

## Guided Discovery of Conditionals in Light of Form-Meaning-Use Correlation

*Vardanyan Lusik*  
*Kharatyan Marina*

**Key words:** *guided discovery, conditional construction, syntax, syntactic construction, semantics, semantic relation, pragmatics, pragmatic function*

Conditionals with their intrinsically complex linguistic form, morphological properties and pragmatic interpretations have always been an object of interest among linguists, psychologists and philosophers. By “conditional”, most grammarians mean a complex sentence consisting of two clauses: the main clause and the subordinate clause, the latter being syntactically subordinated to the former. “As regards nomenclature, with an assertorically consequential conditional of the format ‘If  $p$ , then  $q$ ’ (symbolically  $p \Rightarrow q$ ) the first ‘iffy’ part ( $p$ ) is called the *antecedent* (protasis), and the second, ‘thenny’ part ( $q$ ) is called the *consequent* (apodosis). (N. Rescher, 2007:2). The lesson plan we offer in this article is primarily concerned with “If  $p$ , then  $q$ ” constructions which are either the “product” of their linguistic form or their diverse pragmatic interpretations that can easily be cancelled if not provided with necessary discourse-shaping and regulating extralinguistic factors. Our main concern here is not only to show the semantic representation and pragmatic interpretation of the “If  $p$ , then  $q$ ” formula in the three canonical conditionals: Conditional 1, Conditional 2, and Conditional 3 respectively. Our scope of interest goes far beyond that and occupies rather a large space for the investigation of conditional thinking or as N. Rescher puts it “iffy” thinking (2007:1). It is those “mental spaces” (proposed by G. Fauconnier (1985) in his theory of Mental Spaces) that “iffy” thinking may be unfolded at its best with all its possible and impossible manifestations and readings. Mental spaces: the parent (reality) space and the conditional (hypothetical) space are “constructs distinct from linguistic structures but built up in any discourse according to guidelines provided by the linguistic expressions.” (Fauconnier 1985:16). And only pragmatics can reveal and determine the kinds of relations and dependencies between these two spaces. Our analysis of conditionals in the lesson plan is based on the correlation of these two spaces which either “negotiate” with or “attack” each other when the speaker and the hearer do not appear on the same wavelength in terms of the possible mental worlds they

create. The speaker's conceived reality space may or may not be identified and/or accepted by the hearer since their perception of the reality space may be compatible or incompatible. Surprisingly enough, even the simplest conditional constructions may give rise to divergent interpretations because of the huge discrepancy between the mental spaces created and conceived by the speaker and by the hearer that even students with a profound knowledge of grammar may find it difficult to understand. The number of such misleadingly simple conditional constructions is not small, especially when the type of condition in the antecedent and the nature of the relation between clauses are concerned. Even much more perplexing may seem the interpretations of syntactically marked conditionals which significantly vary not only in their form but also in their lexical, morphological and semantic peculiarities. In some conditional constructions the antecedent means more than just a sufficient or necessary condition for the realisation of its consequent. This fascinating type of *p*-clauses which we would label "politeness and tentativeness gadgets" are largely independent of their *q*-clauses due to the functions they assume in discourse: they ensure the successful realisation of the speech act in *q*-clauses. If our students focus on the forms of the three canonical conditionals only and do not perceive the discourse functions of those "gadgets", they may fail to talk about their hopes, wishes, consequences, regrets and dreams in their conceived mental spaces in a polite, tentative, or diplomatic way and may not be seen as cooperative interlocutors. Hence, conditional constructions should be studied from many different perspectives because as the editors of the book "On Conditionals" Elizabeth Closs Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy Snitzer Reilly and Charles A. Ferguson write "Conditional (if-then) constructions directly reflect the characteristically human ability to reason about alternative situations, to make inferences based on complete information, to imagine possible correlations between situations, and to understand how the world would change if certain correlations were different. Understanding the conceptual and behavioural organisation of this ability to construct and interpret conditionals provides basic insights into the cognitive processes, linguistic competence, and inferential strategies of human beings." (2009:3)

In working out the lesson plan on Conditional Constructions we have primarily been guided by the fact that language is more than a linguistic code and advocated the combined and coordinated approach to grammar teaching, which, in our opinion, is a principled eclectic approach incorporating form, meaning and use. This threefold approach to language teaching has been

chosen for our lesson plan on conditionals because the study of conditionals, directly related to the study of reasoning, requires an in-depth analysis due to their complex interaction of form, meaning and use.

We would also like to mention another no less important “ingredient” of the lesson plan: it explores conditionals in their variety of forms, meanings and appropriateness in the context of feelings, physical and mental abilities, human relationships and behaviour mainly expressed by idioms and idiomatic expressions. We know that culture is a valuable part of foreign language teaching, and the exploration of idioms and idiomatic expressions in the research is a vivid manifestation how we might incorporate culture and its components into our teaching. In doing so, we try to employ synergetic approach aiming to raise students’ awareness of a particular grammatical phenomenon on linguistic, semantic and sociopragmatic levels; to sharpen their intuition and observation; encourage critical and creative thinking about proverbial values and stereotypes.

