

The problem of Parts of the sentence

SUBMITTED BY : KOMILOV D.

The problem of Parts of the sentence

Contents

Introduction	3
§ 1. The principal parts of the sentence	4
§2. The problem of the secondary parts of the sentence	11
§3. Constituent analyses of the sentence	17
Conclusion	24
Bibliography	27

Introduction

Development of a science as a whole and a linguistic science, in particular is connected not only to the decision of actuality scientific problems, but also with features internal and foreign policy of the state, the maintenance of the state educational standards which are to the generators of progress providing social, economic society. It forms the society capable quickly to adapt in the modern world¹.

The course paper under review is dedicated to the study of the problem of parts of the sentence in English used in different context which presents a certain interest both for theoretical investigation and for practical usage.

The topicality of the investigation is expressed on the one hand by the profound interest in learning the problem of parts of the sentence which are widely used to perform linguistic richness of the English language.

The aim of this research is based on detailed study of the problem of parts of the sentence in English.

The object of given investigation is the problem of parts of the sentence and the different structural types of the sentences with them.

The subject is the structural-semantic and functional-contextual features of the problem of parts of the sentence used in sentences in English.

The structure of the given course paper consists of an introduction, three paragraphs, a summary which is followed by the list of literature used in the course of research.

¹ И.А. Каримов. Наша высшая цель - независимость и процветание Родины, свобода и благополучие народа Доклад на первой сессии Олий Мажлиса Республики Узбекистан второго созыва от 22.01.2000ю - Т.: Узбекистан. 2000. Т. 8. - С. 322-340.

§1. The principal parts of the sentence

Parts of the sentence are a syntactic category constituted by the organic interaction of different linguistic units in speech. It is important to observe that the division into parts of speech and the division into parts of the sentence are organically related. This does not call for much to explain. The part of speech classification is known to be based not only on the morphological and word-making characteristics of words but their semantic and syntactic features as well.

The latter are particularly important for such parts of speech as have no morphological distinctions at all. A word (or a phrase) as a part of sentence may enter into various relations with the other parts of a given sentence. These mutual relationships are sometimes very complicated as being conditioned by different factors: lexical, morphological and syntactic proper. Important observations in the theory of the parts of the sentence based on the interrelation of types of syntactic bond and types of syntactic content were made by A. I. Smimitsky. A part of the sentence is defined as a typical combination of the given type of syntactic content and the given type of syntactic bond as regularly reproduced in speech. Different types of syntactic bond form a hierarchy where distinction should be made between predicative bond and non-predicative bond.

On the level of the sentence elements this results in the opposition of principal parts and secondary parts. The predicative bond constitutes the sentence itself.

The parts of the sentence which are connected by means of the predicative bond are principal parts. These are the core of the communicative unit. The non-predicative bond comprises attributive, completive and copulative relations.

Subject-predicate structure gives the sentence its relative independence and the possibility to function as a complete piece of communication. This, however, must be taken with some points of reservation because a sentence may be included in some larger syntactic unit and may thus weaken or lose its independence functioning as part of a larger utterance. Using the terms "subject"

and "predicate" we must naturally make distinction between the content of the parts of the sentence and their linguistic expression, i. e.: a) the words as used in a given sentence and b) the thing meant, which are part of the extralinguistic reality. The subject is thus the thing meant with which the predicate is connected. All the basic sentences consist, first of all, of two immediate constituents: subject and predicate. In the basic sentence patterns subjects are rather simple, consisting of either a single noun, a noun with its determiner or a pronoun. They can naturally grow much more complicated: nouns can be modified in quite a variety of ways and other syntactic structures can be made subjects in place of nouns or its equivalents. Meaning relationships are naturally varied. Subjects can refer to something that is identified, described and classified or located; they may imply something that performs an action, or is affected by action or, say, something involved in an occurrence of some sort.

The semantic content of the term "subject" can be made clear only if we examine the significant contrastive features of sentence patterning as operating to form a complete utterance. In Modern English there are two main types of subject that stand in contrast as opposed to each other in terms of content: the definite subject and the indefinite subject.

Definite subjects denote a thing-meant that can be clearly defined: a concrete object, process, quality, etc., e. g.: (a) Fleur smiled, (b) To defend our Fatherland is our sacred duty, (c) Playing tennis is a pleasure, (d) Her prudence surprised me. Indefinite subjects denote some indefinite person, a state of things or a certain situation, e. g.: (a) They say. (b) You never can tell, (c) One cannot be too careful, (d) It is rather cold, (e) It was easy to do so.

Languages differ in the forms which they have adopted to express this meaning. In English indefinite subjects have always their formal expression. In some types of sentence patterns Modern English relies on the word-order arrangement alone. In The hunter killed the bear variation in the order of sentence elements will give us a different subject. English syntax is well known as

primarily characterised by "subject — verb — complement" order. It will be noted, however, that in a good many sentences of this type the subject and the doer of the action are by no means in full correspondence, e. g.: This room sleeps three men, or Such books sell readily. It comes quite natural that a subject combines the lexical meaning with the structural meaning of "person". Things are specifically different in cases when it and there are used in-subject positions as representatives of words or longer units which embody the real content of the subject but are postponed.

