

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
1.1. The problem of Syntax in present day English.....	4
1.2. Types of sentence according to the types of communication.....	9
1.3. Clause and Sentence Structure in Present Day Syntax.....	12
1.4. The structure of the simple sentence and its types.....	19
4.0. CONCLUSION.....	23
5.0. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	25

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays we are trying to establish a strong democratic state, of course, with the help of the new generation. I also consider myself as one of the members of this innovative people. I dare to say, foreign languages, especially English is a good source to take the advantage. So, in this very qualification paper I tried to make a good research work on the theme “The problem of English syntax in present day English”

This course paper is devoted to the study of the problem of English syntax. It is thorough, but not intimidating; detailed, but not overwhelming.

The skill of writing depends not only on practice and effort but also on an understanding of our language's structures, the conventions acceptable to readers, and the techniques for revising. In writing, functional aspects of the problem of English syntax can be very effective for grabbing a reader's attention or for summing up an argument, but too many parts of the sentence can make your writing seem immature. There are only four styles of sentences that make statements. These styles are infinitely accommodating and flexible. They do not limit our self-expression any more than does the fact that all our reasoning procedures are either inductive or deductive. (People who think they can reason 'laterally' are kidding themselves!)

It is a writer's way of thinking about what he wants to say that determines the style in which each of his Simple Sentences will extend their scope for saying something.

To emphasize that writing is not the exclusive domain of composition classes, these examples reflect a broad range of subjects - history, science, business, literature - and a variety of popular interests - school, entertainment, issues, and family. Some material are serious, some light or humorous. Some material is academic, some popular. The examples have been chosen to reflect the versatility and variety of writing in our lives.

1.1 The problem of syntax in present day English

The notion of sentence has not so far received a satisfactory definition, which would enable us by applying it in every particular case to find out whether a certain linguistic unit was a sentence or not. Thus, for example, the question remains undecided whether such shop notices as Book Shop and such book titles as English Grammar are sentences or not. In favour of the view that they are sentences the following consideration can be brought forward. The notice Book Shop and the title English Grammar mean 'This is a book shop', 'This is an English Grammar'; the phrase is interpreted as the predicative of a sentence whose subject and link verb have been omitted, that is, it is apprehended as a unit of communication. According to the other possible view, such notices as Book Shop and such titles as English Grammar are not units of communication at all, but units of nomination, merely appended to the object they denote. Since there is as yet no definition of a sentence which would enable us to decide this question, it depends on everyone's subjective view which alternative he prefers. We will prefer the view that such notices and book titles are not sentences but rather nomination units.

We also mention here a special case. Some novels have titles formulated as sentences, e. g. *The Stars Look Down*, by A. Cronin, or *They Came to a City*, by J. B. Priestley. These are certainly sentences, but they are used as nomination units, for instance, Have you read *The Stars Look Down*?, Do you like *They Came to a City*? With the rise of modern ideas of paradigmatic syntax yet another problem concerning definition of sentence has to be considered.

In paradigmatic syntax, such units as He has arrived, He has not arrived, Has he arrived, He will arrive, He will not arrive, Will he arrive, etc., are treated as different forms of the same sentence, just as arrives, has arrived, will arrive etc., are different forms of the same verb. We may call this view of the sentence the paradigmatic view.¹

¹ Allen W.S. *Living English Structure*. 1980.p.226

Now from the point of view of communication, He has arrived and He has not arrived are different sentences since they convey different information (indeed, the meaning of the one flatly contradicts that of the other).

The problem of classification of sentences is a highly complicated one, and we will first consider the question of the principles of classification, and of the notions on which it can be based. Let us begin by comparing a few sentences differing from each other in some respect. Take, for example, the following two sentences: (1) But why did you leave England? (GALSWORTHY) and (2) There are to-day more people writing extremely well, in all departments of life, than ever before; what we have to do is to sharpen our judgement and pick these out from the still larger number who write extremely badly. (CRUMP)

Everyone will see that the two sentences are basically different. This is true, but very general and not grammatically exact. In order to arrive at a strictly grammatical statement of the difference (or differences) between them we must apply more exact methods of observation and analysis. Let us, then, proceed to a careful observation of the features which constitute the difference between the two sentences.

