О. Самусевич

асистент кафедри іноземних
мов для гуманітарних факультетів
Львівського національного
університету імені Івана Франка

THE PRINCIPAL AND SECONDARY PARTS OF A SENTENCE IN MODERN ENGLISH

Linguistic investigations of recent years contain much valuable information contributing significantly to the development of the theory of sentence-structure. Syntactic processes and semantic aspects of syntax have now become the main source of interest in grammatical studies. This area of grammar is very much alive today. The new ideas have led to many new insights into the structure of particular languages.

Recent years linguistic investigations of such scientists as M. Celce-Murcia, D. Larsen-Freeman, O. Fedorenko, S. Suchorolska and others contain much valuable information contributing significantly to the development of the theory of sentence-structure. Most grammarians hold the view that language is a system of interdependent units in which the value of each unit results solely from the simultaneous presence of the others.

Sentences convey more than meaning; they convey style. Now, when writing sentences, it must be understood that it consists of two important constituents-structure and purpose. The structure of a sentence and, the purpose in which it is used, both go a long way in forwarding its meaning. That is why it is important to know, in how many ways a sentence can be composed. The entire written language depends on the type of its sentence. Only when one knows the various types then he/she can play with words, thoughts and ideas. In any form of writing, it is the sentences that are the building blocks of the structure of the copy. To help you know more of sentences, there are various types in which sentences can be constructed given below.

The term "sentence" is extremely difficult to define. Just as the various parts of speech may be considered from the points of view of meaning and function or form, so the sentence may be approached from the viewpoint of logic or meaning, of phonetic criteria or style, and of grammar. The search for absolute limitations of content for the sentence unit has not yet produced absolutely undisputable workable criteria. It seems reasonable to proceed from the statement that the sentence is a basic unit of communication distinguished from all other units by its predicativity. One of the primary characteristics of the sentence lies in the fact that it can stand alone as a piece of communication, completing an idea by itself.

In terms of meaning, the sentence is traditionally defined as the expression of a complete thought. But this, it seems to be open to thought and discussion because completeness is, in fact, very relative and depends largely on the purpose of the speaker or writer as well as on the context, linguistic or situational. The principle of transformational grammar is that the whole grammar of a language constitutes a definition of the sentence. The traditional definition is that a sentence is a group of words expressing a complete thought, and is often criticized today on the ground that a sentence is sometimes one word and that the thought is not always complete but largely depends on the meaning of preceding sentences.

Distinction is reasonably made between syntagmatic and paradigmatic or associative relations. In actual speech syntagmatic relations will be observed between linguistic units of different levels, e. g. phonemes and morphemes within a word, between words in phrase structure and sentence, between phrases in sentences, or, say, between the parts of composite sentences, etc.

The question naturally arises about the relation of predicativity to the grammatical organization of the sentence. Grammarians are not agreed at this point. The sentence is sometimes viewed only as a speech event with no relevance to its grammatical organization and distribution at all. On the communicative level any part of the utterance may function as predicate. This view is most emphatically stated by E. Benveniste [3, p. 128].

Studies of the sentence-structure are relevant to a number of questions, such as deep grammar analysis, problems of "textlinguistics" concerned primarily with relationships within a supra-phrasal unity, the actual division of the sentence, and problems of syntactic paradigms. The generalized character of the structure of a language finds its vivid expression in the fact that the sentence-structure itself is a most essential generalization.

One of the most important questions concerning the sentence which seems to remain disputable to this day is the definition of the sentence as a linguistic unit. There is a considerable diversity of viewpoints among grammarians concerning the problem of sentence analysis as well.

According to I. Arnold, the sentence is a minimal unit of communication. Structural units of a lower rank (i.e. words and word combinations) may function only as its constituents. They are not able to be used in speech independently from the sentence [1, p. 35]. A sentence (even comprising one word), unlike a word or a word combination, denotes some actualized situation, i.e. a situation correlated with the real world. For example, *night* as word is only a vocabulary item naming a natural phenomenon. The noun *night* is nothing else but a language expression of the concept "night". The sentence Night differs from all the two. The sentence *Night* presents the phenomenon of night as a fact of reality. It has acquired modality (the speaker interprets the phenomenon as real), as well as certain time perspective (past, present, future). Actualization is even simpler in sentences with finite verbs, for example *the day breaks* vs *day break*. Actualization as syntactic phenomenon is termed *predication* that consists of the unity of the modal and the tense categories.

Finally, relations, binding sentence components, are restricted by sentence boundaries, which appear the most important structural peculiarity of the sentence. N. Baker considers that none of the words of a given sentence may either

subordinate or be subordinated to words outside the sentence. The list of peculiarities is not exhaustive, but it suffices to identify sentences in speech. Thus, the sentence may be defined as a minimal syntactic construction, used in language communication, characterized by predication and a certain structural pattern [2, p. 40].

