical' must be understood according to the conception of grammar adopted by the authors of the book and not to any others' conception of the term 'grammar'. As a result, the *CGEL* is both bulky in size and complex in structure. It is composed of the following divisions:

1. Preliminaries which include a preface, a pronunciation table, and an abbreviations and symbols table.
2. The main text which includes nineteen chapters. They are:
I. the English language
II. a survey of English grammar
III. verbs and auxiliaries
IV. the semantics of the verb phrase
V. nouns and determiners
VI. pronouns and numerals
VII. adjectives and adverbs
VIII. the semantics and grammar of adverbials
IX. prepositions and prepositional phrase
X. the simple sentence
XI. sentence types and discourse functions
XII. pro-forms and ellipsis
XIII. coordination
XIV. the complex sentence
XV. syntactic and semantic functions of subordinate clauses
XVI. complementation of verbs and adjectives
XVII. the noun phrase
XVIII. theme, rhyme and information processing
XIX. from sentence to text, which covers the pages (1421-1514). Unlike the previous eighteen chapters, this final one is completely devoted to some applied aspects of the pragmatic study of the English language.

3. Appendix I Word-formation. This appendix deals with specific area of morphology and it covers the pages (1-1514),

4. Appendix II Stress, rhythm, and intonation. It covers the pages (1587-1608), and

5. Appendix III pronunciation. It covers the pages (1609-1639)

6. Bibliography, It covers the pages (1641-1664)

7. Index. It covers the pages (1665-11779)

It can be easily noticed here that the bulky size of the index which consists of 114 pages, made by David Crystal, reveals that the *CGEL* is the most comprehensive and complex book of grammar ever written.

4. The Concept of Grammar in the *CGEL*

4. 1. It is commonplace that the concept of 'grammar' is drastically controversial. The controversy about the diversified senses of the term 'grammar' and the configuration of the concepts associated with it can be found in the speculations of linguists about this term for the last few decades. For example, Hartmann and Stork (1972: 98) trace the history of senses attached to the term to Greeks, and then they state that:

"Until recently grammar was seen as a branch or 'level' of linguistic study intermediate between phonology and semantics and comprising morphology (i.e. the study of word forms) and syntax (i.e. the study of the way words are linked together in larger structures). [yet] some contemporary linguists regard grammar as an all encompassing theory of linguistic analysis."

The sense of grammar as comprising morphology and syntax mentioned above is congruent with the sense adopted by the authors of the *CGEL* as it will be explained later on. The same sense is tacitly stated by Lyons (1981: 100) by saying that:

"… the term 'grammar' will be employed here and throughout this book (…) in a fairly narrow sense, in contrast with 'phonology' on the one hand, and with 'semantics' on the other. This is one of its traditional senses, and the one which is closest to the ordinary sense of 'grammar'."

Again, Lyons's concept of grammar [ibid] includes only syntax and morphology since he excludes phonology and semantics from the realm of grammar by contrasting it with them. Some other scholars, such as Tallerman (1998:1), assert that:

"Some people also use the term GRAMMAR to mean the same as syntax, although most linguists follow the more recent practice whereby the grammar of a language includes all of its organizing principles: information about the sound system [phonology], about the form of words [morphology], how we adjust language according to context [pragmatics], and so on: syntax is only one part of this grammar."

The taxonomy of the concept of grammar introduced by Tallerman above presents both the narrowest and the widest conceptualizations of the term. In fact, the widest conceptualization of grammar is rather historical and can be traced to the practice of the ancient grammarians of Arabic which has been integral and includes all the aspects of the language study. (cf, Al-Khalidi, 2010: 242)[1]

---

[1] - Of course, we do not assume that the authors of the *CGEL* and other grammarians in the west are unaware of the Arab scholars' treatises in the field of grammar, but most of them used to refer to the western tradition only.