It is most pleasant that she has already come. It was easy to do so. There are a few mistakes in your paper. There were no seats at all.

It and there in such syntactic structures are generally called anticipatory or introductory subjects. There in such patterns is often referred to as a function word, and this is not devoid of some logical foundation. It is pronounced with weak or tertiary stress, which distinguishes it from the adverb there pronounced (ehr, eh) and having primary or secondary stress. There is sometimes called a temporary subject filling the subject position in place of the true subject, which follows the verb. This interpretation seems to have been borne out by the fact that the verb frequently shows concord with the following noun, as in: there is a botanical gardens in our town; there were only three of us there comes his joy. The grammatical organisation of predicates is much more complicated. The predicate can be composed of several different structures. It is just this variety of the predicate that makes us recognise not one basic English sentence pattern but several. In terms of modern linguistics, the predicate is reasonably defined as the IC of the sentence presented by a finite-form of the verb, if even in its zero-alternant. Predicates with zero-alternants offer special difficulties on the point of their analysis as relevant to the problem of ellipsis which has always been a disputable question in grammar learning. Various criteria of classifying different kind of predicate have been set up by grammarians. The common definition of the predicate in terms of modern linguistics is that it is a more or less complex structure with the verb or verb-phrase at its core. This is perfectly reasonable and

in point of fact agrees with the advice of traditional grammars to identify a predicate by looking for the verb. The sentence, indeed, almost always exists for the sake of expressing by means of a verb, an action, state or being.

The verb which is always in key position is the heart of the matter and certain qualities of the verb in any language determine important elements in the structural meaning of the predicate. These features will engage our attention next. To begin with, the predicate may be composed of a word, a phrase or an entire clause. When it is a notional word, it is naturally not only structural but the notional predicate as well. The predicate can be a word, a word-morpheme or a phrase. If it consists of one word or word-morpheme it is simple; if it is made up of more than one word it is called compound. In terms of complementation, predicates are reasonably classified into verbal (time presses, birds fly, the moon rose, etc.) and nominal (is happy, felt strong, got cool, grew old). The two types of predicates in active syntax may be diagrammed as follows:

A. Verbal Predicate Simple Tastes differ. Compound One must do one's duty.

B. Nominal Predicate Simple Quite serious all this! Compound The picture was beautiful.

The multiplicity of ways in which predication can be expressed in active syntax permits a very large number of sentence-patterns to be built in present-day English. We find here both points of coincidence with other languages and special peculiarities of sentence-patterning conditioned by the whole course of language development. Predication, with its immediate relevance to the syntactic categories of person, time and modality, is known to be expressed not only morphologically. Syntactic arrangement and intonation may do this duty as well. Time relations, for instance, may find their expression in syntactic structures without any morphological devices indicating time. The one-member sentence Fire!, depending on the context, linguistic or situational, may be used as: a stylistic alternative of the imperative sentence meaning; a stylistic

alternative of a declarative sentence stating a fact. The multiplicity of syntactic ways in which modality and time relations as well as the category of person maybe expressed in infinitival clauses is also well known. Examples are commonplace.

Run away! Go to the east! To think that he should be tortured so — her Frank!

In the theory of English structure the term "sentence analysis" is open to more than one interpretation. Structural grammatical studies of some modern linguists have abandoned many of the commonly held views of syntax. With regard to the methodology employed their linguistic approach differs from former treatments in language learning. To begin with, distinction must be made between the „mentalistic" and the „mechanistic" approach to sentence analysis. By "mentalistic" approach we mean the "parts of the sentence" analysis based on consideration of semantic relationships between the sentence elements. The "mechanistic" approach is known to have originated in USA in nineteen forties. It is associated primarily with the names of Bloomfield, Fries, Harris and Gleason. Claimed to be entirely formal, the "mechanistic" approach is based only on the structural relations of sentence elements, i. e. their position in the speech chain. To make the distinction between the two approaches clear consider the following examples: "mentalistically" (i. e. analysing sentences by putting questions) "to invite students " and "invitation o f students " are parsed as syntactic structures with objects denoting the person towards whom the action is directed. In terms of "mechanistic" analysis, students and of students would be different sentence elements because they differ in terms of structure (expression plane). The new method of sentence analysis is known as the method of immediate constituents (IC's). As we have already pointed out, the concept of IC was first introduced by L. Bloomfield and later on developed by other linguists. The structural grouping of sentence elements into IC's has naturally its own system in each language. It has been recognised that English has a dichotomous structure. The concept of immediate constituents

(IC's) is important both in morphology and syntax. An immediate constituent is a group of linguistic elements which functions as a unit in some larger whole.