1. The first sentence expresses a question, that is the speaker expects an answer which will supply the information he wants. The second sentence expresses a statement, that is, the author (or .speaker) states his opinion on a certain subject. He does not ask about anything, or expect anybody to supply him any information. This difference is expressed in writing by the first sentence having a question mark at the end, while the second sentence has a full stop.

2. The first sentence is addressed to a certain hearer (or a few hearers present), and is meant to provoke the hearer's reaction (answer). The second sentence is not addressed to any particular person or persons and the author does not know how anybody will react to it.

3. The two sentences differ greatly in length: the first consists of only 6 words, while the second has 39.

4. The first sentence has no punctuation marks within it, while the second has two commas and a semicolon.

5. The first sentence has only one finite verb (did ... leave), while the second has three (are, have, write).

These would seem to be some essential points of difference. We have not yet found out which of them are really relevant from a grammatical viewpoint. We have not included in the above list those which are quite obviously irrelevant from that viewpoint; for example, the first sentence contains a proper name (England), while the second does not contain any, or, the second sentence contains a possessive pronoun (our) while the first does not, etc. Let us now consider each of the five points of difference and see which of them are relevant from a purely grammatical point of view, for a classification of sentences.

Point 1 states a difference in the types of thought expressed in the two sentences. Without going into details of logical analysis, we can merely say that a question (as in the first sentence), and a proposition (as in the second)² are different types of thought, in the logical acceptance of that term. The problem now is, whether this difference is or is not of any importance from the grammatical viewpoint. In Modern English sentences expressing questions (we will call them, as is usually done, interrogative sentences) have some characteristic grammatical features. These features are, in the first place, a specific word order in most cases (predicate — subject), as against the order subject — predicate in sentences expressing propositions (declarative sentences). Thus word order may, with some reservations, be considered as a feature distinguishing this particular type of sentence from others. Another grammatical feature characterising interrogative sentences (again, with some reservations) is the structure of the predicate verb, namely its analytical form "do + infinitive" (in our first sentence, did .., leave ..., not

² As a matter of fact, our second sentence contains more than one proposition; but this does not affect the basic difference between the two types of sentences.

left), where in a declarative sentence there would be the simple form (without do). However, this feature is not restricted to interrogative sentences: as is well known, it also characterises negative sentences. Anyhow, we can (always with some reservations) assume that word order and the form "do + infinitive" are grammatical features characterising interrogative sentences, and in so far the first item of our list appears to be grammatically relevant. We will, accordingly, accept the types "interrogative sentence" and "declarative sentence" as grammatical types of sentences.

Point 2, treating of a difference between a sentence addressed to a definite hearer (or reader) and a sentence free from such limitation, appears not to be grammatical, important as it may be from other points of view. Accordingly, we will not include this distinction among grammatical features of sentences.

Point 3, showing a difference in the length of the sentences, namely in the number of words making up each of them, does not in itself constitute a grammatical feature, though it may be more remotely connected with grammatical distinctions.

Point 4 bears a close relation to grammatical peculiarities; more «specially, a semicolon would be hardly possible in certain types of sentences (so-called simple sentences). But punctuation marks within a sentence are not in themselves grammatical features: they are rather a consequence of grammatical features whose essence is to be looked for elsewhere.

Point 5, on the contrary, is very important from a grammatical viewpoint. Indeed the number of finite verbs in a sentence is one of its main grammatical features. In this particular instance it should be noted that each of the three finite verbs has its own noun or pronoun belonging to it and expressing the doer of the action denoted by the verb: are has the noun people, have the pronoun we. and write the pronoun who. These are sure signs of

the sentence being composite, not simple.³ Thus we will adopt the distinction between simple and composite sentences as a distinction between two grammatical types.