4.2. Quirk et. al. (1985) have given the concept of grammar a special status in the *CGEL* not only because it is one of the most controversial concepts in the field of linguistics, but also because it is the second of the four semantic elements in the title of their book, i.e. comprehensive, grammar, English and language; therefore, they have presented a brief discussion of the meanings of grammar' early in their work. On page 12, they assert that:

"We shall be using 'grammar' to include both SYNTAX and that of MORPHOLOGY (the internal structure of words) that deals with INFLECTIONS (or ACCIDENCE). The fact that the "The word 'grammar' has various meanings, and since grammar is the subject of this book we should explore the past tense of *buy* is *bought* [inflection] and the fact that the interrogative form of *He bought it* is *Did he buy it?* [syntax]are therefore both equally the province of grammar. There is nothing technical in this respect: it corresponds to the common lay uses of the word in the English-speaking world." (Emphasis added)

The underlined statements of this extract declare clearly that the authors concept of grammar, as well as their usage of it in this book, is limited to both inflection and syntax; moreover, they state that "We shall be using 'grammar' to include only syntax and morphology" which means that they will exclude whatever not designated under these two rubrics. The authors, then, have made their concept even clearer when they discussed both the meaning of the word 'grammar' as a codification attached to it by several layman and the meaning that may be attached to it by the Académie Française "… to show the French themselves how their language should be used." (p. 13) accordingly, they state that:

"Naturally, too, the codification [of the word grammar] may refer to grammar in any of the senses already mentioned. The codification will also vary, however, according to linguistic theory embraced by the authors, their idea of the nature of grammar rather than their statement of the grammar of a particular language."

To make things clearer, they add on page 14:

"While theoretical problems are not the concern of this book, our treatment cannot be neutral on the issues that enliven current discussion. For example, we should not wish to assert the total independence of grammar from phonology on the one hand and lexicology or semantics on the other … . Phonology is seen to have a bearing on grammar even in small points such as the association of the initial /ð/ …"

It can be noticed here that both phonology and lexicology are beyond the main interest of this book because they are beyond the authors' concept of grammar. Moreover, they declare that "the borderline between grammar and semantics is unclear." (p. 15) but they have not tried to disambiguate these borders. Now what about the connection between grammar and pragmatics? The authors state that:

Similarly, the borderline between grammar and pragmatics (and even more so between semantics and pragmatics) is unclear. … Our general principle will be to regard grammar as accounting for constructions where greatest generalizations can be formulated" (p. 15)

Therefore, in pragmatics, we can not make any generalizations concerning grammatical constructions because these constructions have no pragmatic effect without the context and we can not make any generalizations concerning the context since it is too manifold and divergent to subjugate to such generalization. The authors' idea of what grammar is has already been established on page 12 as only inflection and syntax and they restate that the purpose of their book by saying that it is "to describe present-day

English from the viewpoint of grammar" without any further specification of the term grammar. Accordingly, it is safe to conclude that their concept of grammar suggests that neither the phonology study nor the pragmatic study of the English language should be included. The close reading of the book reveals that they have not followed the scheme suggested by them in first chapter. In fact, they have not devoted a particular chapter for phonology or semantics, whereas they have devoted chapter No. XIX, entitled "From sentence to text", for the pragmatic study of the English language. This means that they have exceeded the limitation of the principal concept strongly suggested by their own definition of grammar. The aim of this paper is to build up this supposition on both linguistic and pragmatic reading of the *CGEL*.

4. The concept of Pragmatics in The *CGEL*
4. 1. Before starting the discussion of the concept of pragmatics in the *CGEL*, it is necessary to shed some light on the history of the term "pragmatics" and discuss different recent trends in the field of pragmatic studies. In fact, the use of the concept of pragmatics is rather modern, and its correlations with the other linguistic levels of analysis, such as phonetics and phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics' is in need for some survey before discussing the concept of the authors of the *CGEL* and the way they have dealt with it.