The study of syntax is greatly facilitated by studying the types of immediate constituents which occur. We have learned to call the direct components of the sentence "groups". In terms of modern linguistics they are immediate constituents. A basic sentence pattern consists first of all of a subject and a predicate. These are called the immediate constituents of the sentence. They are constituents in the sense that they constitute, or make up, the sentence. They are immediate in the sense that they act immediately on one another: the whole meaning of the one applies to the whole meaning of the other. The subject of a basic sentence is a noun cluster and the predicate is a verb cluster, we can therefore say that the immediate constituents (IC's) of a sentence are a noun cluster and a verb cluster. Each of the IC's of the sentence can in turn be divided to get IC's at the next lower level. For example, the noun cluster of a sentence may consist of a determiner plus a noun. In this case, the construction may be cut between the determiner and the noun, e. g. the girl. The IC's of this noun cluster are the and girl. The verb cluster of the sentence may be a verb plus a noun cluster (played the piano). This cluster can be cut into IC's as follows: played/the piano. The IC analysis is, in fact, nothing very startling to traditional grammar. It will always remind us of what we learned as the direct components of the sentence: "subject group" and "predicate group". But it proceeds further down and includes the division of the sentence into its ultimate constituents. The basic assumption of this approach to the grammatical analysis of sentences is that all the structural signals in English are strictly formal matters that can be described in physical terms of forms, and arrangements of order. The formal signals of structural meanings operate in a system and this is to say that the items of forms and arrangement have signalling significance only as they are parts of patterns in a structural whole. In terms of the IC's model prevalent in structural linguistics, the sentence is represented not as a linear succession of words, but as a hierarchy of its immediate constituents. The

division is thus made with a view to set off such components as admit, in their turn, a maximum number of further division and this is always done proceeding from the binary principle which means that in each case we set off two IC's. Thus, for instance, the sentence My younger brother left all his things there will be analysed as follows:

My younger brother left all his things there

My \ younger brother left all his things \ there

and so on until we receive the minimum constituents which do not admit further division on the syntactic level

left | all his things || there

My || younger HI brother left || all j||| his things || there

left HI all 1111 his \111 things there

The transformational model of the sentence is, in fact, the extension of the linguistic notion of derivation to the syntactic level, which presupposes setting off the so-called basic or "kernel" structures and their transforms, i. e. sentence-structures derived from the basic ones according to the transformational rules.

§2. The problem of the secondary parts of the sentence

The theory of the secondary parts is one of the last developed sections of linguistics. The usual classification of these parts into objects, attributes, and adverbial modifiers is familiar to everyone, no matter what his mother tongue may be and what foreign language he may study. Yet it has many weak points. The characteristic features of each of the three types are not clearly defined, and describing a given word or phrase as an object or an attribute in some cases, or again describing it as an object or an adverbial modifier, in others, often proves to be a matter of personal opinion or predilection. Such statements then lack all scientific value. Indeed, with some scholars the theory of secondary parts of the sentence as usually given has been discredited to such an extent that they have attempted to discard it altogether. For instance, Prof. A. Peshkovsky, in his very valuable book on Russian syntax, does not use the notions of object, attribute, and adverbial modifier at all. Instead, he classifies the secondary parts of a sentence into those which are governed and those which are not². The notion of government, however, properly belongs to the level of phrases, not to that of the sentence and its parts. So we will not follow Peshkovsky in this method of classification. But his decision to do without the traditional categories of secondary parts is very instructive as an attempt to do away with a method whose weaknesses he realised well enough³. We will now look at the three traditional secondary parts of a sentence (object, attribute, and adverbial modifier) and try to find out on what principles their distinction is based and what objective criteria can be found to identify them. Apart from that there will be a special problem concerning the attribute. The object is usually defined in some such way as this: It is a secondary part of the sentence, referring to a part of the sentence expressed by a verb, a noun, a substantival pronoun, an adjective, a numeral,

² See A. М. Пешковский, Русский синтаксис в научном освещении, гл. XIII'

³ Irteneva N.F., Barsova O.M., Blokh M.Y., Shapkin A.P. A Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, 1969.

or an adverb, and denoting a thing to which the action passes on, which is a result of the action, in reference to which an action is committed or a property is manifested, or denoting an action as object of another action⁴.

If we take a closer look at this definition, which is typical in its way, we shall find that it is based on two principles, namely (1) the relation of the object to a certain part of speech, (2) the meaning of the object, that is, the relation between the thing denoted and the action or property with which it is connected. The first item of the definition practically means that an object can refer to any part of speech capable of being a part of the sentence. The second item enumerates certain semantic points in the relation between the thing denoted by the object and the action (or the property) with which it is connected. We can at once note that the second item of the definition is incomplete, as it does not include a very important case, namely an object denoting the doer of the action with the predicate verb in the passive voice, as in the sentences He (Rob) was asked by Chapman and Hall to write the letterpress for a series of sporting plates to be done by Robert Seymour who, however, died shortly after, and was succeeded by him (Phiz), who became the illustrator of most of Dickens's novels. If Charles had inherited any of the qualities of the stern, fearless, not-tempered soldier who had been his father, they had been obliterated in childhood by the ladylike atmosphere in which he had been reared. (Compare similar cases in Russian.)

This part of a sentence is usually called object and certainly is neither an attribute nor an adverbial modifier of any kind. And so, the list of meanings which the object may have should be enlarged by adding one more, which might be put like this — the thing (or person) which is the origin of the action (with the predicate verb in the passive voice).