The lesson is constructed according to the “guided discovery” method (also known as discovery learning or inductive approach) proposed by Jerome Bruner (1961) who derived this learning approach from contemporary studies in cognitive psychology. However, the concept of guided discovery should not be confused with that of unguided instruction or teaching which would make the learning process rather difficult and non-motivating. The most significant characteristic feature of the “guided discovery” learning is that it is more student-centred and involves “picking up” language in a more natural way. Hence, this learning approach fosters autonomous and independent learning inasmuch as it is based on the idea that students have a powerful capacity to discover knowledge by themselves or collaboratively through using their own inductive reasoning.

Thus, our lesson plan, the structure of which is presented below, aims at teaching conditional constructions through different idioms and idiomatic expressions. On the one hand it presents an open-ended type of problem solving and encourages the students to explore a variety of possibilities of “iffy” thinking and answer the question “why not” (creative-convergent mode of thinking); on the other hand, it introduces the students into a linear, closed-ended, systematic, and analytical type of problem solving and pushes the students to find out the optimal solution by giving relevant and logical answers to the question “why” (critical - convergent mode of thinking). It also seeks to explain form-meaning-use correlations from syntactic, semantic and pragmatic

perspectives so that learners could use conditionals accurately, meaningfully, and appropriately keeping in balance between convergent and divergent thinking.

### **THE STRUCTURE OF THE LESSON PLAN**

The lesson plan is composed of 3 sections: A (Form), B (Meaning), and C (Use). In order to help readers understand the terminology used in all these sections, we will try to explain the most intricate terms and labels related to conditional meaning and interpretation by elucidating them with examples drawn from literature.

#### **A: (Form/Syntax)**

This section of the lesson plan is concerned with the syntax of conditionals smoothly proceeding from canonical patterns traditionally distinguished in many pedagogic grammars and handbooks to more complex syntactic constructions of which only some are presented: **exceptional conditionals** (G.Yule 1998:142) and **syntactically marked conditionals** (Declerck & Reed 2001: 367).

**Paratactic Conditionals:** constructions that are interpreted as conditionals but in which the *p*-clause is coordinated with the *q*-clause rather than being syntactically subordinated to it (Declerck & Reed 2001: 401).

*Keep still, you little devil, or I'll cut your throat!* [Ch. Dickens, 4]

(=If you don't keep still, I'll cut your throat.) If [-p], then [+q]

**"The....the....- constructions"** may and may not have a conditional connotation.

*The falser he, the truer Joe; the meaner he, the nobler Joe.* [Ch. Dickens, 421]

(=If he is falser, Joe is truer; if he is meaner, Joe is nobler.)

**Postscript -P Conditionals:** Conditionals in which P-clause is not fully integrated into the Q-clause but is added as a kind of afterthought (and hence follows the Q-clause, with an intonational break between the two clauses. The loose syntactic connection between the clauses renders it possible for the postscript P-clause to be followed by a resumptive marker "that is" for the Q-clause (Declerck & Reed 2001: 367). In writing, the intonation break between clauses is usually signalled by some intermediary punctuation stop, such as a comma or a dash.

*Nay, there seemed to be two or more shouts raised together — if one might judge from a confusion in the sound.* [Ch. Dickens, G.E.,35]

*Save my son all manner of complications, won't it, if he wants to be saved, that is. [M. Lide, 153]*

## **B: (Meaning/Semantics)**

This section aims at revealing the main relations between *p* and *q* which seems to be an important aspect of semantic interpretation of conditionals: a) causal (cause-effect and inverted cause-effect); b) epistemic/inferential, c) speech-act, d) metatextual. As regards temporal relations between *p* and *q*, there are two main types: temporal simultaneity and temporal sequentiality, the latter being part of the interpretation of most conditionals (B. Dancygier 2006:72-109).

### **1. Semantic Relation between P and Q**

**1.1. Causal relation** (the realisation of *q* is a sufficient condition for the realisation in *p*)

*Ordway snapped back, "I'm not here for a debate, Mr. Freemantle. If you do as I say, then*

*you won't be arrested."* [A. Hailey, 431]

**1.2. Epistemic/inferential relation** (premise-conclusion relation: the knowledge of *p* is a sufficient condition for the conclusion made in *q*)

*If, as you say, Sir Thomas Lockit did not precisely monopolise the control of manufacture*

*in Great Britain, he, like others, caused almost any one to think so – his knowledge was so*

*positive and his emphasis so cold. [J. Galsworthy, 175]*

**1.3. Speech-act relation** (*p* guarantees or enables a successful performance of the speech act in *q*)

*If I may introduce myself, I'm Mr. Chou's manager. [G. Greene, 160]*

*I certainly hope you both enjoy your visit here. If you'll permit me I'll call around and see*

*if there's anything I can do to add to your pleasure. [F. Scott Fitzgerald, B.J.S., 167]*

**1.4. Metatextual relation** (commenting on the choice of linguistic expression or on a selected fragment of an utterance; in the meantime, contributing to the interpretation of the whole utterance). Speech-act and meta-textual conditions are conditions on appropriateness and do not have any real-world dependence between the clauses.