For Yule (1996:3), pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader) whereas Verschueren (1999: 1) believes that pragmatics is:
 "... *the study of linguistic phenomena from the point of view of their usage.*"
Now, although these two definitions focus on the 'usage' of language rather than on its structure, they do
 "… not introduce a strict boundary between pragmatics and some other field [sic] of linguistics, such as discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, or conversation analysis." (cf. Verschueren, 1999: 1)
 Moreover, he states that:
"…, pragmatics does not constitute an additional component of a theory of language, but it offers a different *perspective*" (cf. Verschueren, 1999: 2)
Crystal (1997:301), who has written the index of the *CGEL*, states that pragmatics is a term:
"… used to label one of the three major divisions of SEMIOTICS (along with SEMANTICS and SYNTATICS). In modern linguistics, it has come to be applied to the study of LANGUAGE from the point of view of the users, especially the choices they make, the CONSTRAINTS they encounter in using language in social interaction, and the effects their use of language has on the other participants in an act of communication"
These postulations on the term pragmatics lead inevitably to stating that it falls within a realm of the macro linguistics because the principles of language use, whereas grammar, i. e. the abstract formal system of language falls within the ream of the micro linguistics). Yet, these are complementary within linguistic. (Leech, 1983: 4) (cf. Verschueren, 1999: 261)
For Hartmann, R. R. K. & F. C. Stork (1972) Pragmatics is "… the study of the use of language in communication, particularly the relationships between sentences and the context and situations in which they are used. Pragmatics includes the study of:

a) How the interpretation and use of utterances depend on knowledge of the real world.
b) How speakers use and understand speech acts.
c) How the structure of sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and the hearer."

All these three components refer, in one way or another, to the interrelationship between grammar and pragmatics. But the third one has been distinguished since it presents an account of (the effect of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer), which falls within macro linguistics, on (the structure of the sentences), which falls within micro linguistics. It is implicitly understood that this component includes, among other things, discourse markers. These markers can be designated as linguistic expressions used to signal the relation of an utterance to its immediate context, with the primary function of bringing to the listener's attention a particular kind of linkage of the upcoming utterance with the immediate discourse context. But the authors of The *CGEL* have never referred to these markers. (cf. the index of The *CGEL*)

The accounts of pragmatics mentioned above tantamount to the allegation that pragmatics, as such, is a unique discipline in the field of linguistics although some scholars believe that pragmatics is not sharply separated from the different levels of linguistic analysis as mentioned above. For example, Morris (1938:35) states that:
"Syntactic rules determine the sign relations between sign vehicles, the semantic rules correlate sign vehicles with other objects; pragmatical rules state the conditions in the interpreters under which a sign vehicle is a sign. *Any rule when actually in use operates a type of behaviour, and* <u>*in this sense there is a pragmatical component in all rules*</u>." (Emphasis added)
This means that although there is a kind of overlapping between pragmatical rules on one hand and the syntactic and semantic rules on the other hand, pragmatics is still an independent discipline since it:
"… designated the science of the relation of the signs to their interpreters. […] it deals with the biotic aspects of semiosis, that is, with all the psychological, biological, and sociological phenomena which occur in the functioning of signs." (cf. Morris, 1938:35)

The independence of pragmatics as such can be based on the fact that it has its own topic, terms and methodology; therefore, it can be defined:
"… as *a general cognitive, social, and cultural perspective on linguistic phenomena in relation to their usage in forms of behaviour*" (cf. Verschueren,1999: 7)

Moreover, Verschueren (ibid) states that:
"… we must observe that pragmatics is not only situated outside the contrast set to which phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax and semantics belong; neither does it fit into the set of interdisciplinary fields such as neurolinguistics, psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics"
This means that Verschueren takes a drastic attitude which puts pragmatics completely outside all types of linguistic study. But some other scholars introduce a rather moderate attitude although they still assert that pragmatics is an independent discipline. For example, Levinson (1983:9) discusses this problem and states that:
"Here we come to the heart of the definitional problem: the term *pragmatics* covers both context-dependent aspects of language structure and principles of language usage and understanding that have nothing or <u>little to do with linguistic structure</u>. It is difficult to forge a definition that will happily cover both aspects. But this should not be taken to

imply that pragmatics is hodge-podge, concerned with quite disparate and unrelated aspects of language, rather, pragmaticists are specially interested in the inter-relation of language structure and principles of language usage." [emphasis added]

Consequently, the phrase that pragmatics may have "… little to do with linguistic structure" can be understood as an agreement that there is a kind of internal correlation between pragmatics and linguistics.