The definition of the sentence given above includes a rather limited number of features and, therefore, many properties of the sentence are neglected, though they may in some way or the other be related to the properties mentioned in the definition. Consequently, the following discussion in this paragraph may be treated as extended definition of the sentence. Let us discuss its other properties [1, p. 235].

The sentence is the result of the speaker's creative activity.

Creative thought is among other abilities of the human being. Thus, since thought is closely related to speech, creativity in syntax is most natural and obvious. Speakers generate an infinite variety of new sentences. The average speaker does not store in memory sets of ready-made sentences but constructs for occasional use new sentences even in similar situations.

It is the sentence that enables the speaker to react creatively and actively to ever-changing dynamic reality, to interact (with the help of language means) with new conditions (both in terms of content and participants of the communication). In the sentence, the structure (i.e. structural patterns) is rigid and stable, but it is also characterized by new content and novelty of every sentence. (Meantime, one should bear in mind such formulas as *Nice to meet you, Take care, Happy birthday, See you later,* etc.) Thus, having a certain number of words and a finite set of rules, the speaker is capable of constructing an endless number of sentences with different structure and content.

The sentence has a form.

According to M. Hoey, the sentence, like any other meaningful language unit, has a form, though native speakers usually see the sentence form as something natural and do not pay particular attention to this sentence characteristic [8, p. 44]. However, such constructions as *A diggled waggle uggleda wiggled diggle* highlight the importance of the form. Some scientists believe that the sentence in question consists of word forms rather than a sentence form. Still, the sentence is a composite sign and its form consists of a set of signs of a definite form, variable or invariable, and positioned in a certain order. It is on the basis of formal properties that we treat *Jake owe me five pounds* as sentence and *Five me Jake pounds owes* as non-sentence.

Thus, the form of the sentence presupposes many layers and components. In particular, the sentence form includes formal properties of components – sentence parts, their order as well as their number. Grammatically, the order is their mutual sequence, while, phonetically, it is their general intonation pattern.

Every sentence is intonationally arranged.

Intonational arrangement characterizes every sentence. What is important for sentence intonation, these are intonation patterns special for different communicative types of sentences (for example, the intonation patterns of declarative and imperative sentences). Thus, intonational patterns are added to structural and grammatical organization of sentences. Interestingly, grammar and phonetics may interact within a sentence, which leads to neutralization of grammatical features. As a result, declarative sentences, pronounced with a certain intonation, may acquire interrogative meaning, for example: *You do not agree with me.* This shows that phonetic indicators rather than grammatical ones are important in the hierarchy of language means expressing "declaration/interrogation" [1, p. 236].

Thus, 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 is a sentence or not. As a result, there are many definitions of the sentence and many new definitions still appear which results from complexity of the phenomenon.

The adequate definition should refer the phenomenon to a certain genus and then point out specific features of the phenomenon that make it unique. Accordingly, we may state that the sentence is one of syntactic constructions. The sentence is a meaningful construction, therefore, discussing its specific features, we should characterize the sentence in terms of the three aspects of any meaningful language unit: structure, meaning and communicative function.

It is common in grammatical theory to distinguish between **main** and **secondary** parts of a sentence. Besides these two types there is one more – elements which are said to stand outside the sentence structure. In starting now to study parts of the sentence in Modern English, we will begin by analysing the principle or principles on which this classification is based.

Any part of the sentence may be expressed in four ways, that is, by a single word-form or a *word-form* preceded by a formal word, by a *phrase*, by a predicative complex, or by a clause. The only exception is the verbal predicate which can be neither a predicative complex nor a clause [10, p. 318].

A linguistic experiment to prove the correctness of this view would be to take a sentence containing a subject, a predicate, and a number of secondary parts, and to show that any of the secondary parts might be removed without the sentence being destroyed, whereas if either the subject or the predicate were removed there would be no sentence left: its "backbone" would be broken. This experiment would probably succeed and prove the point in a vast majority of cases. We will therefore stick to the division of sentence parts into main and secondary, taking the subject and the predicate to be the main parts, and all the others to be secondary [11, p. 205].

The question now arises, how are we to define the subject of a sentence? The question may also be put in a different way: what criteria do we practically apply when we say that a word (or, sometimes, a phrase) is the subject of a sentence?

In trying to give a definition of the subject, we shall have to include it in both general points, valid for language in general, and specific points connected with the structure of Modern English. Thus, the definition of the subject in Modern English will only partly, not wholly, coincide with its definition, say, in Ukrainian.