*You are my true friend, I know, if I have any in the world. [Ch. Dickens, D.C., 110]*

*My dear Copperfield”, said Mr. Micawber, rising with one of his thumbs in each of his waistcoat pockets, “the companion of my youth – if I may be allowed the expression – and my esteemed friend Traddler – if I may be permitted to call him so – will allow me, on the part of Mrs. Micawber, myself, and our offspring, to thank them in the warmest and most uncompromising terms for their good wishes.*

*[Ch. Dickens, D.C., 514]*

## **2. Temporal Relation between P and Q**

### **2.1. Simultaneity** (the two situations in the clauses are simultaneous)

*If he defends himself,” said Soames gloomily, other people won’t. [J. Galsworthy, 133]*

### **2.2. Sequentiality** (the situation in *p* precedes the situation in *q* or vice versa)

*“If all goes well,” I said, “you will be perfectly free and safe again, within a few hours.”*

*[Ch. Dickens, G.E., 437]*

## **C: (Use/Pragmatics)**

This section of the lesson plan deals with the form-function relationship of conditionals, more specifically, the interpersonal metafunctions of if-clauses and the meanings that they acquire in a specific context. This type of if-clauses may be labelled as “stylistic devices” or “illocutionary force indicating devices” meant to express the speaker’s attitudes and viewpoints as well as to ensure appropriateness of what is said in their main clauses, making them more polite, not exclusively though. Those discourse-regulating functions of if-clauses include, but are not limited to, anchoring, comparing, commenting, hedging (Declerck & Reed:319-365).

**Anchoring:**(functioning as a linking device to heighten coherence by including the main clause into the ongoing discourse; hence, providing a starting point for the utterance in the main clause)

*“If it’s about Minnie, you’re wasting your time being sore,” Le Moyne explained suddenly.*

*[F. Scott Fitzgerald, B.J.S., 167]*

### **Comparing:**

*If I adored her before, I now doubly adore her. [Ch. Dickens, G.E., 248]*

*If you are saved, your child is saved too; if you are lost, your child is still saved.*

*[Ch. Dickens, G.E., 413]*

**Commenting:**

*I have more information – course, height, speed – if you want to know. [A. Hailey, 377]*

*“You’re out of luck, if I may believe Miss. Havisham,” says Compeyson to me.*

*[Ch. Dickens, G.E., 349]*

**Hedging:** (making the utterance in the main clause more tentative, polite or diplomatic)

*“If I am not mistaken,” said Mr. Spewlow, as Miss Murdstone brought a parcel of letters out of her reticule, tied round with the dearest bit of blue ribbon, “those are also from your pen, Mr. Copperfield.” [Ch. Dickens, D.C., 526]*

*But, sir, if you will pardon my presumption, you are saying too much. [W.Hudson, 105]*

To put it succinctly, this lesson plan is, in essence, based on “why” and “why-not” thinking skills and strategies to uncover and/or discover “iffy” thinking through differentiating the wide variety of forms that marked and unmarked conditionals may have (Syntax: responsible for the grammatical accuracy of utterances); revealing the overwhelming variety of encoded meanings of conditionals (Semantics: responsible for the meaningfulness of utterances); as well as exploring and deciphering the infinite variety of pragmatic meanings conditionals may acquire in context (Pragmatics: responsible for the appropriateness of utterances in context).

The formulaic form of our lesson plan on Conditionals would probably look like:

**IFFY-thinking RECIPE = Syntax + Semantics + Pragmatics** flavoured by **WHY** and **WHY-NOT** thinking skills explored and digested in the Mysterious World of **IDIOMS**

This “recipe” designed for Conditionals is not a rigid model; it is flexible like creative thinking and well-reasoned like critical thinking offering a space for any ingredient to be added and seasoned by other types of thinking (analytical, systemic, reflective, logical, analogical, practical, deliberative, problem-solving), each of which is distinguished in its distinctive flavour and is irreplaceable in its direct input in developing learners’ cognitive skills. This model is also open and elastic for any kind of updating and reshaping in terms of the topic and other spices (idioms, idiomatic expressions, collocations) no less

important for enriching the recipe with unique smell and taste.

With the aim of not imposing our vision and perception on those who would like to make use of this lesson plan, we are offering a considerable number of assignments for each part of the lesson (all of which are nearly impossible to be used within the frame of one lesson) from which users may opt for the ones that are best fit for the aim and objectives of their lesson. By introducing these tools for explaining conditionals we want to share with our readers some of our insights on how it is possible to design and develop lesson plans involving one or another one; moreover, all these tools are alternative versions to all the popular ways and techniques of teaching conditionals.

