Basic syntactic notions

S Y N T A X LECTURE 6 BASIC SYNTACTIC NOTIONS 1. Some approaches to the study of syntactic units. The central role of syntax within theoretical linguistics became clear only in the 20th century, which some scholars call the " century of syntactic theory" as far as linguistics is concerned. Nowadays theoretical approaches to the discipline of syntax are numerous and extremely diverse. One school of thought treats syntax as a branch of biology, since it conceives of syntax as the study of linguistic knowledge as embodied in the human mind.

Other linguists regard syntax to be the study of an abstract formal system. Yet others consider syntax to be a taxonomical device to reach broad generalizations across languages. One more school of thought approaches syntactic phenomena from the philosophical point of view proceeding from the idea that reality consists of things, their qualities and relationships. Hence, the subdivision of words by the parts of speech and the treatment of syntactic problems as philisophic processes. The hypothesis of generative grammar is that language is a structure of the human mind.

The goal of generative grammar is to make a complete model of this inner language (known as i-language). This model could be used to describe all human language and to predict the grammaticality of any given utterance (that is, to predict whether the utterance would sound correct to native speakers of the language). This approach to language was pioneered by Noam Comsky. Most generative theories (although not all of them) assume that syntax is based upon the constituent structure of sentences. Generative grammars are among the theories that focus primarily on the form of a sentence, rather than its communicative function.

Among the many generative theories of linguistics, the Chomskyan theories are: Transformational Grammar (TG) (Original theory of generative syntax laid out by Chomsky in Syntactic Structures in 1957 ; Government and binding theory (GB) (revised theory in the tradition of TG developed mainly by Chomsky in the 1970s and 1980s); Minimalist program (MP) (a reworking of the theory out of the GB framework published by Chomsky in 1995) Categorial grammar is an approach that attributes the syntactic structure not to rules of grammar, but to the properties of the syntactic categories themselves.

For example, rather than asserting that sentences are constructed by a rule that combines a noun phrase (NP) and a verb phrase (VP) (e. g. the phrase structure rule S > NP VP), in categorial grammar, such principles are embedded in the category of the head word itself. So the syntactic category for an intransitive verb is a complex formula representing the fact that the verb acts as a functor which requires an NP as an input and produces a sentence level structure as an output. This complex category is regarded as " a category that searches to the left for a NP (the element on the left) and outputs a sentence (the element on the right)".

The category of transitive verb is defined as an element that requires two NPs (its subject and its direct object) to form a sentence. Dependency grammar regards structure as determined by the relations (such as grammatical relations) between a word (a head) and its dependents, rather than being based in constituent structure. For example, syntactic structure is described in terms of whether a particular noun is the subject or agent of the verb, rather than describing the relations in terms of phrases.

Stochastic/probabilistic grammars/network theories These are theoretical approaches to syntax based upon probability theory.

They are known as stochastic grammars. One common implementation of such an approach makes use of a neural network or connectionism. Some theories based within this approach are: Optimality theory and Stochastic context-free grammar. Functionalist grammars are functionalist theories, which (though focused upon form) are driven by explanation based upon the function of a sentence (i. e. its communicative function). Some typical functionalist theories include: Funtionalist grammar; Prague Linguistic Circle; Systemic functional grammar; Cognitive grammar; Construction grammar; Role and reference grammar; Emergent grammar Constructional Syntax.

Constructional analysis of syntactic units was initiated by Prof. G. Pocheptsov (1971). The analysis deals with the constructional significance/insignificance of a part of the sentence for the whole syntactic unit. The theory is based on the obligatory or optionalenvironmentof syntactic elements. For example, the element him in the sentence / saw him there yesterday is constructionally significant because it is impossible to omit it. At the same time the elements there and yesterday are constructionally insignificant - they can be omitted without destroying the whole structure.

Communicative Syntax. It is primarily concerned with the analysis of utterances from the point of their communicative value and informative structure. It deals with the actual division of the utterance - the theme and rheme analysis. Both the theme and the rheme constitute the informative structure of utterances. Pragmatic approach to the study of syntactic units can briefly be described as the study of the way language is used in

particular contexts to achieve particulargoals. Speech Act Theory was first introduced by John Austin.