It must be noted here that there is not only one gestalt image of pragmatics. In fact there are several forms of it. For example, Verschueren (1999: 256) refers to Ehlich's functional pragmatics, Apel's transcendental pragmatics and Habermas's universal pragmatics. In addition to the types mentioned by Verschueren, we can add Leech's general pragmatics (1983:10-11) which is explained as follows:

"I have mentioned that my principal subject in this book is GENRAL PRAGMATICS. By this term I mean to distinguish the study of the general conditions of the communicative use of language, and to exclude more specific 'local' conditions on language use. The latter may be said to belong to a less abstract field of SOCIO-PRAGMATICS, for it is clear that the Cooperative Principle and the Politeness Principle operate variably in different cultures or language communities, in different social situations, among different social classes, etc. […] In other words, socio-pragmatics is the sociological interface of pragmatics. Much of the work which has taken place in conversational analysis has been limited in this sense, and has been closely bound to local conversational data. The term PRAGMALINGUISTICS, on the other hand, can be applied to the study of the more linguistic end of pragmatics – where we consider the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions." (Emphasis added)

Accordingly, the pragmatic study of any specific language is a type of socio-pragmatics, which is an in-between, or applied aspect of the main field of pragmatics. Davis (1991: 11) tends to distinguish two types of theory stating that:

"… we now have a way to distinguish between a theory of satisfaction and a theory of pragmatics. We can say that the former must give an account of the satisfaction conditions that certain sentences have relative to the particular context of use. This requirement means that within a specification of context-relative truth conditions, a theory of satisfaction must mention the speakers intentions where those intentions play a role in determining the referent of the terms that have no semantic referent given by the conventions of the language. Pragmatics will have as its domain speakers' communicative intentions, the uses of language that requires such intentions, and the strategies that hearers employ to determine what these intentions and acts are, so that they can understand what the speaker intends to communicate." (emphasis added) (from the introduction to Davis (ed.) 1991: 11)

It is clear that the speaker's intentions are not necessarily bound to, or reflected in any specific utterance; therefore, there is no one to one correlation between pragmatics and grammar. Moreover, the distinction between semantics and pragmatics, as explained by Blackmore (1992: 39) is based on the distinction between the hearer's own knowledge of his/her language and his/her knowledge of the world. Yet, the relationship between grammar and pragmatics is complementary, Leech (1983: 4) states:

"… that grammar (the abstracts formal system of language) and pragmatics (the principles of language use) are complementary within linguistics"

According to this extract from Leech, both grammar and pragmatics consummate each other, but they are still of a different natures. In this paper, it is assumed that the correspondence between pragmatics and semantics is pseudo because the former works in the field of significance determined by non-linguistic contextual factors whereas the latter works in the field of meaning determined by linguistic textual factors.

4. 2. 1. Some pragmatic concepts are in need of shedding light since they constitute the fundamental and most prominent features of the field. These include speech acts, conversational implicatures, presuppositions, and politeness. (cf. Levinson, 1983; Yule, 1996) Historically speaking, the current theory of speech-act semantics, which is drastically different from linguistic semantics, has evolved from ordinary-language philosophy. Eastman (2004) states that:

"The British philosopher J. L. Austin claimed that, by speaking, a person performs an act, or does something (such as state, predict, or warn), and that meaning is found in what an expression does, in the act it performs. The American philosopher John R. Searle extended Austin's ideas, emphasizing the need to relate the functions of signs or expressions to their social context. Searle asserted that speech encompasses at least three kinds of acts: (1) locutionary acts, in which things are said with a certain sense or reference (as in "the moon is a sphere"); (2) illocutionary acts, in which such acts as promising or commanding are performed by means of speaking; and (3) perlocutionary acts, in which the speaker, by speaking, does something to someone else (for example, angers, consoles, or persuades someone). The speaker's intentions are conveyed by the illocutionary force that is given to the signs—that is, by the actions implicit in what is said."