### **LESSON PLAN (advanced)**

**Objective:** By the end of the lesson the learners will be better able to use conditionals in the context of feelings, physical and mental abilities, human relationships and behaviour mainly expressed by idioms and idiomatic expressions.

#### **Main Aims:**

➤ For learners to learn/revise and practise the basic forms and meanings of Conditionals I, II, III in the given context.

➤ Learners will have been introduced to and practised exceptional conditionals, as well as two syntactically-marked constructions that implicitly express conditional meanings (paratactic constructions, the...the...-constructions).

➤ Learners will become aware of different relations between the clauses in conditional constructions: simultaneity; sequentiality; causality; epistemic/inferential, speech-act and metatextual relations.

➤ Learners will become more accurate and confident in identifying the contextually-based meanings of if-clauses in different conditional constructions, namely discourse-regulating functions that include, but are not limited to, restating, anchoring, comparing, contrasting, commenting, evaluating, reminding, illustrating and hedging.

#### **Subsidiary Aims:**

➤ Learners will enrich their vocabulary through practising idioms and idiomatic expressions related to different human relationships, feelings and abilities.

## GUIDED DISCOVERY WORKSHEET

### A: FORM (SYNTAX)

#### A1: Basic Forms of Conditionals

I. Underline the conditional clauses in the following sentences containing idioms, then identify each type, using one of the labels: a) factual (Zero Conditional); b) predictive (Conditional 1); c) hypothetical (Conditional 2); d) counterfactual (Conditional 3).

1. *If all else fails, I'll have to go and live somewhere else.* \_\_\_\_\_

2. *If you do something to your heart's content, you do it as much as you want to because you enjoy it.* \_\_\_\_\_

3. *If Sarah had pulled her weight, we would have completed the project on time.* \_\_\_\_\_

4. *Would you be pleased if you were told that your behaviour at work had gone beyond a joke?* \_\_\_\_\_

#### A2: Exceptional Conditionals

II. Identify the type of condition expressed in the conditional clauses by using the following labels: a) exclusive condition; b) exceptional negative condition; c) concessive condition; d) intensifying unreal condition.

1. *People are usually in complete agreement over crucial issues **only if** they are on the same wavelength.* \_\_\_\_\_

2. ***Even if** he is usually quick on the uptake and always knows what's what, there seems to be a degree of uncertainty in his answers.* \_\_\_\_\_

3. ***If only** I had had my wits about me while making that important decision.* \_\_\_\_\_

4. *You won't see the wood for the trees **unless** you stop wasting time splitting hairs and start looking at the big picture.* \_\_\_\_\_

#### A3: Syntactically-marked Forms of Conditionals

III. Which of these "the...the... -constructions" yields a conditional interpretation? Paraphrase that sentence and match it with these symbolic formulas: If [+p], then [+q]; If [+p], then [-q]; if [-p], then [+q]; if [-p], then [-q]. You might have more than one matching.

1. *The more indulgent and permissive parents are, the more often their children throw a tantrum.* \_\_\_\_\_

2. *The more he experienced a sharp deterioration in his health condition, the more difficult he found it to come to terms with his illness.* \_\_\_\_\_

IV. Some idioms and idiomatic expressions seem to have an inherent conditional relationship between the elements. Give your own interpretation of these idioms with initial if-clauses. Try to explain the syntactic peculiarities of these paratactic conditionals.

1. *Spare the rod and spoil the child.*

If \_\_\_\_\_ .

2. *You snooze, you lose.*

If \_\_\_\_\_ .

3. *A stitch in time saves nine.*

If \_\_\_\_\_ .

V. Compare these two sentences with postposed if-clauses. Are there any differences between them or are they similar?

1. *I'd like to have a shot at bungee-jumping one day if I ever get the chance.*

2. *I'd like to have a shot at bungee-jumping one day, if I ever get the chance.*

- How many intonation patterns do you identify in these sentences: one or two? If two, what are the differences between them?
- Which of these sentences is a postscript-p conditional?
- What other punctuation mark(s) could have been used instead of the comma?

### **B: MEANING (SEMANTICS)**

VI. Define the type of semantic and temporal relations between *p* and *q* in the conditional constructions: **Semantic relations:** a) causal (cause-effect), b) causal (inverted cause-effect), c) epistemic/inferential,

d) speech-act, e) metatextual

**Temporal relations:** a) simultaneity b) sequentiality

1. *Grandma is feeling lousy, if that's an appropriate expression.* \_\_\_\_\_

2. *If you let Vanessa have her own way all the time, you'll spoil her.* \_\_\_\_\_

3. *If I may ask, how did you manage to gain the upper hand.*

4. *If he dares to attack everyone in the office like that, he will have taken the powers into his own hands.* \_\_\_\_\_

5. *If you are always singing his praises to me, his behaviour in class must have improved.* \_\_\_\_\_

- In which of these sentences do you think sequentiality is temporally reversed?
- Do you think that in all the sentences the temporal relation is necessarily either simultaneous or sequential?