The notion of a speech act presupposes that an utterance can be said with different intentions or purposes and therefore can influence the speaker and situation in different ways: I just state the fact; Textlinguistics studies the text as a syntactic unit, its main features and peculiarities, different ways of its analysis. Discourse analysis focuses on the study of language use with reference to the social and psychological factors that influencecommunication. 2. Some concrete methods of syntactic analysis.

The most commonly applied concrete methods of syntactic analysis seem to be the IC and transformational procedures. The method of IC is based on the idea that sentences have a hierarchic structure consisting of a number of layers. It is assumed that parts of a sentence are combined with each other according to strict rules. If we want to know how a sentence is built we must separate its units or constituents. Hence the notion of immediate constituents /IC/. Immediate constituents are those parts of a sentence that we arrive at after dividing it into two (the first step).

Those parts or IC may, in their turn, be divided into further parts until the actual place of each word in the structure of the sentence as a whole has been established. (e. g. The old man saw a black dog there. S – sentence P – phrase N- noun V – verb t – article p - preposition A – adjective D – adverb) The method of IC is very helpful in syntactical analysis. But it has certain limitations. Sentences in which the relations between words are considerably different despite identical surface structures get in the IC model quite similar interpretations. Compare the sentences: John is eager to please and John is

easy to please. In the former the relations between John and eager are of a subjective character, while in the latter John and easy stand in an objective relation to each other. By applying the method of IC we cannot establish formally the existing difference. It is because the structures of these sentences are analyzed separately from the structures of other sentences. The tansformational method is aimed at overcoming the demerits of the method of IC.

The Transformational grammar was first suggested by American scholar Zelling Harris as a method of analyzing sentences and was later elaborated by another American scholar Noam Chomsky as a synthetic method of ' generating' (constructing) sentenceswhich is why the theory is also called " generative grammar". The fundamental ideas underlying this method are as follows. Every language has a very small number of sentence patterns called kernel or basic sentences. All the variety of sentences which can exist in that language are derived or generated from these kernel sentences by derivation rules.

Grammarians have made attempts at setting up a list of patterns that could be regarded as kernel sentences. It is interesting to point out that the number of these is essentially different in various books. Transformational grammar makes a fundamental distinction between two types of sentences: kernel sentences and transforms. The latter are derived from the former. Transformational grammar traces the derivational history of a sentence by establishing what is called its " depth structure". It thus shows why sentences having similar surface structures convey different structural meanings.

The differences in meaning can be formally explained applying the transformational method. Z. Harris set up the following list of kernel sentences: NV(John came); NVpN (John looked at Mary); NVN(John saw Mary); N is N (John is ateacher); N is p N (/John is in bed); N is D (John is here); N is A (John is angry) The above sentence " The old man saw a dog there" can be interpreted as the transform of the following three kernel sentences: The man saw a dog there. The man was old. The dog was black. (The man who was old saw a dog that was black. (The old man saw a black dog there.

The ambiguity of the sentence " Flying planes can be dangerous", is easily explained by the following transformational procedure: To fly planes is dangerous. He can fly planes. (Flying planes can be dangerous. Planes can be dangerous. Planes fly. (Flying planes can be dangerous. Only by transformation can we explain why phrases of the N`sN type denote different relations as in John's arrival and John's trial, the former being a transform of the kernel sentence John arrives and the latter having a different derivational history: X triesJohn (John is tried (John's trial.

S. Porter reduces the number of kernel sentences to three: " All simple sentences belong to one of three types: A) The sun warms the earth; B) The sun is a star; C) The sun is bright; As an argument S. Porter adds: " Word order is changeless in A) and B), but not in C). Even in sober prose a man may say " Bright is the sun". The sentences derived fromsuch kernel sentences are words or combination words added to the kernel ones in accordance with their combinability so as to make the communication as complete as the speaker wishes.