First let us formulate the structure of the definition itself. It is bound to contain the following items:

1) the meaning of the subject, i. e. its relation to the thought expressed in the sentence;

2) its syntactical relations in the sentence;

3) its morphological realization: here a list of morphological ways of realizing the subject must be given, but it need not be exhaustive, as it is our purpose merely to establish the essential characteristics of every part of the sentence.

The definition of the subject would, then, be something like this. The subject is one of the two main parts of the sentence.

1. It denotes the thing, whose action of characteristic is expressed by the predicate.

2. It is not dependent on any other part of the sentence.

3. It may be expressed by different parts of speech, the most frequent ones being: a noun in the common case, a personal pronoun in the nominative case, a demonstrative pronoun occasionally, a substantivized adjective, a numeral, an infinitive, and a gerund. It may also be expressed by a phrase [9, p. 205].

According to the meaning of its components, the predicate may denote an action, a state, a quality, or an attitude to some action or state ascribed to the subject. These different meanings find their expression in the structure of the predicate and the lexical meaning of its constituents [10, p. 331].

From the structural point of view there are two main types of predicate: *the simple predicate* and the compound predicate. Both these types may be either nominal or verbal, which gives four sub-groups: *simple verbal, simple nominal, compound verbal, compound nominal*. Compound verbal predicates may be further classified into phrasal, modal and of double orientation Compound nominal predicates may be classified into *nominal proper* and *double nominal*.

Independent elements of the sentence, as the term implies, generally are not grammatically dependent on any particular part of the sentence, but as a rule refer to the sentence as a whole. Only occasionally they may refer to a separate part of the sentence. The independent element may consist of a word or a phrase. Its position is free than that of any other parts of the sentence and accordingly it may occur in different positions in the sentence.

There are two groups of independent elements:

1. *Direct address.* A direct address is the name of a person (or occasionally a non-person) to whom the rest of the sentence is addressed. It may be emotionally charged or neutral, but semantically it does not influence the sentence:

"I'm sorry, *Major*, we had an arrangement. *Jenny, darling,* don't say such things".

2. *Parenthesis*. As to its meaning the parenthesis may be of several types:

a) It may express the speaker's attitude to the relation between what is expressed in the sentence and reality (*perhaps, maybe, certainly, of course, evidently, oh, Goodness Gracious, etc.*): *Undoubtedly* you are both excellent engineers. *Surely* he had too wide a mouth.

b) It may connect the sentence it belongs to with the preceding or the following one expressing different relations (*first, firstly, secondly, finally, after all, moreover, besides, by the way, on the contrary, that is* (i.e.), *for example* (e.g.), etc.): I was listening and thinking. Besides, I wanted to tell you something. *After all*, he'd only been doing his duty. *Finally* the whole party started-walking.

c) It may specify that which is said in the sentence or express a comment (*according to my taste, in my opinion, to tell the truth, in other words, as is known, by the way,* etc.): *According to your theory*, we're in a mighty soulful era. *To tell you the truth*, the total was more than a thousand francs [10, p. 391].

There are different **ways of expressing parts of the sentence. Word-forms** are any form of the grammatical paradigm of the word. *Girl, girls, girl's, girls'; to write, writes, wrote, is writing, has been written, will have been writing,* etc.; *pale, paler; brilliant, more brilliant, most brilliant* are all word-forms.

As seen from the above a word-form may contain either one component or more than one. One-component word-forms are various synthetic forms of the word, while multi-component word-forms are analytical forms of the word which are composed of one or more auxiliary components and one notional component. The auxiliary components may be verbs (*be, have, do, shall, will*), adverbs (*more, most*), particles (*to*).

A **phrase** is a group of two or more notional words functioning as a whole. Besides notional words a phrase may contain one or more formal words. Compare: *to see her – to look at her*.

Depending on the relation between its components, phrases may be divided into two kinds: phrases which are divisible both syntactically and semantically, and phrases which are indivisible either syntactically or semantically, or both [10, p. 319].

The subject of as clause is usually a *noun phrase*. "Noun phrase", often abbreviated to NP, is a convenient term for any one of the following:

a) a noun, such as *George, boys*;

b) a nominal group, such as the boys, the headmaster's desk, in which a noun (boys, desk) is the *head*, and in which the other words (the, the headmaster's) *modify* the head;

c) *a pronoun*, which may be one of the seven so-called *personal pronouns* (I, you, he, she, it, we, they) or *an indefinite pronoun* like *everyone or something*, or one of the words like *this* and *that* which can be used as pronouns. A pronoun is a *pro-form*, a form used instead of another form;

d) *a pronominal group*, such as we all, everyone in our class, in which a pronoun (we, everyone) is the head [7, p. 3].

There are also **phrases which are divisible both syntactically and semantically**. Phrases of this kind contain a headword and one or more word-forms dependent on it. Here the following kinds of phrases may be distinguished: *nominal, verbal, adjectival, adverbial* and *statival phrases*.