The items we have established as a result of comparing the two sentences given on page 183 certainly do not exhaust all the possible grammatical features a sentence can be shown to possess. They were only meant to illustrate the method to be applied if a reasonable grammatical classification of sentences is to be achieved. If we were to take another pair or other pairs of sentences and proceed to compare them in a similar way we should arrive at some more grammatical distinctions which have to be taken into account in making up a classification. We will not give any more examples but we will take up the grammatical classification of sentences in a systematic way.

It is evident that there are two principles of classification. Applying one of them, we obtain a classification into declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentences. We can call this principle that of "types of communication".

The other classification is according to structure. Here we state two main types: simple sentences and composite sentences. We will not now go into the question of a further subdivision of composite sentences, or into the question of possible intermediate types between simple and composite ones. These questions will be treated later on respectively). Meanwhile, then, we get the following results: w

1.2 Types of Sentences According to Types of Communication

- (1) Declarative;
- (2) Interrogative;
- (3) Imperative.

Sentences belonging to the several types differ from each other in some grammatical points, too. Thus, interrogative sentences are characterised

³ We use the term "composite sentence" in the same meaning as that attributed to it in H. Poutsma's Grammar of Late Modern English, namely as opposite to the term "simple sentence".

by a special word order. In interrogative sentences very few modal words are used, as the meanings of some modal words are incompatible with the meaning of an interrogative sentence. It is clear that modal words expressing full certainty, such as certainly, surely, naturally, etc., cannot appear in a sentence expressing a question. On the other hand, the modal word indeed, with its peculiar shades of meaning, is quite possible in interrogative sentences, for instance, Isn't so indeed?

(SHAKESPEARE)

There are also sentences which might be termed semi-interrogative. The third sentence in the following passage belongs to this type:

"Well, I daresay that's more revealing about poor George than you. At any rate, he seems to have survived it." "Oh, you've seen him?" She did not particularly mark her question for an answer, but it was, after all, the pivot-point, and Bone found him self replying — that indeed he had. (BUECHNER)

The sentence Oh, you've seen him? is half-way between the affirmative declarative sentence, You have seen him, and the interrogative sentence, Have you seen him? Let us proceed to find out the precise characteristics of the sentence in the text as against the two sentences just given for the sake of comparison. From the syntactical viewpoint, the sentence is declarative, as the mutual position of subject and predicate is, you have seen, not have you seen, which would be the interrogative order. In what way or ways does it, then, differ from a Usual declarative sentence? That is where the question of the intonation comes in. Whether the question mark at the end of the sentence does or does not mean that the intonation is not that typical of a declarative sentence, is hard to tell, though it would rather seem that it does. To be certain about this a phonetic experiment should be undertaken, but in this particular case the author gives a context which itself goes some way toward settling the question. The author's words, She did not particularly mark her question for an answer. seem to refer to the intonation with which it was pronounced: the intonation must not have been clearly interrogative, that is not clearly rising,

though it must have differed from the regular falling intonation to some extent: if it had not been at all different, the sentence could not have been termed a "question", and the author does call it a question. Reacting to this semi-interrogative intonation, Bone (the man to whom the question was addressed) answered in the affirmative. It seems the best way, on the whole, to term such sentences semi-interrogative. Their purpose of course is to utter a somewhat hesitating statement and to expect the other person to confirm it.

Imperative sentences also show marked peculiarities in the use of modal words. It is quite evident, for example, that modal words expressing possibility, such as perhaps, maybe, possibly, are incompatible with the notion of order or request. Indeed, modal words are hardly used at all in imperative sentences.

The notion of exclamatory sentences and their relation to the three established types of declarative, interrogative, and imperative sentences presents some difficulty. It would seem that the best way to deal with it is this. On the one hand, every sentence, whether narrative, interrogative, or imperative, may be exclamatory at the same time, that is, it may convey the speaker's feelings and be characterised by emphatic intonation and by an exclamation mark in writing. This may be seen in the following examples:

Bat he can't do anything to you! (R. WEST)

What can he possibly do to you!