### C: USE (PRAGMATICS)

VII. Under what circumstances would you say the conditional sentence given below? For each situational context define the interpersonal function of the if-clause: **reminding**, **hedging**, and **anchoring**. How important is the tenor (the relationship between the speaker and hearer) while deciding on the illocutionary force of the if-clause “**If I may remind you**”?

***If I may remind you**, you have promised not to tell anyone about our plan, so keep it under your hat.*

VIII. Answer the question given below so that your answer would sound appropriate and natural for peer-peer and parent-child communication. Identify the if-clause illocutionary force for each relationship and analyse it in a context. Does feeling a lot of affection for one particular person (often without knowing why) implicate evaluation, comment or implicit comparison? If it is an evaluation, does it have a boosting, downtoning or presupposition-rejecting connotation? Do you think that in a specific situational context it might even connote irony or sarcasm?

***If you are having a soft spot for her**, is the feeling mutual?*

VIII. Can “indicative counterfactual” constructions explicitly or implicitly indicate comparison? Compare these two examples in which the if-clause is the same but the main clauses differ in the amount of non-truth in the actual world.

1. *If you can keep yourself to yourself, **I can do that even more easily.***

2. *If you can keep yourself to yourself, **I'll eat my hat.***

- Which of these two sentences can be labelled as an absurdum conditional and why?
- Why do you think the semantic representation of absurdum conditionals goes from  $p$  to  $q$ , whereas their pragmatic interpretation in terms of an inference proceeds in the opposite direction?
- Does the if-clause in these two sentences have the same restating function (the information presented in an if-clause has already been mentioned in the preceding discourse) or do they have different functions (e.g. commenting, comparing, illustrating).
- On what pragmatic grounds does the speaker think that it is nearly

impossible for his/her interlocutor to avoid talking with or doing things with other people? May the level of intimacy between the interlocutors determine the level of absurdity of the utterance in both sentences?

- Under what circumstances could the first example be considered an absurdum conditional? (What if the speaker is an inveterate extrovert himself not imagining a second without his friends?)
- Can you think of other examples of these two seemingly similar-looking types? What are the most important “discourse ingredients” that should be taken into account when forming examples of these types?

XI. Decide on the extent to which “**then**” (as a marker of sequentiality or a resumptive anaphora) is compatible or incompatible in the five conditional sentences given below. Pay attention to the fact that the *p*-clause in all the sentences is the same and keep in mind that the use of “then” is not obligatory in any of them. In order to decide on the extent to which “then” is required or appropriate in these sentences it is necessary to identify the interpersonal function of the if-clause in each sentence through defining the type of the relation between the if-clause and the main clause. The particular relation between clauses will help us say whether that connection is close or loose, which in its turn will decide on the level of appropriateness or necessity of “then” between the clauses.

To make the task easier we are offering 6 tools which will help you analyse the two functions of “then” and decipher their pragmatic interpretations in specific contexts that you are supposed to provide these utterances with.

1. *If you are interested, **then** I'll let you in on a well-kept secret, but on one condition: you should take that secret to the grave with you.*
2. *If you are interested, **then** you should keep that plan under wraps, or else somebody else may grab that opportunity.*
3. *If you are interested, **then** it's you who has taken the lid off what really happened during the closed session yesterday.*
4. *If you are interested, **then** Malisa spilled the beans on her relationship with her boss.*
5. *If you are interested, **then** there is a book “Owls are good at keeping secrets” by Sara O’Leary in our University library.*

**Tool 1:** to add phrases “**as you say/claim/assert**”, “**as one might think/assume/conclude**”, “**as far as I could understand/infer**” to the if-clause to prove that the if-clause is a quotation from previous discourse. Though such if-

clauses are contextually given and are mainly seen as the hearer's echoed utterances, the truthfulness of their utterances may or may not be shared by the speaker.

- In which of the five examples do you think the phrases in bold may be added to the if-clause? In which of them are they less likely to be used and why?
- In order to determine the speaker's intent of saying "if you are interested" and 'if you are interested, as you say" try to create a situational context which would help you to decide on the circumstances under which the if-clauses with and without the added phrases may seem the same or different.
- Do all the sentences with the added phrases seem meaningful with "then". If yes, identify the function of "then": Is it a resumptive anaphora or a marker of sequentiality?
- Do you think "then" should be excluded from some of the sentences because they sound illogical with the phrases added to the if-clause? If yes, from which sentences and under what circumstances? Create different situational contexts for your analysis.

**Tool 2:** to add the expressions **"as a result", "as a consequence", or "as a corollary"** at the end of the main clause to discover the causal relation between the two clauses, thereby considering the possible sequentiality that causality may derive from.