However, this addition will not make the second item of the definition satisfactory. Formulated as it is, it shows that the object can mean one thing and

⁴ See, for example, Грамматика русского языка, т. II, ч. 1, стр. 523 The first of these principles is syntactical, based on morphology (morphologico-syntactical), the second is semantic.

another (the number of these meanings is 5 or 6), but the essential question remains unanswered: what is the meaning of an object, or, what is that which unites all those 5 or 6 meanings into one category, called the object? If the definition is to be satisfactory it is bound to formulate this invariable, as we may call it, which will appear in different shapes in each particular case where an object is found in a sentence. It is certainly far from easy to give a definition of this invariable, but probably it should run something like this — "a thing (or person) connected with a process or a property". Before, however, adopting any definition of this kind, we should carefully check it in as many sentences as possible. This difficulty will become clearer after we have considered the definitions of the other secondary parts — the attribute and the adverbial modifier.⁵

We will now take up the definition of the attribute and consider it as we have considered that of the object. Besides, as we have already hinted, there is a special question concerning the status of the attribute in relation to other parts of a sentence. The usual kind of definition of the attribute is this: It is a secondary part of the sentence modifying a part of the sentence expressed by a noun, a substantival pronoun, a cardinal numeral, and any substantivised word, and characterising the thing named by these words as to its quality or property. This definition, as well as that of the object, contains two items: (1) its syntactical relations to other parts of the sentence expressed by certain parts of speech, (2) its meaning. As far as meaning is concerned, the definition of the attribute is stricter than that of the object, as it practically mentions one meaning only (the terms "quality" and "property" may well be said to denote closely connected varieties of one basic notion). As far as the first item is concerned, the definition also gives a narrower scope of syntactic connections than was the case with the object: all parts of speech enumerated here are united by the notion of substantivity common to all of them.

⁵ Irtenyeva N.F., Barsova O.M., Blokh M.Y., Shapkin A.P. A Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, 1969.

If we now compare the definition of the attribute with that of the object we shall see at once that there are two main differences between them: (1) the attribute, as distinct from the object, cannot modify a verb, an adjective, or an adverb, and (2) the attribute expresses a property while the object expresses a thing. They also have something in common: they both can modify a noun, a pronoun, and a numeral. We shall see further on that the two definitions are not always a safe guide in distinguishing an attribute from an object. Now let us consider the definition of an adverbial modifier. It may sound like this: It is a secondary part of the sentence modifying a part of the sentence expressed by a verb, a verbal noun, an adjective, or an adverb, and serving to characterise an action or a property as to its quality or intensity, or to indicate the way an action is done, the time, place, cause, purpose, or condition, with which the action or the manifestation of the quality is connected. This definition is based on the same principles as two other definitions we have discussed: (1) the syntactical connection of an adverbial modifier with parts of the sentence expressed by certain parts of speech (and the list in this case is shorter than in either of the first two). (2) the meanings, which in this case are extremely varied, comprising no less than eight different items (and the list is not exhaustive at that). It appears to be particularly necessary here to look for an answer to the question: what does an adverbial modifier express, after all, so that the answer should not be a list, but just one notion — its invariable. It could probably be argued that all the meanings enumerated in the definition amount to one, viz. the characteristic feature of an action or property. If we choose to put it that way, there remains only one "or" (action or property), which we might perhaps try to get rid of by looking for a term which would cover both actions and properties. As to the first item of the definition, it has some peculiarities worth notice. In the list of parts of speech there is a point unparalleled in the other definitions which we have discussed, namely not every kind of noun can have an adverbial modifier, but only a verbal noun, that is, a noun expressing an action presented as a thing. So the characteristic

features of a noun as a part of speech are not sufficient to enable it to have an adverbial modifier: it must belong to a certain lexical class. Let us now proceed to compare the parts of speech enumerated in the definition of an adverbial modifier with those enumerated in the definitions of the other secondary parts of a sentence, and let us first take the list given in the definition of the object. There all the parts of speech capable of being parts of the sentence were given. So the parts of speech which the two lists have in common are, a verb, a verbal noun, an adjective, and an adverb. If we now compare the list given for the adverbial modifier with that given for the attribute, we shall find that the only point which they have in common is the verbal noun: for the attribute it says "noun", which of course includes verbal nouns, and for the adverbial modifier it expressly says "verbal noun". Thus the sphere of overlapping between attributes and adverbial modifiers is very limited.⁶

Summing up these comparisons we find that the first item of the definitions leaves room for ambiguity in the following cases: (1) if the part of the sentence which is modified is expressed by a noun, its modifier may be either an object or an attribute; (2) if it is expressed by a verbal noun, the modifier may be either an object, or an attribute, or an adverbial modifier; (3) if it is expressed by an adjective, the modifier may be either an object or an adverbial modifier; (4) if it is expressed by a cardinal numeral, the modifier may be either an object or an attribute; (5) if it is expressed by a verb,- the modifier may be either an object or an adverbial modifier; (6) if it is expressed by an adverb the modifier may be either an object or an adverbial modifier, too. The above classification does not take into account the stative. If we add it to our list we shall get one more point: (7) if the part modified is expressed by a stative, the modifier may be either an object, or an adverbial modifier.

⁶ Irtenyeva N.F., Barsova O.M., Blokh M.Y., Shapkin A.P. A Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, 1969.