(Idem) Scarlett, spare me! (M. MITCHELL)

On the other hand, a sentence may be purely exclamatory, that is. it may not belong to any of the three types classed above. This would be the case in the following examples: "Well, fiddle-dee-dee!" said Scarlett. (M. MITCHELL) Oh, for God's sake, Henry! (Idem) However, it would perhaps be better to use different terms for sentences which are purely exclamatory, and thus constitute a special type, and those which add an emotional element to their basic quality, which is either declarative, or interrogative, or imperative.

If this view is endorsed, we should have our classification of sentences according to type of communication thus modified:

- (1) Declarative (including emotional ones)
- (2) Interrogative (including emotional ones)
- (3) Imperative (including emotional ones)
- (4) Exclamatory

This view would avoid the awkward contradiction of exclamatory sentences constituting a special type and belonging to the first three types at the same time.

1.3 Clause and Sentence Structure in Present Day Syntax

Main points

- Simple Sentences have one clause.
- Clauses usually consist of a noun group as the subject, and a verb group.
- Clauses can also have another noun group as the object or complement.
- Clauses can have an adverbial, also called an adjunct.
- Changing the order of the words in a clause can change its meaning.
- Compound Sentences consist of two or more main clauses. Complex Sentences always include a subordinate clause, as well as one or more main clauses.

1. A Simple Sentence has one clause, beginning with a noun group called the subject. The subject is the person or thing that the sentence is about. This is followed by a verb group, which tells you what the subject is doing, or describes the subject's situation.

I waited.

The girl screamed.

2. The verb group may be followed by another noun group, which is called the object. The object is the person or thing affected by the action or situation.

He opened the car door.

She married a young engineer.

After link verbs like "be", "become", "feel", and "seem", the verb group may be followed by a noun group or an adjective, called a complement. The complement tells you more about the subject.

She was a doctor. He was angry.

3. The verb group, the object, or the complement can be followed by an adverb or a prepositional phrase, called an adverbial. The adverbial tells you more about the action or situation, for example how, when, or where it happens. Adverbials are also called adjuncts.

They shouted loudly.

She won the competition last week.

He was a policeman in Birmingham.

4. The word order of a clause is different when the clause is a statement, a question, or a command.

He speaks English very well (statement). Did she win at the Olympics? (question).

Stop her (command). Note that the subject is omitted in commands, so the verb comes first.

5. A Compound Sentence has two or more main clauses: that is, clauses which are equally important. You join them with "and", "but", or "or".

He met Jane at the station and went shopping.

I wanted to go but I felt too ill.

You can come now or you can meet us there later.

Note that the order of the two clauses can change the meaning of the sentence.

He went shopping and met Jane at the station.

If the subject of both clauses is the same, you usually omit the subject in the second clause.

/ wanted to go but felt too ill.

6. A Complex Sentence contains a subordinate clause and at least one main clause. A subordinate clause gives information about a main clause, and is

introduced by a conjunction such as "because", "if", "that", or a "wh"-word. Subordinate clauses can come before, after, or inside the main clause.

When he stopped, no one said anything. If you want, I'll teach you.

They were going by car because it was more comfortable. I told him that nothing was going to happen to me.

The car that I drove was a Ford.

The man who came into the room was small.

Just as words and phrases form the constituents of the clause rank, so too clauses themselves can combine in several ways as the constituents of the sentence. The idea of the sentence, however, is a difficult one for grammar for many reasons.

First, when linguists think of language, they tend to think of sound. Sound (speech) is the primary mode of communication in language. And people do not speak in sentences. People speak in words, and phrases, and clauses. Look for example at this sequence of clauses.⁴

['] I got very upset [] because they would not stop talking [] I eventually had to leave.

Notice that in transcribing this bit of speech we have no difficulty determining the

constituent words, phrases, or even the clauses that exist within this example.

However, it is much more guess-work to determine the where the sentences are,

especially without the aid of intonation. If we wished, we could punctuate these

clauses very differently, creating different sentences:

(a) I got very upset, because they would not stop talking. I eventually had to leave.