Thus, the kernel sentence " Boys play" can be quite independent. But this sentence can be extended by realizing the combinability of the noun " boys" and the verb " play" into " The three noisy boys play boisterous upstairs". We can develop the sentence into a still more extended one. But one should bear in mind that the rules of combinability have to be observed for the sentence to be valid. It should also be stressed that there are rules of grammatical and lexical combinability as well as stylistic ones.

The combination of words will be ungrammatical if we put together " boys plays", instead of " boys play" or " the fish shouted" instead of " the boy shouted". 3 The Subject Matter of Syntax Words by themselves do not, as a rule, make up complete units of speech, in order to become such units, they must get combined with one another in the framework of linguistic items of a higher rank. These are the sentence and the phrase. As a whole, they make up the syntactical structure of a language.

From the point of view of Structural Grammar syntax is the part of grammar that studies the laws in accordance with which words become phrases, and sentences. Hence, syntax is the part of grammar that investigates the syntactical structure of a language. It treats of both phrases and sentences which, though belonging to different levels of language structure, are closely connected with each other. The traditional definition of syntax was extended by Prof. L. S. Barkhudarov who states that syntax has also to investigate phenomena lying on a still higher level, namely the level on which sentences combine into groups of sentences.

Considering the fact that syntax studies the way words and phrases are combined into phrases, sentences and texts some scholars define syntax as

thesciencewhich studies the types of formal and semantic relations within word combinations, sentences, supra-phrasal unities and texts. The syntactic language level can be described with the help of special linguistic terms and notions: syntactic unit, syntactic form, syntactic meaning, syntactic function, syntactic position, and syntactic relations. Syntactic unit is always a combination that has at least two constituents.

The basic syntactic units are a word-group, a clause, a sentence, and a text. Their main features are: they are hierarchical units (the units of a lower level serve the building material for the units of a higher level); as all language units the syntactic units are of two-fold nature (the content side - the syntactic meaning of a syntactic unit- being opposed to the expression side - the syntactic form of a syntactic unit); they are of communicative and non-communicative nature (word-groups and clauses are of non-communicative nature while sentences and texts are of communicative nature.

Syntactic meaning is the way in which separate word meanings are combined to produce meaningful word-groups and sentences. Syntactic form may be described as the distributional formula of the unit (pattern). John hits the ball - N1 + V + N2. Syntactic function is the function of a unit on the basis of which it is included to a larger unit: in the word-group a smart student the word ' smart' is in subordinate attributive relations to the head element. In traditional terms it is used to denote syntactic function of a unit within the sentence (subject, predicate, etc.).

Syntactic position is the position of an element. The order of constituents in syntactic units is of principal importance in analytical languages. The syntactic position of an element may determine its relationship with the

other elements of the same unit: his broad back, a back district, to go back, to back sm. Syntactic relations are syntagmatic relations observed between syntactic units. They can be of three types -coordination, subordination and predication. 4 The Phrase Level and the Sentence Level Modern linguistics distinguishes between the phrase level and the sentence level.

There exist many definitions of phrases, the difference between them being that one group of scholars hold that phrases consist of only notional words while their opponents think that the constituents of a phrase can be function words (prepositions, conjunctions, etc.). Most definitions mention some negative feature characteristic of phrases. Prof. B. A. Ilyish, for instance, terms as phrase " every combination of two or more words which is a grammatical unit but is not an analytical form of some word. " Prof. L.

S. Barkhudarov, on the other hand, defines a phrase as " a group of syntactically connected notional words being part of a sentence but not being the sentence itself. " We have already mentioned how difficult it is to draw a rigid demarcation line between phrases and analytical forms. As to the borderline between phrases and sentences, it is much easier to establish. The most important feature of a sentence as distinct from a phrase is its intonation. The structure of a phrase is of a very wide and abstract character.

While singling out particular types of phrases we do not take into account the lexical meanings of the words or their morphological features. (So, for example, all the groups of words, that follow, can be classed as phrases of the V+N type: writes a letter, has seen the friend, has been giving lessons, having completed the work, etc.) Since phrases are only parts of sentences,

we must assume that there exists a higher level with its own peculiar structure. It is called the sentence level.