- Is the order of reasoning (from causes to effects or from effects to causes) worth considering while deciding on the appropriateness or inappropriateness of the expression "as a result" in the main clause? If yes, which order allows that kind of addition?
- Do you think that the use of "as a result" is nearly impossible in sentences 3, 4, 5? If yes, then can we deduce that "as a result" can hardly be used in the sentences when reasoning goes from effects to causes (inverted cause-effect relations) or when the if-clause functions as an anchoring device or a politeness hedge?
- Is the improbability of "as a result" in the main clause somehow related to its incompatibility with "then"?
- Should temporal sequentiality and simultaneity be involved in the interpretation of the conditional constructions? Does the expression "as a result" sound natural if there isn't a marked sequential order between

the clauses or if the two situations are simultaneous? As a result, can we deduce that “then” in sentence 1 (in which the semantic relation between the clauses is close due to the marked sequential-causal relations) connotes “as a result” and can be substituted for it? Why does this substitute seem hardly possible in sentence 2 and nearly impossible in sentences 3, 4, and 5?

- Is the expression “as a result” a means to decide on the use of “then” in those sentences?
- Do you think that only sequential-causal relations between clauses may enable the two functions of “then” (resumptive anaphora and marker of sequentiality) to be revealed at a time? In which of these conditional sentences does “then” have this twofold function?

**Tool 3:** to add the focusing adverb “**only**” to if-clauses to see in which of the conditional sentences the restrictive meaning of “only” is appropriate and in which sentences its addition has a special effect. The phrase “only if” is synonymous to “providing/provided (that)”, “as/so long as”, “on condition that”, all of which, unlike if-clauses, express both a sufficient and necessary condition and may mean “if and only if”, known in philosophical literature as “iff”. The restrictive meaning of “only” may serve another effective tool to decide on the level of appropriateness of “then” in the five conditional sentences given above.

- In which of the five sentences do you think the “only if-clause” is possible to be used and why?
- Is “only if” compatible with “then” or do you think that “only” should be repeated before “then”?
- In sentence 1 “if” can easily be substituted for “only if” without a big change in the meaning of the whole utterance. However, there is one change that needs to be made in the main clause. Can you make that change by employing the right inversion rule?

**Tool 4:** to add the expression “**it means**” immediately after “then” to highlight the inferential relations between the  $p$  and  $q$  (premise-conclusion relation: the knowledge of an if-clause is a sufficient condition for the conclusion made in the main clause).

- Which of the five sentences does not undergo a change in meaning when “then” is replaced by “then it means” and why?
- Why do you think “then it means” sounds even more reasonable and intelligible than “then” in sentence 3? What is it that distinguishes the

nature of “then” in sentence 3 from that of other sentences? Can you define the function of “then” in that sentence: is it a resumptive anaphora, a marker of sequentiality or both?

- Can this tool help identify the “pragmatic nature” of “then” in all the conditional sentences. Does that nature serve a base on which we could build our understanding of conditionals in general and our interpretation of each of the sentences in a specific context in particular?
- Why do you think that the replacement of “then” by “then it means” is incompatible with the type of the relation between the clauses in sentences 1, 4 and 5. What is it that makes that replacement nearly impossible in them?
- Do you think that the use of “then it means” in sentences 2 and 3 is the same or different? Argue your point by identifying the function of the if-clause (restating, anchoring, reminding, commenting, etc.) in these sentences in a specific situational context.
- In which of the sentences does the if-clause connote uncertainty? Can you define the type of the meaning that uncertainty has in these sentences: a semantic meaning which is encoded by linguistic form and is not cancellable either explicitly or implicitly in a discourse context or a pragmatic meaning which is not encoded by form and is cancellable because it is acquired in a specific context of utterance? Create particular situational contexts to decide on the type of the meaning that uncertainty connotes in the if-clauses in the given sentences. Can the replacement of “then” by “then it means” help you to define the nature of uncertainty in the if-clauses?

**Tool 5:** to add the “**biconditional**” **reading of conditionals** to the interpretation of the five sentences to understand the nature of “then” in them and to decide on the interconnection of “what is said” (Semantics) and “what is implicated” (Pragmatics) expressed by these sentences. For example, the biconditional reading of the sentence “If the weather changes for the better, then we will go on a picnic” includes not only “what is said”, but also the converse conditional that is not said but is rather implicated: “If the weather doesn’t change for the better, then we won’t go on a picnic.” Thus, the condition expressed in the if-clause is not only sufficient but also necessary for the realisation of the situation in the main clause and, therefore, may be paraphrased in two possible ways: “Only if the weather changes for the better,

will we go on a picnic” or “If and only if the weather changes for the better, we will go on a picnic.”