⁴ Allen U.S. Living English Structure. 1980.p.226

(b) I got very upset. Because they would not stop talking, I eventually had to leave.

The idea of the sentence is a product of a tendency to think primarily of written language, where standardized writing systems articulate the conventions associated with the written sentence.

Thus, many grammarians prefer to use a more inclusive, more general term when describing the grammatical relationship that holds between two or more clauses - a clause complex. For our purposes, though, we can continue to use the term sentence as long as we remain aware of the limits and biases implied by the more common term. Sentences are subcategorized by the number and type of clause relationships they exhibit. The first distinction we should make is between the simple and the multiple sentence. The Simple Sentence has but one clause; the multiple sentence has more than one clause.

The multiple sentence is further distinguished by the type of grammatical relationship that holds between the clauses. If the grammatical relationship is paratactic, the clauses are coordinated. If the grammatical relationship is hypotactic, the clauses are subordinated.

Parataxis is the grammatical arrangement of "equal" constituents, clauses in this case. The word parataxis literally means 'equal' (para) 'arrangement' (taxis). Parataxis is the hallmark of coordination. In most cases, the equality of the clauses is evident both grammatically and semantically. Coordination can link constituents at any rank. It creates parallel grammatical structures - structures that are identical in function and usually form as well. And coordination holds each of the parallel structures at the same grammatical rank (Lakoff 1971 and Martin 1983). Consider the sentences in (1) through (3) below.

(1) I have a story. This story has ruined my life.

(2) I have a story, and this story has ruined my life.

(3) I have a story; this story has ruined my life.

In sentence (1), the two Simple Sentences (each with one clause) are not overtly linked. Should writers wish to express the link between the two

sentences -a link of addition - they can choose overt markers of coordination (such as the conjunction and) or the semicolon. The use of a conjunction (such as and, but, or, nor, for, so, yet) is called syndetic coordination, as in (2). The absence of the coordinator creates asyndetic coordination, as in (3). The use of a coordinator creates what the traditional grammars call a "compound" grammatical structure.

The sentences in (1) through (3) may seem synonymous, but there are subtle, yet significant, differences in meaning. The coordinators themselves create different semantic links between the clauses (Hoey 1986, Hoey and Winter 1986). For example, look at the sentence in (4) through (10):

(4) Sandy left early, and Liz followed, [addition]

(5) The committee felt obligated, but the chairperson did not. [contrast]

(6) The children should leave, or I will, [alternative]

(7) Emily does not want to see the doctor, nor does Liz. [negative alternative]

(8) Liz drove very carefully, for the traffic was unusually heavy, [reason]

(9) Neither side made a convincing argument, so the committee decided to postpone its decision, [result]

(10) The college anticipated the budget cuts, yet it still needed to cut several student programs, [concession].

Now some might think that asyndetic coordination, as in (3), must be identical in meaning to the use of the two separate sentences, as in (1), since no coordinator is present to add a new bit of meaning. However, the implied connections between clauses that are juxtaposed can be just as significant. Consider Caesar's famous use of asyndetic coordination when he juxtaposed these three short clauses and in the process gave us an insight into the egomaniacal soul:

(11) veni, vidi, vici ("I came, I saw, I conquered.")

By the use of asyndetic coordination, Caesar can suggest that the effort he expended on conquering of his territories and enemies was no

greater than the effort he expended on simply arriving and observing. Coordination suggests parallelism, an idea that could not be conveyed by three separate, independent sentences in (11).

Hypotaxis, on the other hand, is the arrangement of "unequal" constituents. The word hypotaxis literally means 'beneath' (hypo) 'arrangement' (taxis), and hypotaxis forms the basis of subordination. The inequalities between hypotactic clauses are evident both grammatically and semantically. The subordinate structure takes on the grammatical function of subject, object, complement, or adverbial in the main clause. The subordinate clause is overtly marked as a subordinate

To illustrate the fact that each subordinate clause is still a "clause," we can take the subordinate clause (the adverbial clause above for example) and subdivide it into its clause level constituents, as in (16).