Irrespective of its linear character (a succession in time or space of morphemes, words, phrases), the sentence has a hierarchic structure. That means that the parts of a sentence are not independent, they can exist as such only in their mutual interrelation. The interdependence of the parts of a sentence is not necessarily reflected in their linear succession. 5. Types of Syntactical Relations; Means of Expression The relations between words within phrases and sentences are not uniform.

It is one of the most important tasks of syntax to single out and to define the types of syntactical relations. The universally recognized types of syntactic relations are: subordination, coordination and predication. Subordination is the type of syntactical relation under which the function of one part of the phrase coincides with the function of the phrase as a whole. The leading part is called the head of the phrase while the part having a function different from that of the head is called the adjunct of the phrase.

Apart from the purely semantic criterion it is quite possible to establish which word is the head by applying the formal procedure of substitution (e. g. " A young man entered the room". In this sentence the whole group a young man performs the function of the subject. We may replace the group by the word man: " A man entered the room". Hence, the word man is the head of the phrase and young - the adjunct.) While performing the substitution procedure one should not change the syntactical relations within the sentence as a whole(e. g. He is a young man.

He is a man. He is young /wrong/). Coordination is the type of syntactical relation under which he syntactical function of the whole group coincides with that of its parts. Coordination can also be established by applying the substitution test (Thus, in the sentence " Boys and girls studied at that school", the group boys and girls performs the function of the subject. The same function can be performed by either of the words making up the group: " Boys and girls studied at that school". " Boys studied at that school", " Girls studied at that school").

Coordinative relations are found in phrases with coordinative conjunctions /but, neither…nor/ and also in groups like the poet Byron, my brother the teacher(e. g. The poet Byron lived in Greece. – The poet lived in Greece. – Byron lived in Greece; My brother the teacher got married last year. – My brother got married last year. - The teacher got married last year). Predication is the type of syntactical relation under which the syntactical function of the group as a whole is different from the functions of each of its components /IC/.

The most typical predicative relation is that between the subject and the predicate. This is most distinctly seen in complex sentences such as: " I hate…talking loudly"; " I knew he had come" None of the IC of the subordinate clauses can be replaced by the clause as a whole. It is impossible to say " I knew he" or " I knew had come". The types of syntactic bonds just described are generally recognized, though not all scholars use the terms given above to designate them.

However, these types of syntactic bonds can fail to explain the relation between, for instance, the main predication and the inserted elements in the

sentences (" The boy, as it were, left the house". " Interestingly and fortunately for him nobody saw him"). That is why some grammarians consider it also necessary to single out other types of syntactic relation to cover the cases in question. The number and types of syntactic bonds added to the above given ones varies from author to author and we are not going to dwell on them here.

Instead, we shall confine ourselves to presenting the system of syntactic bonds worked out by Prof. Smirnitskiy which will serve as an example. According to him there are four types of syntactic relations in English: 1) the attributive bond characterized by A. I. Smirnitskiy as the closest kind of syntactic relations (we deal with the attributive bond in attributive word combinations or between the attributive subordinate clause and its head in the main clause); 2) the completive bond connecting the predicate and all kinds of objects, objective subordinate clauses.

Adverbial subordinate clauses are also said to be connected with the main clause with the help of this kind of bond; 3) the copulative bond connecting homogeneous parts of a sentence, or independent clauses in a compound sentence. Parenthesis(or insertions) of all kinds are also regarded as syntactic phenomena introduced into the sentence with the help of this kind of syntactic bond; 4) the predicative bond, which is described as the loosest of all syntactic bonds, establishes the relations between the subject and the predicate.

Every language has its peculiar grammatical means that signal different syntactical relations. Like morphemes indicating various forms of words, these may be called syntactical forms for they express syntactical relations.