The three kinds of acts: locutionary acts, illocutionary acts, and perlocutionary acts can work successfully if and only if signs are appropriate, sincere, and consistent with the speaker's general beliefs and conduct, and recognizable as meaningful by the hearer. Eastman (2004) shows the difference between the two types of meaning by stating that:

"What has developed in philosophical semantics, then, is a distinction between truth-based semantics and speech-act semantics. Some critics of speech-act theory believe that it deals primarily with meaning in communication (as opposed to meaning in language) and thus is part of the pragmatic aspect of a language's semiotic—that it relates to signs and to the knowledge of the world shared by speakers and hearers, rather than relating to signs and their designations (semantic aspect) or to formal relations among signs (syntactic aspect). These scholars hold that semantics should be restricted to assigning interpretations to signs alone—independent of a speaker and hearer."

Accordingly, this account of the two types of semantics, or linguistic semantics and speech-act semantics, has revealed that they are completely different types for the following two reasons: (1) Each one of them depends on its own specific background, and (2) Each produces its own specific kind of significance.

As for implicatures, Blackburn (2010) introduces a brief history of them, then he states:

"An utterance such as She got married and raised a family, for example, would ordinarily convey that she got married before she raised a family. But this "implicature," as Grice called it, is not part of the literal meaning of the utterance ("what is said"). It is inferred by the hearer on the basis of his knowledge of what is said and his presumption that the

speaker is observing a set of conversational maxims, one of which prescribes that events be mentioned in the temporal order in which they occurred.

Later, he states that:

The largest and most important class of implicatures consists of those that are generated not by observing the maxims but by openly and obviously violating them. For example, if the author of a letter ostensibly recommending an applicant for a job says only that Mr. Jones is very punctual and his penmanship is excellent, he thereby flouts the maxim enjoining the speaker (or author) to be as informative as necessary; he may also flout the maxim enjoining relevance. Since both the author and the reader know that more information is wanted and that the author could have provided it, the author implicates that he is prevented from doing so by other considerations, such as politeness. Additionally, therefore, he implicates that the applicant is not qualified for the job."

4. 2. 2. In the *CGEL*, the authors' concept of pragmatics is so brief and general that it covers less than one page if the elucidations are excluded. The authors present some very preliminary and general statements to introduce their concept of pragmatics. For example, on page (1423) they state that:

"In the present chapter, we work in a converse way. We take the texts as our starting point and examine the language comprising them. In other words, we bring together all the grammatical processes already described but we do so now with a view to discussing their role in both the interpretation of a text and in the construction of a text. And we shall pay considerable attention to lexical and other features of textual structure in order to show that, important as is the role of grammar, many factors other than grammar are involved."

Now, the factors which are 'other than grammar' may mean either pragmatic or textual or both. But the authors do not introduce a brief account of those factors to make things more specific. Instead, they try to bridge the gap between grammar and those factors on the same page by stating that:

"Moreover, as we are using the term, a text – unlike a sentence – is not a grammatical unit but rather a semantic and even a pragmatic one. That is, the text 'coheres' in its real-world context, semantically and pragmatically, and it is also internally or linguistically coherent. For this latter facet, the term 'cohesive' has been applied, referring to the actual forms of linguistic linkage. …

Textual structure relates to the concerns of this book – the grammar of the English – by virtue of the fact that texts are realized in grammatical units." (emphasis added)

Now, if the textual structure, which can be here understood as synonym or equivalent to pragmatic structure, correlates with the grammatical system of the English language "by virtue of the fact that texts are realized in grammatical units", then, the whole discipline of pragmatics is appended to the field of grammar covered by the *CGEL* which contradicts with the authors' previous assumption that the concept of 'grammar' is limited to morphology and syntax. It is commonplace that pragmatics studies significance, yet this significance is totally different from the study of meaning in the field of semantics, therefore, it must be separated from semantics. This stance can be traced in the efforts of some scholars such as Geoffrey Leech (1983:5) who asserts that the differences between semantic meaning and pragmatic meaning can be summed up in the following postulate:

1.The semantic representation (or logical form) of a sentence is distinct from its pragmatic interpretation.

2.Semantics is rule governed (= grammatical); general pragmatics is principle controlled (= rhetorical).

3.The rules of grammar are fundamentally conventional; the principles of general pragmatics are fundamentally non-conventional, *ie* motivated in terms of conversational goals.