Since in these cases the first item of the definition does not lead to unambiguous results, we shall have to apply its second item, namely, the meaning of the modifier: a property, a thing, or whatever it may happen to be. For instance, if there is in the sentence a secondary part modifying the subject which is expressed by a noun, this secondary part may be either an object or an attribute. (It cannot be an adverbial modifier, which cannot modify a part of the sentence expressed by a non-verbal noun.) Now, to find out whether the secondary part in question is an object or an attribute we shall have to apply the second test and see whether it expresses a thing or a property. This would seem to be simple enough, but is far from being always so. In a considerable number of cases, the answer to the question whether a secondary part expresses a thing or a property will, strangely enough, be arbitrary, that is, it will depend on the scholar's opinion, and not on any binding objective facts⁷.

Take, for instance, the following sentence: The dim gloom of drawn blinds and winter twilight closed about her. Here the phrase of drawn blinds and winter twilight modifies the noun gloom, which is the subject of the sentence. Since it modifies a noun it may be either an object or an attribute, and the choice between the two has to be made by deciding whether it denotes a thing (of whatever kind) or a property. How are we to decide that? On the one hand, it may be argued that it denotes a thing and its relation to the other thing, called gloom, is indicated. Then the phrase is an object. This view can hardly be disproved. On the other hand, however, it is also possible to regard the matter differently, and to assert that the phrase expresses a property of the gloom and is therefore an attribute. That view is quite plausible, too, and there is nothing in the facts of the language to show that it is wrong. So we shall have to choose the answer that seems to us to be the "better" one, i. e. to apply personal taste and opinion. The result thus gained will inevitably be subjective. The matter may also be settled by convention, that

⁷ Iriskulov M.A. Kuldashv A.M. Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. Tashkent, 2008, 208 pages

is, we may declare that we shall consider, say, every prepositional phrase modifying a noun to be an attribute (this is actually done in most English grammars)⁸.

From a theoretical point of view the distinction is of no particular interest, and a convention may be accepted without prejudice to the scientific level of our study. We might even say that in such circumstances the distinction between object and attribute is neutralised, and propose some new term, which would be more general than either "object" or "attribute". This indeed would probably be the best way of making syntactic theory agree with the actual facts. We may suppose that that is the case in other spheres of syntax, too: if two views conflict in defining the essence of a certain phenomenon, and appear to be both of them right in their way, it is very likely that the distinction has been neutralised. A similar situation is also possible with the object and the adverbial modifier. This is the case, for instance, in a sentence like this: In her face were too sharply blended the delicate features of her mother, a coast aristocrat of French descent, and the heavy ones of her florid Irish father. The question is, what part of the sentence is in her face. As it modifies a verb it can be either an object or an adverbial modifier. To decide between these, we apply the second item of the definitions, and find out whether the secondary part expresses a thing or characterises the action. Now, obviously it is possible to take it in two ways; we might say that the secondary part of the sentence expresses an object affected by the action, or that it expresses a characteristic of the action itself.

Accordingly whoever said that it was an object would have something on his side, and so would he who said that it was an adverbial modifier. In this case it seems rather more difficult than in the preceding case (see above) to settle the matter by convention. We could not possibly set down that any prepositional phrase modifying a verb is an object, since in many cases that

⁸ Iriskulov M.A. Kuldashv A.M. Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. Tashkent, 2008, 208 pages.

would be clearly untrue. So the choice between object and adverbial modifier is bound to be arbitrary and subjective. The right way out of this is to say that in these positions the distinction between object and adverbial modifier is neutralised, and to propose some new term which would be more general than either "object" or "adverbial modifier". Since it is always difficult to invent a new term that will stand a reasonable chance of being generally accepted, it might perhaps be the best solution to use the term "secondary part" for all cases when the distinction between object and attribute, or that between object and adverbial modifier, is neutralised.

§3. Constituent analyses of the sentence

The parts of the sentences are the basic syntactical units. First and important in the investigation of the structure of the sentence is segmentation that is articulation of the composition of the sentence into constituents. A sentence as a unit of the language, with the help of which speech communication is carried out, must reflect, on the one hand, all diversity of possible, constantly changing beyond the language situations and, on the other hand, regulate the imagination of them through generalizing character structural schemes and semantic configurations.⁹ Only satisfying these requirements the language can effectively function as a means of communication and a means of thinking activity of man. It is natural that a member of the sentence as a constituent part of the sentence cannot be indifferent to these requirements, but on the contrary, must provide their implementation. The part of the sentence when it functional syntactical nature doesn't change in all unlimited number of the real sentences (the subject as a source or the object of the action, the predicate as an action that the subject carries out) being differently expressed lexically under conditions of identity of lexemes is sorted as a component of each new sentence with all the new subjects, with their properties, their terms of existence, thus providing the reflection of final setting of language means of unlimited diversity of the objective world and worlds that are created by intellectual activity of human

Part of the sentence is a two-sided language mark, which possesses the meaning and the form. Its meaning is syntactic function, that is, that substantial relation, in which given syntactic element is in another structure of some - π consecution of elements. The form of the part - is not only syntactically meaningful morphological form of the word, but also characteristics, connected with the belonging of the word to the definite part of speech or to the category of words inside of the part of speech, presence or v) sence of secondary auxiliary words, the location in the relation to another enseat