The relations between words in a phrase or a sentence are diverse and multiple. In syntactical analyses we normally avoid mentioning relations which can be ascribed to the lexical meanings of the words (e. g. In the phrases his singing and his hat the semantic relations between the words are different (doer- process, possession) but syntactically we have one and the same relation (subordination).

Modern English makes use of the following syntactical means of expressing syntagmatic relations: Word-order. It is with the help of word-order that we make out the syntactical relations between the words in the following groups: a young man; to read a book; stone wall; Peter sees Mary; etc. Word order may indicate not only that the words stand in some kind of relation to one another but also what kind of relation it is. The forms of the words. This linguistic device has more than often been underestimated by scholars writing on the grammar of English.

In the opinion of Prof. A. I. Smirnitskiy, it is just due to their scarcity that the forms of the words acquire an important role in the structure of the sentence or phrase. The importance of the morphological forms can be clearly seen if we compare the following two groups of which only the former is a sentence: He likes them – Him like they. Function words. By these we mean prepositions and conjunctions which show different relations between words (e. g. the poet Byron – the poet after Byron; a poor man – poor and proud). Intonation.

Intonation may perform different functions: it helps to distinguish between a phrase and a sentence, it may also indicate different relations between words. LECTURE 7 THE PHRASE 1. Syntactical Classification of Phrases In

accordance with the character of syntactic relations existing between the parts of a phrase, these are divided into three large classes: subordinative phrases, coordinative phrases, predicative phrases. This division is based on the definition under which a phrase is understood as a combination of two. or more notional words standing in some syntactical relation to one another' and being . art of a sentence. 2. Formal Relations within a Phrase. The inner relations between the parts of a phrase are expressed formally in some way or other. No uniform classification of these formal devices has not been established so far. Still, the following types of formal syntactical means have been outlined so far: Agreement by which grammarians understand the phenomenon of two or more words having similar morphological forms due to their being connected syntactically. As a rule, the subordinate element adapts its form to that of the word it is subordinated to.

Agreement is found in noun phrases with demonstrative pronouns: (this book - these books that house - those houses.) As to the agreement between the subject and the predicate, it is of a less formal character (e. g. The United States is a country situated in North America. Our group are fond of sports.) In thisrespectEnglish is less formal than, say, Russian. In English the subject and the predicate agree with each other semantically rather than formally. This type of connection is called correspondence. Government by which grammarians understand he phenomenon of one of the words in a phrase having some grammatical form conditioned by the word it is subordinate to Government is very common in Russian where even prepositions can require that the nouns following them should stand in a certain case form. As a syntactical device government is rather rare in Modern English. We find it in

combinations of the V+In type in which the verb requires that the personal pronoun should have the form of the objective case. The same can be said of p + In and p + whom (see him, invite us, to me, about whom, etc). Adjoining and enclosure.

The absence of both agreement and government, termed adjoining, is the most characteristic feature of the syntactical structure of Modern English. Adverbs, for example, are said to be adjoined to verbs and adjectives. Strictly speaking it is not only the actual position of the adjective that helps the hearer or reader to understand what word is modified by the adverb, but in many cases some semantic features have also to be taken into account, for the adverb may be considerably far from the word it is connected with. Modern English makes extensive use of another means of expressing syntactical relations.

It is called en enclosure. A very illustrative example of enclosure is found in word groups like a. fine day, where the article is separated from the noun permitting other words to become syntactically connected with the noun. In this way any word, word group and even whole sentences may become adjuncts of the noun (e. g. The above statement; a big-circulation newspaper; a take-it-or-leave-it tone). 3. 0. Jespersen 's Theory of Ranks A very interesting syntactical theory, known as the theory of three ranks. was elaborated by O. Jespersen.