4.General pragmatics relates the sense (or grammatical meaning) of an utterance to its pragmatic (or illocutionary) force. This relationship may be relatively direct or indirect.

5.Grammatical correspondences are defined by mapping; pragmatic correspondences are defined by problems and their solutions.

6.Grammatical explanations are primarily formal; pragmatic explanations are primarily functional.

7.Grammar is ideational; pragmatics is interpersonal and textual.

8.In general, grammar is describable in terms of discrete and determinate categories; pragmatics is describable in terms of continuous and indeterminate values."

This clear distinction between semantic sense or meaning and pragmatic significance has been emphasized by other scholars. For example, Levinson (1983: 32) simultaneously states that:

 "The most promising [definitions of pragmatics] are the definitions that equate pragmatics with 'meaning minus semantics', or with a theory of language understanding that takes context into account, in order to complement the contribution that semantics makes to meaning."

   This is so because of the interdisciplinary nature of pragmatic significance. Schmidt (1974: 7) explains those broad topics which can introduce enhancement to pragmatic study stating that:

"Pragmatics' – whether as a component of a linguistic theory or as a new kind of theory of linguistic communication, has to rely on close cooperation with other disciplines such as sociology, psychology, philosophy, logic and mathematics, information and system theory, jurisprudence, literary science, etc."

This stance concentrates on the precise and rigorous limitations of the term 'pragmatics' as a study of significance by making use of disciplines other than linguistics. Accordingly, the issue of distinction between semantic meaning and pragmatic significance had been the motive of some scholars to hold the first international workshop on "Where Semantics Meets Pragmatics". It was held at Michigan State University in 2003, and the papers presented in it were published in a volume. (cf. Heusinger and Turner: 2006) Here, the introduction written by the two editors and the two studies in the first chapter "Semantics-Pragmatics Interface" are very important in this field since the perplexities of the problem were elaborately discussed. Moreover, Stalnaker (1988: 212) asserts that:

"Semantics, as contrasted with pragmatics, can mean either the study of *meaning* or the study of *content*. The contrasts between semantic and pragmatic claims can be either of two things, depending on which notion of semantics one has in mind. First, it can a contrast between claims about the particular conventional meaning of some word or phrase on the one hand, and claims about the general structure or strategy of conversation on the other. Grice's distinction between conventional implicatures and conversational

implicatures is an instance of this contrast. Second, it can be a contrast between claims about the truth-conditions or *content* of what is said – the proposition expressed – on the one hand, and claims about the *context* in which a statement is made – the attitudes and interests of speaker and audience – on the other."

Now, it is obvious that although the boundaries between semantics and pragmatics are not completely solid, the two disciplines are so distinct in the senses each one studies, in the procedures each one follows, and in the areas each one covers.

The authors of the *CGEL* should adopt a stricter plan in writing their book and omit the nineteenth chapter from the book. They can write a new book on pragmatics if they wish to do so.

Practically speaking, the authors of the *CGEL* discuss the topics of pragmatics in the following rubrics or themes:

1.the notion of the text,
2.connective devices,
3.grammatical devices,
4.the scrutiny of an example,
5.the features of grammar,
6.further illustrative texts.

Then they subclassify each one of these rubrics into subthemes without any elaborate discussion of the main issues of pragmatics or reference to them, such as speech acts, implicatures, and so on (cf. Levinson:1983: 1, *passim,* Yule:1996: 10, *passim*).

Now, the discussion of the subthemes, which are 66 in number, is beyond the limitation of this paper; therefore, only three of them will be randomly chosen.