⁹ Blokh M.Y. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, 1983, p 236

intonation indications of syntactic relation- shortly everything that allows to identify the word or group of words as a bearer of definite syntactic- functional significance. Thus, syntactic form, unlike morphological one, is multi-componential. The diversity of syntactical and semantic configurations is unlimited. The system of the parts of sentence in some extent is appropriate to the system of parts of speech. What elements form the system of parts of the sentence? Their nomenclature is standard and therefore it unlikely needs the substantiation. These are the subject, the predicate, the object, the modifier and the attribute. Full parallelism between that and the other systems is not only undesirable from the point of view of substantial problems and the possibilities of the language, but also on principle it is impossible, even for the fact that in the structural-semantic nature of some parts of speech are input their syntactical half-functionality. Thus, the noun as a expresser of the meaning of the object can be the subject, the object, the modifier, nominative attribute, nominative part of the predicate. Traditionally the parts of the sentence are divided into main and secondary parts. Taking the given designations as conditionals (such-called secondary parts, like the main parts can belong to the structural minimum of the sentence; the object is correlative with the subject) one should acknowledge that established division traditionally reflects the necessary differential property of the parts of the sentence, and especially their participation / absence in the formation of predicative core of the sentence, in expressing the category of predicativity. Practical convenience to the advantage of such division is in its unambiguity: the subject and the predicate are the main parts of the sentences; the others are always secondary parts of the sentences. If to proceed from the role that the parts of the sentence play in formation of structural-semantic minimum of the sentence, then it turns out that most of the objects and some modifiers (depending on syntagmatic class of the verb-predicate) are the as important as the subject and the predicate. The removal of the objects and the modifiers in the examples below makes them grammatically and semantically unmarked: She closed her eyes. She was there.

The distribution of the parts of the sentence will be different if they are considered coming from the role in the actual articulation of the sentence.¹⁰ Here it appears that it is secondary parts that are communicatively essential (rhematic), as the subject and to the less extent predicate form initial part of the utterance (thematic). In the following example But she cries always in the succession of the sentence She doesn't move for hours at a time. But she cries always. (S. Maugham) the modifier always forms more important part of the information, given by this sentence, than the subject. Thus the elements of one and the same system are organized differently, if they are considered in the aspects of different properties peculiar to them. It will be right in establishing the systems of the parts of sentence to come from the roles of parts of sentences in the formation of the sentence and from the character of their mutual relations. Here we can distinguish three main groups of the parts of the speech:

The first group includes the subject and the predicate. The status of the subject and the predicate is special in comparison with the other parts of the sentence. Only the subject and the predicate are mutually connected with each other and independent in the relation to any other member of the sentence as all the other parts can be raised on the base of the ties of dependence on the subject and the predicate as topping elements. This hierarchy of dependence is clearly seen when establishing the schemes of dependence. The top layer is occupied by the subject and the predicate. Look at the scheme of dependence for the sentence Small white crests were appearing on the blue sea (in it interdependent elements are connected with reciprocally directed pointer, topping and dependent elements- one- side- directed pointer from the dependent to the topping element.¹¹ The second group includes the object and the modifier. The object and the modifier are the invariably dependent parts of sentence. They can verbally-oriented, i.e. syntactically they usually depend on the verb (The object

¹⁰ see Иванова И.П., Бурлакова В.В. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. М, 1981, ст.181

¹¹ Иванова И.П., Бурлакова В.В. Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка. М, 1981, ст. 187.:

can depend on the adjective in the predicative position): I am very bad at refusing people who ask me for money. The objects and the modifiers can be completive, i.e., the elements which are important for structural-semantic completeness of elementary sentence. Compare the impossibility to omit both of these parts of the sentence in the sentence: She treated Daddy like a child, [...].

The third group includes the attributes. Always dependent, like the objects and the modifiers, the attributes, in contrast to those parts, syntactically connected only with the nouns. Their non-verbal orientedness determines their belonging to the different cut in the articulation of the sentence. In contrast to all these elements attributes are not included in the structural scheme of the sentence. The problem of substantiating differentiation of the parts of speech remains complex one. It is relatively easily solved in differentiation of main and secondary parts of the sentences. Only by first one the category of predicativity is expressed, but the second one does not participate in its expression. When there is a verbal predicate, the differentiation of the subject and the predicate is carried out on the basis of indication of morphological nature of words: name — the subject, verb — predicate. In case the predicate is nominative with the noun as a nominative part, it will be difficult to solve the question what is. It also can be inversed location of the subject and the predicate.