According to this theory, there is a certain analogy between the distribution of words into parts of speech and their interrelations in actual speech. Analysing the word group extremely hot weather 0. Jespersen points out that the chief word is defined by another word which in its turn may be defined

by a third word, etc. " We are thus", he writes, " led to establish different " ranks" of words according to their mutual relations as defined defining. " In his example weather is called_the primary, hot - the secondary, extremely - the tertiary In this way one can establish the rank of a word in respect of the other words it is connected with. . Subordinative phrases: noun phrases; verb phrases; adjective phrases; adverb phrases; pronoun phrases. . Subordinative phrases are distinctly different from co-ordinative and predicative phrases. In these phrases we always find parts winch are unequal as regards their syntactical status. The word whose function coincides with the function of the whole_phrase is called the head, and the dependent or subordinate word is called the adjunct. Unlike coordinative phrases subordinative phrases are always binary in structure.

That means that irrespective of the actual number of words making up a subordinative phrase it always falls into two immediate constituents. So, for example, the phrase continued to refuse to meet demands for higher wages, at the initial stage of division into I? falls into two parts: continued and to refuse to meet demands for higher wages. What was the adjunct during the first division, in its turn, falls into the next I?: to refuse and to meet demands for higher wages; the latter also consists of two parts: to meet and demands for higher wages, and so on.

The principles of classification of subordinative phrases may be various. They may be classified depending on the part of speech the head of the phrase belongs to. Under this classification the following types of phrases are distinguished: noun phrases, verb phrases, adjective phrases, adverb phrases, pronoun phrases. The second classification takes into account

whether the I? of the phrase consist of one or more than one. notional words. If each I? of the phrase has only one notional_word, the phrase is called simple.

If at least one of the I? has_two or more notional_words, the phrase is called complex. We can also distinguish, in this connection, between complex phrases with an expanded head and complex phrases with an expanded adjunct , and, finally, there may be phrases in which both the head and the adjunct are expanded. (e. g. The reception of the delegation by the President (a complex phrase with an expanded head) Saw the father of the youth (a complex phrase with an expanded adjunct); The reception of the delegation by the President of the state (a complex phrase in which both the head and the adjunct are expanded).

Subordinative phrases may additionally be divided into continuous and discontinuous. This division takes into account the fact whether the I? of the phrase are found in succession or whether they are separated by some word which does not belong to this phrase. (e. g. Slowly, Old Jolyon got up out of the chair - a discontinuous phrase). a. Noun Phrases Noun_phrases are subordinatiye phrases in which the, head is a noun. As regards the mutual positions of the head and its adjunct linguists distinguish noun phrases with preposed adjuncts and noun phrases with postposed adjuncts.

In noun phrases with preposed adjuncts the latter can be expressed by the following classes of words: adjectives, pronouns, numerals, verbs in the form of participle I or participle II, nouns having the 's morpheme or without it. To use symbols, these phrases have the following structures: AN (whitesnow; thick books); IaN (this room; his friend); QN (three windows; the second

lesson); V-ingN (shouting boys; melting ice); V-enN (written works; corrected mistakes); N'sN (Mary's book; a week's delay); NN (window glass; university team).

In noun phrases with postposed adjuncts the following units may be the adjuncts: prepositional groups; adjectives and adjective phrases; verbs in the form of participles and verb phrases in which participles are the heads; verbs in the form of the infinitive and verb phrases in which the infinitive is the head; infinitival and gerundial predicative phrases; noun phrases; conjunctional groups; adverbs; numerals; subordinate clauses.

The patterns noun phrases with postposed adjuncts are: NpN (the title of the book); NpNP (the title of the new book); NpIn (the saving of him); NpV-ing (my reason for coming); NpV-ingP (my reason for coming here). In principle any preposition can be part of a postposed adjunct. Special investigations have shown, however, that the preposition of covers 70% of all occurrences. Postposed adjuncts with adjectives are relatively rare, in this position the occurrence of adjective phrases is much more common: NA (the people present); NAP (a country rich in coal).

It should be stressed here that only a limited number of adjectives can be used as postposed adjuncts. They are: the adjective present; adjectives with the suffixes -ible, -able, some adjectives with the prefix a- (afraid, alive). Postposed adjuncts with verbs in various forms are represented by the following types: NV-en (the person addressed); NV-ing (the children shouting); NV-enP (the work done by him); NV-ingP (the children shouting in the yard); NtoV (the work to do); NtoVD (the work to do quickly).