Reduced subordinate clauses are missing many or most of those constituents, usually the subordinator, the subject, and the finite part of the verb. (The finite part of the verb, remember, is the part of the verb phrase that is marked for tense, such as the -ed past tense inflection.)

Consider (17), an example of a full subordinate clause functioning as the object of its main clause, and (18), a reduced subordinate clause also functioning as the object of its main clause:

I know that you lied.

Subordinator: Subject: Verb

The part of the verb that remains in the reduced subordinate clause is the nonfinite constituent, the participle, the verb that is not marked for tense. Consequently, reduced subordinate clauses are often called 'nonfinite' clauses. Like full subordinate clauses, the reduced subordinate clause can assume a variety of functions at the clause rank. In (18), we have seen a reduced subordinate clause functioning as direct object. In (19) and (20), we have examples of the same infinitive clause functioning as subject and complement.

To be alone \ can be

Subordinate Clause

Subject

An independent clause is a group of words that contains a subject and verb and expresses a complete thought. An independent clause is a sentence. Example: Jim studied in the Sweet Shop for his chemistry quiz. (1C) Dependent Clause (DC)

⁵A dependent clause is a group of words that contains a subject and verb but does not express a complete thought. A dependent clause cannot be a sentence. Often a dependent clause is marked by a dependent marker word. Example: When Jim studied in the Sweet Shop for his chemistry quiz . . . (DC)

(What happened when he studied? The thought is incomplete.)

Dependent Marker Word (DM)

A dependent marker word is a word added to the beginning of an independent clause that makes it into a dependent clause. Example: When Jim studied in the Sweet Shop for his chemistry quiz, it was very noisy. (DM)

Some common dependent markers are: after, although, as, as if because, before, even if even though, if in order to, since, though, unless, until, whatever, when, whenever, whether, and while.

Connecting dependent and independent clauses

There are two types of words that can be used as connectors at the beginning of an independent clause: coordinating conjunctions and independent marker words.

1. Coordinating Conjunction (CC)

The seven coordinating conjunctions used as connecting words at the beginning of an independent clause are and, but, for, or, nor, so, and yet. When the second independent clause in a sentence begins with a coordinating conjunction, a comma is needed before the coordinating conjunction:

⁵ Allen W.S. Living English Structure. 1980.p.226

Example: Jim studied in the Sweet Shop for his chemistry quiz, but it was hard to concentrate because of the noise. (CC)

2. Independent Marker Word (IM)

An independent marker word is a connecting word used at the beginning of an independent clause. These words can always begin a sentence that can stand alone. When the second independent clause in a sentence has an independent marker word, a semicolon is needed before the independent marker word. Example: Jim studied in the Sweet Shop for his chemistry quiz; however, it was hard to concentrate because of the noise. (IM)

Some common independent markers are: also, consequently, furthermore, however, moreover, nevertheless, and therefore.

1.4 The Structure of the Sentence in present day Syntax

We will now study the structure of the simple sentence and the types of simple sentences. First of all we shall have to deal with the problem of negative sentences. The problem, briefly stated, is this: do negative sentences constitute a special grammatical type, and if so, what are its grammatical features? In other words, if we say, "This is a negative sentence," do we thereby give it a grammatical description?

The difficulty of the problem lies in the peculiarity of negative expressions in Modern English. Let us take two sentences, both negative in meaning: (1) She did not know when she would be seeing any of them again. (R. MACAULAY)

(2) Helen's tremendous spell — perhaps no one ever quite escaped from it. (Idem)

They are obviously different in their ways of expressing negation. In (1) we see a special form of the predicate verb (did... know, not knew) which is due to the negative character of the sentence and is in so far a grammatical sign of its being negative. In (2), on the other hand, there is no grammatical feature to show that the sentence is negative. Indeed, there is no grammatical

difference whatever between the sentences Nobody saw him and Everybody saw him. The difference lies entirely in the meaning of the pronouns functioning as subject, that is to say, it is lexical, not grammatical. The same is of course true of such sentences as I found nobody and I found everybody. On the other hand, in the sentence I did not find anybody there is again a grammatical feature, viz. the form of the predicate verb (did... find, not found)⁶

The conclusion to be drawn from these observations is obviously this. Since in a number of cases negative sentences are not characterised as such by any grammatical peculiarities, they are not a grammatical type. They are a logical type, which may or may not be reflected in grammatical structure. Accordingly, the division of sentences into affirmative and negative ought not to be included into their grammatical classification.