4. 2. 3. In (ch. 19.1) the authors demand two things from the reader of the *CG*EL. The first is that the examples presented should "be not only read, but heard" since language is basically oral. The second is that these examples should be put in "a suitable context" (p. 1423). Then the authors admit that they are in need for a context accompanying every text. These contextual demands affect four types of orientation, therefore, the authors state that:"In particular, we need an orientation in respect of *place*, *time*, *factuality* and *participant* [sic] *relations*."[(21)] (p. 1432)

Now, the "occasion" of the utterance and the "previous linguistic material" can be added to the four types of orientation. These six types of orientation are all required to understand the message precisely. It may be said that *place* is usually referred to, either in the text or by the speaker, by expressions such as *here*, *there*, and *nearby*, whereas *time* is usually referred to by expressions such as *yesterday*, *tomorrow*, and *two days ago*; therefore you can not add any new categories of orientation to their four types. This objection can be refuted by referring to the fact that the other two types of orientation in this short extract, i.e. *factuality* and *participant relation*s are usually not mentioned in the text. In fact, the authors avoid giving fair theoretical presentation of the pragmatic concepts and problems. Instead, they straightly go to examples and their explanation. For instance, they deal with the interface between "pragmatics and semantics" only in two subsections. They are (19. 70) and (19. 71). But these two subsections occupy a page and

---

[1] - The expression *"participant relation*s" can be understood as either referring to "participant's relations", which is inaccurate since there is no only one participant in any conversation, or to "participants' relations".

four lines only; moreover, they are completely devoted to the analyses of three examples, two in (19. 70) and one in (190, 71).

Now, let's consider the following three extracts taken from the *CG*EL. They will be suffice to show that the authors' concept of pragmatics is somehow linguistic since they basically concentrate on the analyses of linguistic phenomena of texts.

A. In (19.23), and under the rubric "Lexical Recurrence", the authors state that:

"Lexical linkage by recurrence of form is generally avoided since lexical items can easily seem obtrusive:" [Then, they introduce the following example]

A: There was a delightful party at my office for the boss's fiftieth birthday. What I found particularly delightful were the speeches. They were delightfully witty.

B: It all sounds a bit *too* delightful for my taste." (p. 1441)

Now, it is obvious that the avoidance of the recurrence is discoursal, i.e., it occurs within the linguistic context, therefore it is a linguistic factor, and not a pragmatic one. It is a kind of anaphora since it refers to linguistic elements mentioned previously in the text by using other linguistic elements, without referring to any supra linguistic factors which might lead to the avoidance of recurrence of the linguistic elements.

Then they present a text taken from an insurance document saying that:

"…, a great deal of lexical recurrence is tolerated in legal language [or register] where misinterpretation is of more serious concern than adverse stylistic criticism." (p. 1441)

Now we already know that the features of register used in the financial documents is usually followed strictly to avoid misinterpretation. In this document, the pragmatic factor may be understood as the following: the linguistic elements of this document are affected by the fact that it is an agreement between two parties and they should determine as clearly as possible the financial responsibilities of both parties.

B. In (19.69), and under the rubric "The Scrutiny of an Example" the authors state that:

"We now present a fictional memoir, which will be analysed fairly closely in terms of textual structure as described in the earlier parts of this chapter." (p. 1488) [emphasis added]

The underlined phrase reveals that the authors' notion of pragmatics is still micro linguistic in nature since it is based on the analysis of the 'textual structure' only. In fact, the following subdivisions (19.70, 19.71, 19.72. 10.73, and 19.74) are all devoted to the textual analyses of the fictional text presented in (19.69). The focus is still on textual elements. Then, in (19.75), the authors implicitly refer to the fact that language is basically oral, and the written text is only a kind of depicting its aural form. Therefore, they assert that:

"We must insist afresh that even silent reading of a typically paper-originated text (such as an insurance document) demands the silent assignment of speech prosodies as an aid to understanding." (p.1494) (emphasis added)

This means that even the perception or reading of a written text entails the presence of the aural form of language since the speech intonational aspects of language are part of linguistic phenomena. Then, we are within the domain of linguistics again.

C. In (19.31), and under the rubric "Place and time relaters", we notice that the authors avoid using the pragmatic term "deixis" although they discuss the deixis of place and time. The reference to place and time are of pragmatic nature; yet, the first example the authors introduce is very important in showing the inevitable dependency between linguistic factors and pragmatic factors, and the impreciseness of former in deciding the

exact place and time without the help of some knowledge found in world beyond the linguistic utterance.