Postposed adjuncts consisting of predicative phrases are of two kinds: they may have as a head either the infinitive or the ing-form. As a rule, they are introduced by the preposition for (the so-called for-phrases). Here are some of the most frequent patterns: NforNtoV (a book for Tom to read); NforN'sV-ing or NforNV-ing (the reason for Tom's coming; the reason for Tom coming). Each part of the adjunct may get considerably expanded (the reason for poor Tom's coming late; a poem for this little boy to learn by heart).

Postposed adjuncts in which nouns are the heads or introduced by the conjunction as are not very frequent in Modern English. They are: NNP (a child the same age); NasN (his life as an artist); NasNP (his life as an opera singer). Postposed adjuncts with adverbs are rarely used: ND (Jim's speech yesterday). Postposed adjuncts with numerals are confined in English only to quantitative numerals (page three, room ten). b. Verb PhrasesVerb phrases take a central position among all types of phrases in Modern English. They display a great variety of structure and are capable of combining with one another.

Therefore they make up syntactical constructions of considerable depth, and complexity. Prof. L. S. Barkhudarov suggested that verb phrases should be classified according to the lexico-grammatical nature of the verb being the head of the phrase. As is known, all English verbs fall into two large classes: transitive and intransitive verbs. It is also known that many verbs can be used in either meaning but this is quite irrelevant for syntax because in any given sentence one and the same verb is either transitive or intransitive.

Under the classification suggested by Prof. L. S. Barkhudarov English verb phrases fall into the following main classes: phrases the head of which is

either a transitive or an intransitive verb; phrases the head of which necessarily belongs to a definite subclass of verbs (transitive or intransitive). The adjuncts in verb phrases, accordingly, fall into two types: adjuncts capable of combining with verbs of either class called extensions; adjuncts capable of combining with verbs of only a definite class (transitive or intransitive) called complements.

The adjuncts of a transitive verb are called object complements, those of an intransitive verb qualifying complements. The following adjuncts can be found in verb phrases with extensions: adverbs and adverb phrases; adjectives and adjective phrases; prepositional groups; noun phrases without prepositions; pronouns; verbs in the form of the infinitive; participle I and participle II; conjunctional groups; predicative phrases; subordinate clauses: VD (runs quickly); VDP (runs very quickly); VA (stood, angry); VAP (stood, red with anger); VpN (returns to the country); VNP arrived last week); VIa (lives there); VIself. washing himself); VtoT (came to help); VtoVP (came to help me); VV-ing (came laughing); VV-en (came, frightened); VbN (acting as judge); VbA (speaking whenever possible); Vb toV (rising so as to see); VforNtoV (stood for John to pass); VpN'sV-ing (left without John's, noticing). (For verb phrases with complements see: ?. ?. ??????????. ????????? ???????? ??????????? ???????????? ??????????? ?????, p? 89 -110) ?.

Adjective Phrases Adjective phrases have a comparatively low frequency of occurrence, if the head of the phrase is an adjective in the positive degree, the adjunct may be: an adverb; a prepositional group; a noun; a noun phrase; a verb in the form of the gerund or the infinitive; a predicative phrase and a subordinate clause: DA (incredibly beautiful); ApNP (good for

young children); AN (worth the trouble); AV-ingP (busy doing sums); AtoV (ready to go); AforNtoV (easy for John to read).

Things are somewhat different with adjectives in the comparative and superlative degrees. Adjectives in the comparative degree usually combine with adjuncts introduced by the conjunction than (Tom is older than George). They also combine with adverbs and adverbial pronouns, such as far, still, much (far greater, much better, still greater). Adjectives in the superlative degree may have a proposed adjunct like by far or a postposed adjunct - a prepositional group introduced by the prepositions of and in. d.

Adverb Phrases In adverb phrases the adjuncts may stand both in preposition and in postposition. Proposed adjuncts are adverbs and adverbial pronouns (except enough), and with the adverbs before, later, earlier, ago nouns or noun phrases. Postposed adjuncts are the pro-adverb enough, prepositional groups (p+N, etc.), nouns and noun phrases: DD (rather well); IdD (so nicely); ND (years later); NPD (six days ago); D+enough (well enough); DpN (high in the air). e. Pronoun PhrasesOnly indefinite, negative and demonstrative pronouns can be heads of pronoun phrases.