Before we proceed with our study of sentence structure it will be well to consider the relation between the two notions of sentence and clause. Among different types of sentences treated in a syntactic investigation it is naturally the simple sentence that comes first. It is with specimens of simple sentences that we study such categories as parts of the sentence, main and secondary; homogeneous members, word order, etc. It is also with specimens of simple sentences that we illustrate such notions as declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory sentences, as two-member and one-member sentences, and so forth. As long as we limit ourselves to the study of simple sentences, the notion of "clause" need not occur at all.

When, however, we come to composite sentences (that is, sentences consisting of two or more clauses), we have to deal with the notions of main clause, head clause, and subordinate clause. Everything we said about the simple sentence will also hold good for clauses: a clause also has its parts (main and secondary), it can also be a two-member or a one-member clause; a main clause at least must also be either declarative, interrogative, imperative, or

⁶ Myish B. The Structure of Modern English 1965.p.341

exclamatory, etc. We will consider these questions in due course. So then we will take it for granted that whatever is said about a simple sentence will also apply to an independent clause within a composite sentence.

For instance, whatever we say about word order in a simple sentence will also apply to word order, in an independent clause within a composite sentence, etc.

TYPES OF SIMPLE SENTENCES. MAIN PARTS OF A SENTENCE

It has been usual for some time now to classify sentences into two-member and one-member sentences⁷. This distinction is based on a difference in the so-called main parts of a sentence. We shall therefore have to consider the two problems, that of two-member and one-member sentences and that of main parts of the sentence, simultaneously.

In a sentence like *Helen sighed* (B. MACAULAY) there obviously are two main parts: *Helen*, which denotes the doer of the action and is called (grammatical) subject, and *sighed*, which denotes the action performed by the subject and is called (grammatical) predicate. Sentences having this basic structure, viz. a word (or phrase) to denote the doer of the action and another word (or phrase) to denote the action, are termed two-member sentences. However, there are sentences which do not contain two such separate parts; in these sentences there is only one main part: the other main part is not there and it could not even be supplied, at least not without a violent change in the structure of the sentence. Examples of such sentences, which are accordingly termed one-member sentences, are the following: *Fire! Come on!* or the opening sentence of "*An American Tragedy*": *Dusk — of a summer night.* (DREISER)

There is no separate main part of the sentence, the grammatical subject, and no other separate main part, the grammatical predicate. Instead there is only one

⁷ Ilyish B. *The Structure of Modern English* 1965, p.341

main part (fire, come on, and dusk, respectively). These, then, are one-member sentences.

It is a disputed point whether the main part of such a sentence should, or should not, be termed subject in some cases, and predicate, in others. This question has been raised with reference to the Russian language. Academician A. Shakhmatov held that the chief part of a one-member sentence was either the subject, or the predicate, as the case might be (for example, if that part was a finite verb, he termed it predicate). Academician V. Vinogradov, on the other hand, started on the assumption that grammatical subject and grammatical predicate were correlative notions and that the terms were meaningless outside their relation to each other.² Accordingly, he suggested that for one-member sentences, the term "main part" should be used, without giving it any more specific name. Maybe this is rather a point of terminology than of actual grammatical theory. We will not investigate it any further, but content ourselves with naming the part in question the main part of one-member sentence, as proposed by V. Vinogradov.