The status of the subject and the predicate in the structure of the sentence is unique. Only with the help of them the category of predicativity is expressed, which is the most important structural and semantic indication of the sentence. Strictly speaking, the predicativity is expressed by the forms of the verb-predicate. But, however, these forms themselves arise and exist on the basis of unity and at the same time on mutual contraposition of the subject and the predicate, it can be said about the participation, let it be indirect, of the subject in expressing the category of predicativity. Mutual relationship of these two members of the sentence is also unique. In combination of the subject and the predicate there are not dominant and dependent elements. The subject and the predicate are in the interdependent relation. At the same time all other parts of

the sentence directly or indirectly are connected with the subject and the predicate by the tie of dependence. That's why the first and the foremost articulation of the sentences on immediate constituent parts, which takes into account the relations of syntactical dependence is the division into the groups of subject and the group of predicate (the group of nouns and the group of verbs). The subject and the predicate are the only parts of the sentence among other parts of the sentence which are permanently included into structural-semantic minimum of the sentence. In English one can come across verbal sentences of two-part type. In imperative sentences there is not subject, but it is given in implication. This is the subject you. It is reality is proved by constructing the imperative type with explicit subject, for example: You stay at home! and also is confirmed by transformative analyses of imperative sentences with reflexive forms of the verb: Wash yourself! The subject is syntactical counter-part and simultaneously "the partner" of the predicate. The subject fulfils two structural functions in the sentence: categorical function and relative function.

Categorical function of the subject includes designation of the bearer of the predicative feature, conveyed by the predicate. Compulsory two-partness of the English verbal sentence makes the subject essential constituent element of the sentence. Relative function of the subject consists of the fact that it is initial element in consistent syntagmatic unfolding of the sentence, forming left-sided encirclement of the verb-predicate, which withstands to its right-sided encirclement, first of all to the object or to the objects. As a part of the sentence *sui generis* the subject is formed only when there is the predicate. In the absence of the latter the word form of nominative case of personal pronoun or common case of the noun is not enough to ascribe the status of the subject to the appropriate words. On the other hand, quantitative meaning of the noun-subject (not its form) determines the form of the verb as a predicate or its changing part in the relation of the number. In the singular form (but the meaning of partitioned majority) of the subject the predicate takes plural form. On the contrary in the plural form (by its meaning unpartitioned majority) or the plurality

connected with coordinating conjunction of the nouns and the group of subject interpreted by language perception as a single referent, the predicate takes the singular form. Comp.: The staff were very sympathetic about it. and

The bread and cheese was presently brought in and distributed [...] ()

One more indication of primary importance of real, but not formally marked content of the subject (in the subject itself) is the choice of ways of sequence between the subject and the predicate in person in the cases when the person of the subject does not have differentiated expression: Then it's not your wife who left you; it's you who've left your wife. One of the distinguishing peculiarities of the object (in contrast to the modifier) with especially clear and consistent manifestation in English is its correlation with the subject. In general, both parts of the sentence has in morphological- lexical plan common substantive base, can be in the relations of conversion (X played Y - Y was played by X). The object can be easily transformed to the subject in the passive form of the verb in the sentence. In verbal sentences the subject and the object are the closest (according to the character of syntactical connections) to the verb elements of its encirclement. The object which is in syntactical ties with the verb-predicate is invariable component of the structural scheme of the sentence.

The appearance of the object in the sentence, as a rule, is determined by the semantics of the verb or the adjective in predicative use. That's why the object is characterized by limited distribution. The object does not possess such single structural meaning as the subject. In contrast to other parts of sentence, the classification of which is lightened by morphologization and lexicalization of appropriate syntactic meanings, the objects do not have such lexical- grammatical correspondences.

The modifier does not transform into the subject. Its presence in the sentence is not always determined by the semantics of the verb, and that's why, being free in the possibilities of use, modifier can be present in any type of the sentences. Therefore the modifier can be characterized as the member of the sentence which possesses free distribution. Only in the connection with the

limited number of the verbs, and especially the verbs which have adverbial direction, the modifier is the component of structural scheme of the sentence.

Conclusion

The principal parts of a simple sentence are the subject and the predicate. They are indispensable. The subject denotes something that is spoken about. It is subdivided into a group subject (expanded), a complex subject (expressed by a predicative construction,) (For me to do it is dangerous; His having done that surprised me), a formal subject which introduces the genuine subject (It is strange his doing that), an impersonal subject (It rains), a rhematic subject (A woman entered the room), a thematic subject (The woman came up to the window). The predicate denotes an action, state or property of the thing expressed by the subject. It agrees with the subject logically. A single subject denoting multitude agrees with a plural predicate (The great majority are satisfied with the outcomes of the elections). Predicates are classified into simple and compound ones. A simple predicate can be simple verbal, simple nominal, infinitival and reflexive. A simple verbal predicate is expressed by a verb in any form representing any category (person, number, tense, aspect, correlation, voice and mood). A simple nominal predicate is expressed by a noun or an adjective (He is clever?! He is a general?!). The nature of the nominal predicate can be interpreted transformationally or by means of the method of deep and surface structures (He is clever. I do not believe. He is a general. I do not believe). An infinitival predicate is usually found in exclamatory-interrogative sentences (Mr Domby to divorce his wife?! => Mr. Domby divorces his wife. I do not believe). In a reflexive predicate the element self cannot be omitted (I enjoyed myself in the park). To the simple verbal predicates some scholars refer a phraseological predicate (He was probably losing his marbles) (going crazy).