They take the following adjuncts: prepositional groups (p+N; p+In, p+NP); adjectives or adjective phrases; verbs in the form of the infinitive or verb phrases with the infinitive as the head; infinitival predicative phrases and subordinate clauses. The adjunct is always placed in postposition: In pN (some of the workers); In pIn (some of us); InA (something strange); IntoV (nothing to do); In forNtoV (Nobody for Tom to see). 5. Coordinative phrases. Co-ordinate phrases are characterized by the following features: all its

members have a similar function in the sentence; their structure is not binary.

As to the morphological peculiarities of the constituents of a coordinate phrase, it should be stressed here that this point is of no relevance for syntax. (So, for example, in the sentence - Celia was pretty and a good companion - pretty and a good companion are the constituents of one and the same coordinate phrase irrespective of their being essentially different as regards their morphological nature: pretty is an adjective, good companion is a noun phrase.) Coordinate phrases fall into two groups: 1)Syndetic coordinate phrases.

The syntactical connection between the I? is expressed with the help of conjunctions. If the conjunction is continuous, the coordinate phrase is said to be simple. If the conjunction is discontinuous, the phrase is said to be correlative (E. g. It was the sound of a gramophone, harsh and loud, He has both luck and talent.) 2)Asyndetic coordinate phrases. The syntactical connection between the parts of the phrase is expressed only with the help of intonation. (E. g. He was hot, dusty, tired out. The good lady her mother now interposed.) 6.

Predicative phrases Predicative phrases fall into three groups: infinitival predicative phrases (for John to come); gerundial predicative phrases (John's coming); absolute predicative phrases (all things considered). Predicative phrases have a binary structure, they are made up of only two I?. They have much in common with sentences, but the I? of a predicative phrase should not be termed subject and predicate. It should be noted here that the

subjectival member of a predicative phrase and the subject of a sentence always refer to different persons or things. (E. g.

He stood up for me to sit down. He is proud of his friend having won a prize. The lesson being over, we went home.) Infinitival predicative phrasesThe subjectival member of an infinitival predicative phrase is a noun. a noun phrase or a pronoun, the latter in the form of the objective case. The predicatival member of an infinitival predicative phrase is any form of the infinitive with or without words subordinate to it. The phrase is preceded by the preposition for: forN/P/toV/P/ (for John to go there); forI toV/P/ (for something to happen); forI toV/?/ (for him to come late).

Gerundial predicative phrasesThe subjectival member of a gerundial predicative phrase is a noun or a noun phrase with or without the morpheme 's; a possessive pronoun in the conjoint form or a personal pronoun in the objective case form and other pronouns. The predicatival member of a gerundial predicative phrase is any form of the gerund with or without words subordinate to it: NP'sV-ingP (young John's coming late); NPV-ing P: (young John coming late); I'sV-ingP (his coming late); ImV-ing P (him coming late).

Absolute predicative phrasesThe subjectival member of an absolute predicative phrase is a noun or a noun phrase, a personal pronoun in the nominative case or another type of pro-noun. The predicatival member of an absolute predicative phrase is a verb in the form of the participle or the infinitive, or a verb phrase with these forms as a head, or non-verbal parts of speech: adjectives, adverbs, prepositional groups: NPV-ingP (his voice trembling with excitement); InV-ingP (it rising slowly); NPV-enP (his thirst gone);

NPtoV? (the expenses to be paid); In toVP (each to be defined); NPAP (his face very pale); NPD (breakfast over); NPpNP (hat in hand); NPplm (her back to him); NPNP (his shot afailure). Instances are not few when absolute predicative phrases are introduced by the prepositions with or without. (He looked at Mr. Micawber attentively, with his whole face breathing short and quick in every feature. I left the room without anybody noticing it)