One-member sentences should be kept apart from two-member sentences with either the subject or the predicate omitted, i. e. from elliptical sentences,⁵ of which we will discuss in a following chapter. There are many difficulties in this field. As we have done more than once, we will carefully distinguish what has been proved and what remains a matter of opinion, depending to a great extent on the subjective views or inclinations of one scholar or another. Matters belonging to this latter category are numerous enough in the sphere of sentence study.⁸

⁸ Blokh M. Y. "A course in theoretical English Grammar" Moscow, "Vysshaya Shkola". 1983.p.343

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have looked through the problem of English syntax in present day English. In absolute majority of the structural types and ways of expressing attributive, the clauses take important place. That's why the significant aspect of the syntax has more concrete content in the language in comparison structural-semantic features of sentences. A thorough analysis showed, that there are two generally recognised main parts of the sentence.- the subject and the predicate.

As in the secondary parts,, their number varies slightly. Among them we object (with its subdivisions), the attribute,, and the adverbial phrase. Other secondary parts are also sometimes mentioned — the opposition (its relation to the attribute is variously interpreted) the objective predicative, and occasionally some other parts, too. Due to scientific studies of foreign, and Russian linguists, the first consists of a determiner and a noun, which we have so far been describing as a head followed by its complement in the usual English pattern: second a pronoun, and we have claimed that pronouns are "intransitive" determiners, i.e. determiners without NP complement. The third consists of just a proper noun and the last just a count noun, These last two examples are puzzling: how can they be considered as DPs when they contain no determiner? Perhaps these are not DPs at all but simply NPs. But if this is true, as the examples in (1) have the same construction.. they must also be considered NPs. Thus, the pronoun, should be regarded as a noun and the determiner in (2) is not the head of the phrase., but some other element within the NP, perhaps an adjunct or a specifier (it is on the wrong side to be considered a complement)

This is not a good argument., however, as it is not wise to conclude about the syntactic properties of an element on the basis of its semantic properties. There are examples which might be considered to be syntactic Head of a phrase are not the semantically most important word. For example, consider the following: cups of tea

Semantically, the noun tea is the most important element in this phrase: it refers to something which can be described as tea and not a cup. When one drinks a cup of tea, it is the tea that gets drunk, not the cup! Yet, syntactically it seems that cup should be considered as the head and the phrase containing tea as its complement.

This provides us with a straightforward structure: cups of tea

If, on the other hand, we wanted to claim that the noun tea is the syntactic head of the phrase we would have difficulty fitting in the preposition and the other noun: tea

The Questions connected with study of the syntactic composition and subservience; touch the row of the problems, which anyway touch with study morphological and structural-semantic properties of functional aspects of the attributive constructions.

This suggests that there are two different empty determiners: one which is definite and the other indefinite. The interesting thing is that these empty determiners differ in other ways. The empty definite determiner takes only NP complements headed by proper nouns whereas the empty indefinite determiner takes only NP complements headed by plural nouns. This is perfectly normal behaviour for a head, as heads do place restrictions on their complements.

To conclude the present discussion, while it seems that there is no independent evidence that pronouns are accompanied by an empty noun, there is much evidence that proper and plural nouns may be accompanied by empty determiners. This conclusion itself lends support for the claim that the determiner is the head of the phrase and that the noun is not. From this perspective, the noun is the head of its own phrase which sits in the complement position of the determiner.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. From the President I.A.Karimov's report at the Oliy Majlis session of the first convocation, February, 1995. 185 стр.
2. И.А.Каримов. Гармонично-развитое поколение-основа прогресса Узбекистана. Ташкент. 1998. Стр 158-168
3. Azar Betty Shramper "Fundamentals of English Grammar" Second Edition, New Jersey "Prentice-Hall" 1992., 341 p.
4. Blokh M. Y. "A course in theoretical English Grammar" Moscow, "Vysshaya Shkola". 1983. 346 p.
5. Ilysh B.A. "The structure of Modern English" Moscow, Leningrad, 1971., 341 p.
6. Allen W.S. Living English Structure. 1980., 226 p.
7. Jespersen O. Growth and Structure of English Language. Oxford, 1983., 310 p.
8. [www. English Syntax.com](http://www.EnglishSyntax.com)