- Which of the five sentences do you think may have biconditional reading and why?
- Do you think that the level of uncertainty expressed in the if-clause and their biconditional readings (if possible, of course) are directly or indirectly interdependent?
- Do you think that biconditional reading hardly works for sentences 3, 4, and 5? If not, what can it be attributed to?
- To what extent does biconditional reading of conditionals act as a “distinguishing indicator” for the type of the condition of the if-clause (sufficient, necessary, or both) in the first place, and for the function of “then” (if it is compatible with biconditional reading) in each of the sentences in the second place?
- What type of relations between clauses (causal, sequential, resultative, inferential, speech-act) fits biconditional reading and is more likely to be analysed through it?

**Tool 6:** to add the modal verbs **would** or **might** to the if-clause to analyse the five conditional sentences in light of modality which is “a milestone” for revealing the interpersonal functions of the if-clause in discourse. This “modal colouring” of the utterance “if you would/might be interested” would be effective in revealing tenor (speaker-hearer relationship) acting as a politeness hedge for tentatively conveying uncertainty, doubt or hesitation about the truthfulness of the if-clause without threatening the hearer’s negative face (the obstruction of the hearer’s freedom of action through directly involving him/her into an ongoing discourse). This seemingly small addition to the if-clause has a great pragmatic value inasmuch as these modal verbs help to make the speaker’s negotiating and cooperating attempts more natural and polite. As far as the epistemic or non-epistemic nature of the modal verbs is concerned, they may only be identified in particular settings which will put the different levels of the hearer’s willingness of getting involved in the discourse on the map.

- Do you think that this addition is possible in all of the five sentences and is that possibility somewhat connected with the nature of “then”? Try to give well-reasoned responses.

- Do you think that modality is a powerful tool to explicitly or implicitly showcase the speaker's attitude not only to the content of the communication but also to the extralinguistic factors that "regulate or guide" the communication in a specific context? Which of these two attitudes is to be considered in the analysis of these conditional sentences (if the suggested change is possible to be made in them) in a setting you would provide?
- If "would" or "might" can be inserted in sentence 1, what is it that these modals may markedly enhance: the level of uncertainty or politeness? How could this addition affect the use of "then" between the clauses? For each answer create an appropriate real-life situation.
- Do you think that the use of "would" or "might" in sentence 2 may cast doubt on the hearer's echoed utterance? Could it also cast doubt on the use of "then"?
- Under what circumstances would it be feasible to add modality to the if-clause in sentence 3 and what pragmatic interpretations may it give rise to?
- Could the use of the modals in sentences 4 and 5 bring about a radical change in the meaning? If yes, to what extent?

**Tool-based Analysis:** Agree or disagree with the conclusions drawn from the tool assignments given above. Write T (true) or F (false) next to each assertion.

- Irrespective of the relations between the if-clause and the head clause, the use of "then" is not obligatory; it may accentuate or reinforce the interconnection and/or interdependence between clauses though. \_\_\_\_\_
- Depending on the type of the relation between clauses, the use of "then" may seem inappropriate, even unacceptable; only under certain circumstances might its use become logical, even necessary. \_\_\_\_\_
- Uncertainty expressed by the if-clause is encoded in linguistic form and is therefore not cancellable regardless of the context that the conditional construction might be used in. \_\_\_\_\_
- Biconditional reading is the most efficient tool while deciding on the relevant use of "then" in the above-mentioned conditional sentences. \_\_\_\_\_
- Of all the tools mentioned above, only tool 4 may not be employed in \_\_\_\_\_

sentence 1 because the expression “then it means” is a tool to intensify inferential but not causal relations between clauses. \_\_\_\_\_

- Whether the if-clause in sentence 2 expresses uncertainty or is merely seen as the hearer’s echoed utterance can be determined in discourse where the degree of uncertainty or truthfulness of the utterances may vary from context to context and from person to person; the importance and/or the necessity of “then” may accordingly vary too. \_\_\_\_\_
- Both tool 3 (only if) and tool 5 (biconditional reading) aim at intensifying the sufficient and necessary condition in the if-clause the relation of which with the main clause is sequential and causal; in its turn “then” may be regarded as another means of emphasizing that close relation. \_\_\_\_\_
- Unlike the other relations between clauses, the speech-act relations in sentences 4 and 5 are evaluated as rather weak which is proved by the fact that not all the tools are applicable in their analysis. \_\_\_\_\_

Thus, we have come to realize, that conditionals being the guides of our reasoning of real and unreal situations can be studied in a variety of ways and from a variety of perspectives. The lesson plan reveals and exhibits the conspicuous and non-conspicuous particularities of “iffy” thinking through the integration of “why” (critical) and “why-not” (creative) thinking skills. The integrated three-fold approach to teaching conditionals will eventually lead to developing insights for constructing our own opinions and assumptions through a myriad of feasible answers. Not only will this kind of approach promote students’ grammatical accuracy and proficiency, but it will also embrace and develop interdisciplinary knowledge, skills, values and behavior. Another no less important hallmark of this approach is that it is multidimensional and hierarchical (form - meaning - use) as it provides smooth transition from lower order thinking skills (LOTS) to higher order thinking skills (HOTS). Last but not least, this approach is task-based: using the authentic language of idioms in meaningful exercises.