Now, we can say that the type of pragmatics the authors refer to is conventional. This type of pragmatics is usually referred to as "… the conventional association of certain formal properties of language with certain constraints on pragmatic context." It is also obvious that the "effects of the conventional pragmatics are none-necessary effects, and so we would expect to find some degree of language variation …" (cf. Goldberg: 2006: 428) Therefore, the authors' notion of the pragmatics is still in the realm of micro linguistics rather than macro linguistics.

5.Findings and Conclusions:
5. 1. Findings:
1.There is a conceptual problem concerning the authors' use and conceptualization of the two terms 'grammar' and 'pragmatics'. This problem has arisen from the fact that the authors themselves have adopted a very narrow and strict concept of grammar right from the beginning of introductory chapter and can detected in other early ones on one hand, and a very vast and equivocal one of pragmatics on the other hand.
2.The authors exceed the limitations of the topic of their book as they have pinpointed it at the beginning although these limitations have been very clearly outlined several times by them.
3.The fragments of authors' theoretical concept of pragmatics do not give the reader a clear idea. This can be reattributed to the fact that theoretical aspects of pragmatics have not been elaborately studied or adequately surveyed in the book.
4.**2. conclusions**:
1.Since the authors' efforts in Chapter 19 of the *CGEL* are very important, this chapter can take the form of a separate book in pragmatics. This can be done with some expansion and modifications concerning the theoretical aspects as well as the applications analyses included in it.
2.The entire work the *CGEL* has been in need of rewriting since the omission of the last chapter can definitely affect the rest of the book.

Bibliography

1.   English References:
Back, Kent & Robert M, Harnish (1979). *Linguistics Communications and Speech Acts*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Blackburn, Simon W. (2010) "language, philosophy of". In Encyclopedia Britannica. Encyclopædia *Britannica Ultimate Reference Suite.* Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.
Blackmore, D. (1992). *Understanding Utterances: an Introduction to Pragmatics.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Brown, P. & S. C. Levinson (1978). *Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena*.
Crystal, David (1997). *Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. (4th edn) Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
Davis, S. (ed.) (1991). *Pragmatics*: A Reader. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Eastman, Carol M. (2004) "Semantics" in the Encyclopædia of *Microsoft Encarta Reference Library*. (2004)

Goldberg, Adele, E. (2006) "Pragmatics and Argument Structure" (427-441) in Horn, Laurence R. and Gregory Ward (eds) (2006) *The Handbook of Pragmatics.* New York, Blackwell Publishing.

Halliday, M..A.K. (1973). *Explorations in the Development of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hartmann, R. R. K. & F. C. Stork (1972) *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London. Applied Science Publishers LTD.

Hymes, Dell (1972). On Communicative Competence. In: J. B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.) *Sociolinguistics*. P 269-293. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Leech, G.N. (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics.* London, Longman.

Levinson, S.C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John (1981) *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.Morris (1938:35)

Randolph Quirk, & Sidney Geenbaum, (1973) *A Concise Grammar of Contemporary English*. Houghton, Mifflin: Harcourt School.

Randolph Quirk, & Sidney Geenbaum, (1974) *A University Grammar of English*. Singapore: Longman Group.

Randolph Quirk, Sidney Geenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.

Randolph Quirk, Sidney Geenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Essex, Pearson, Longman.

Richards, Jack *et al*. (1996*). Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Longman.

Stalnaker, R.(1988) "Belief Attribution and Context" in R. Grimm, D. Merril (eds.) *Contents of Thought.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Tallerman, Maggie (1998) *Understanding Pragmatics*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Verschueren, Jef, (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Yule, George (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2. German References:

Schmidt, S. J. (1974). *Pragmatik I: Interdiszplinäre Beiträge zur Erforschung der sprachlichen Kommunikation*. München: Fink.

3. Arabic References:

كريم حسن ناصح الخالدي "منهجنا و منهج الآخرين في الدرس النحوي" في كتاب مجيد الماشطة (٢٠١٠) اللغة العربية و اللسانيات المعاصرة. البصرة: مطبعة النخيل.

و ترجمته في الإنجليزية:

Al-Khalidi, "Our Method and the Method of Others in Studying Grammar" in Al-Mashta, Majeed (2010) *Arabic Language and the Modern Linguistics.* Basrah, Al-Nakheel Press.