Compound predicates are subdivided into compound nominal predicates, compound modal predicates, compound aspect predicates; double predicates and predicates of double orientation. A compound nominal predicate is built up on the model a link- verb + a predicative. The number of link- verbs is great and it is still growing larger (He is a poet. He turned pale. He was going mad).

Predicative are most frequently expressed by nouns and adjectives. A verbal aspect predicate consists of a verb denoting the beginning, development or the end of an action and a non-finite form of a verb (He came running. He got going. He began reading. He continued speaking). A compound verbal modal predicate consists of a modal verb (or a modal equivalent) and an infinitive (indefinite, continuous or perfect (She could have danced all night). Among compound predicates we find mixed types (a compound modal nominal predicate, a compound modal aspectual predicate (He must be a poet. He may begin to attend classes). A double predicate consists of two parts, verbal and nominal, the former being an explicit predicate, the latter being an implicit predicate. It can be described transformationally (He married young=>He married. He was young). The predicate of double orientation consists of two parts, the latter oriented upon the subject of this sentence, the former oriented upon a subject beyond the limits of this sentence which can be proved transformationally (He is said to have done it —> They say that he has done it).

The secondary parts of a simple sentence can be indispensable or facultative for the structural and semantic completeness of the sentence. Secondary parts are divided into objects, attributes and adverbial modifiers. An object is a secondary part which depends upon the predicate. It is verb-oriented. Logical relations between a predicate-verb and its object are various. An object is indispensable (obligatory) when it is used after verbs of incomplete predication (to be, seem, appear, smell, take). Such verbs are insufficient by themselves, structurally, communicatively and semantically incomplete and need an object or an adverbial modifier (They took the boy to the theatre). By means of the transformational procedure of deletion we can deprive the verb of its object and see whether it is complete or incomplete (They broke the thing gently => *they broke gently, where the sign * means “ungrammatical”). Traditionally objects are classified into direct, indirect, prepositional and cognate (родственный) (He smiled a winner’s smile. He lived a happy life). In the cognate object the verb and the noun, functioning as the object, are of the same

root). We can distinguish a complex object which is expressed by a predicative construction with an infinitive, a participle or a Gerund (/ remember my mother singing a song to me. I saw him cross the street. I heard her singing. I found the house ruined). We can also distinguish a formal object which introduces a genuine object (I find it strange to go there). According to their semantic roles objects are divided by professors Burlakova, Ivanova and Pocheptsov into the object of the object (I read the book), the object of the addressee (He gives it to me), the object of the subject(I was blackmailed by him).

It a secondary or a tertiary of the sentence, it is verb- and adverb-oriented. It is not determined by the semantic meaning of the verb. Types of adverbial modifiers are determined by semantic varieties or semantic types of adverbs. We distinguish adverbial modifiers of manner, measure, cause, attendant circumstances, time, exception, direction, place, comparison (real/unreal), concession (real/unreal/problematic). It can be facultative and indispensable(He broke the thing gently. They took the boy to the theatre.)

Complex adverbial modifiers are expressed by predicative constructions! He entered the room, the dog following him (a nominative absolute participial construction). He entered the room, with his dog following him (a prepositional participial construction) An attribute is a noun- oriented secondary or tertiary part of a sentence. It doesn't enter the structural scheme of the sentence. Very often it facultative and can be easily omitted (A beautiful girl entered a spacious room). It can be used in pre-position and post-position. Its position is determined by its semantics. Attributes giving more concrete character to a noun are placed nearer to it than those giving general assessment (An attractive small girl). It can be complex, when it is expressed by a predicative construction (This is a book for you to read). An attribute very often merely decorates a sentence, but there are instances when without it a noun is communicatively empty (She has blue eyes), which makes it obligatory.

Bibliography

1. Iriskulov M.A. Kuldashev A.M. Theoretical Grammar of the English Language. Tashkent, 2008, 208 pages
2. Буронов Ж. Инглиз ва узбек тилларининг қиёсий грамматикаси. Т. Уқитувчи, 1974, 280 б.
3. Ирискулов М.Т. Лекции по теоретической грамматике английского языка. Т., 2004, 240 с.
4. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J. A Grammar of Contemporary English. Lnd., 1972, 1040 p.
5. Смирницкий А.И. Синтаксис английского языка. М., 1966, 360 с.
6. Худяков А.В. Теоретическая грамматика М. ВШ, 2007, 248 с.
7. Iyish B. A. The structure of Modern English. M.-L., 1971, 380 p.
8. Irtenyeva N.F., Barsova O.M., Blokh M. Y., Shapkin A.P. Theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, 1969, 220 p
9. W. N. Francis. The Structure of American English. New York, 2008, 450
10. Close R.A. A Reference Grammar for Students of English. Ldn., 1977.
11. Khaimovich B.S., Rogovskaya B.I. A Course in English Grammar. Moscow, 1967.
12. Блох М.Я. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка. М., 2005.
13. Резник Р.В. Практическая грамматика английского языка. М., 2002.
14. Качалова В.А. Грамматика английского языка. М., 2004.
15. www.terminologyfoundations.org/edu
16. www.terminologyresources.com
17. www.transaltiontheoiT.com/ru
18. www.translationandterminology.com
19. www.grammarru.net
20. www.grammatika.ru/chasti_rechi.html