## References

1. Bruner, J. S., The act of discovery. *Harvard educational Review*, 1961:31-32.
2. Dancygier B., Conditionals and Prediction, Time, knowledge and causation in conditional constructions, Cambridge University Press, 2006: 72-109.
3. Dancygier B., and E. Sweetser, Conditionals, distancing, and alternative spaces. In: Adele Goldberg (ed.), *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications, 1996:83-98.
4. Declerck R., Reed S., Conditionals, A Comprehensive Empirical Analysis, Mouton de Gruyter, 2001:319-401.
5. Elizabeth C. Traugott, Alice ter Meulen, Judy S. Reilly and Charles A. Ferguson (eds), *On Conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009:3-5.
6. Fauconnier, G., Mental spaces: Aspects of meaning construction in natural language. Cambridge University Press, 1985: 16-21.
7. McCarty M., and O'Dell F., *English Idioms in Use*, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
8. Rescher, N., *Conditionals*. A Bradford Book. The MIT Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts / London, England, 2007:1-4.
9. Richards Jack. C., and Rodgers Theodore S., *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press, 2014.
10. Thornbury S., *How to teach Grammar*, Pearson Education Limited, 1999.
11. Trask R. L., *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*, Routledge, 1996.
12. Yule G., *Explaining English Grammar*, Oxford University Press, 1998: 142.

## Fiction

1. Arthur Hailey. *Airport*. Bantam Books; Doubleday Company, Inc., 1969.
2. Charles Dickens. *David Copperfield (DC.)*. The Pocket Library, 1978.
3. Charles Dickens. *Great Expectations (GE.)*. Penguin Classics, 1996.
4. F.Scott Fitzgerald. *The Basil and Josephine Stories(B.J.S.)* Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1973.
5. Graham Greene. *The Quiet American*. 1968.
6. John Galsworthy. *A Modern Comedy*. Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976.
7. Mary Lide. *The Legacy of Tregaran*. St. Martin's Press, New York, 1991.
8. W. H. Hudson. *Green Mansions*. 1955.

**Պայմանի հարաբերություն արտահայտող կառույցների  
ուսումնասիրությունը «ուղղորդված հայտնագործության»  
մեթոդով՝ «ձև-իմաստ-կիրառություն»  
հարաբերակցության լույսի ներքո**

**Վարդանյան Լուսիկ  
Խառատյան Մարինե**

**Ամփոփում**

*Հանգուցային բառեր. ուղղորդված հայտնագործություն, պայման արտահայտող կառույց, շարահյուսություն, շարահյուսական կառուցվածք, իմաստաբանություն, իմաստային հարաբերություն, գործաբանություն, գործաբանական գործառույթ*

Հոդվածում ուսումնասիրվում են պայմանի հարաբերություն արտահայտող կառույցների շարահյուսական առանձնահատկությունները, բաղադրիչ նախադասությունների իմաստային հարաբերությունները և ստորադաս բաղադրիչի գործաբանական գործառույթները ձև-իմաստ-կիրառություն հարաբերակցության լույսի ներքո: Հոդվածում ներկայացված դասի պլանի հիմքում ընկած է ամերիկացի հոգեբան և մանկավարժ Ջերոմ Բրուների «ուղղորդված հայտնագործության» մեթոդը, որը զգալիորեն խթանում է սովորողների քննադատական (կոնվերգենտ) և ստեղծագործական (դիվերգենտ) մտածողությունը: Պայման արտահայտող կառույցներում բաղադրիչների փոխկապակցության բնույթը դիտարկվում և բացահայտվում է դարձվածքների և դարձվածաբանական արտահայտությունների միջոցով՝ լեզվաբանական գործիքների կիրառմամբ:

**Изучение условных предложений методом  
«направляемых открытий» в свете  
корреляции «форма-значение-употребление»**

*Варданян Лусик  
Харатян Марина*

**Резюме**

**Ключевые слова:** метод направляемых открытий, условные конструкции, синтаксис, синтаксическая структура, семантика, семантическая связь, прагматика, прагматическая функция.

В статье изучаются синтаксические характеристики условных конструкций, семантические связи между главными и придаточными предложениями, а также прагматические функции придаточных предложений в свете корреляции форма-значение-употребление. В основе плана урока, представленный в статье, лежит метод «направляемых открытий», автором которого является американский психолог и педагог Джером Брунер. Данный метод значительно стимулирует критическое (конвергентное) и креативное (дивергентное) мышление у студентов. Взаимосвязь между главными и придаточными предложениями в условных конструкциях раскрывается при помощи идиоматических оборотов и выражений с применением языковых инструментов.

**Ներկայացվել է 20.03.2022 թ.**

**Գրախոսվել է 13.05.2022 թ.**

**Ընդունվել է տպագրության 27.05.2022 թ.**