1. In *nominal phrases* the headword is a noun, a noun-pronoun, or a numeral modified by one or more word-forms. The latter are mostly adjectives, nouns, or pronouns with prepositions, although they may be participles or infinitives. They may have dependent words of their own: a *new way, a very good friend, a recently built house, the years to come,* etc.; *something curious, anything so unexpected, everybody staying here, all of them, nothing to say; the first of May, the second to enter,* etc. Their relation to the headword is attributive. Phrases of this kind function as nouns treated separately.

The old man was sitting in a big armchair. (subject and adverbial modifier expressed by nominal phrases)

The man sat on the sofa. (subject and adverbial modifier expressed by nouns)

2. In *verbal phrases* the headword is a verbal which has one or more word-forms dependent on it. The latter are mostly nouns, noun-pronouns, or adverbs, each of which may have its own dependent words: *to know him, to see her again, going home in the evening, speaking a foreign language.* In all these phrases syntactical relations between the headwords and dependent words are either objective (him, her, a language) or adverbial (*again, home, in the evening*). Phrases of this kind function according to the nature of their headwords, that is, in the same way as their headwords do when used separately.

"*To see* is to believe. *To see you here* is a real pleasure"

(subject expressed by an (subject expressed by an infinitive)

infinitive phrase).

"Do you like *swimming*!" (object expressed by a gerund).

"I hate *swimming in cold water*" (object expressed by a gerundial phrase) [10, 319].

In adjective phrases the headword is an adjective which has some words dependent on it. They are usually adverbs or nouns with a preposition, or an infinitive. These may have dependent words of their own: **quite** *true,* **too** *big,* **wonderfully** *clever, kind* **enough**, *absent* **from classes**, *true* **to his** *word, unable* **to say a word,** etc. Their relation to the headword is either adverbial (where the dependent word is an adverb) or objective (where the dependent word is a noun with a preposition or an infinitive). Such phrases perform the same functions as adjectives used alone.

"She has a *kind* heart" (attribute expressed by an adjective).

"Are you *angry*?" (predicative expressed by an adjective).

"It was a *very dark* night" (attribute expressed by an adjective phrase).

"Are you *quite ready*?" (predicative expressed by an adjective phrase).

4. In *adverbial phrases* the headword is an adverb modified by some other adverb or (very seldom) by a noun/pronoun with a preposition: **very** *happily,* **rather** *well,* etc. Their relation to the headword is either adverbial (in this case the modifying word is an adverb) or objective (in this case it is a noun with a preposition). Such phrases function like separate adverbs.

"She thanked him *warmly*" (adverbial modifier expressed by an adverb).

"He set to work *heartily enough*" (adverbial modifier expressed by an adverbial phrase).

5. In *statival* phrases where the headword is a stative modified either by a noun with a preposition, or by an adverb, or by an Infinitive, each of which may have dependent words of its own: *aware* **of the danger**, *afraid* **of cold water**, *so* **deeply** *asleep,* **quite** *alone,* etc. Their relation to the headword is either adverbial (the dependent word is an adverb) or objective (in this case it is a noun with a preposition or an infinitive). Such phrases function as the corresponding statives do when used separately.

"The whole land *was aflame*" (predicative expressed by a stative).

"The sky above them seemed *afire with stars*" (predicative expressed by a statival phrase).

As it is seen from the above, the relations between the headword and dependent words within these phrases (1–5) may be of three kinds: attributive, objective, or adverbial [10, p. 320].

There are phrases which are **indivisible either syntactically or semantically or both**. Phrases of this kind contain two or more notional word-forms used together to designate a person or a non-person, an action or a quality. Syntactical relations between their components are not always explicit, and so they are not analysed separately.

Predicative complexes differ from phrases in that they have two words with predicative relation between the nominal and the verbal parts of the phrase. These words in their turn may have one or more words dependent on them. Though the predicative relation within a complex is grammatically only implicit, its presence makes it possible to turn any predicative complex into a clause, which cannot be done to a phrase.

"I saw *him run*" → "I saw *that he was running*".

"He still found *life interesting*" → "He still found that *life was interesting*" [6, p. 322].

Clauses, like predicative complexes, contain two words connected predicatively, but unlike predicative complexes the predicative relation in clauses is expressed explicitly in the grammatical forms of the subject and the predicate.

"I don't know *what you mean*". "She came *when nobody was in*".

Within the sentence we usually distinguish two **syntactical levels of analysis**, one belonging to the sentence proper, which is called *the sentence level*, and one belonging to various phrases treated as a whole and functioning in the sentence with the same force as separate words. This level is called *the phrase level*.

The subject and the predicate belong to the sentence level only. The object, the adverbial modifier, the attribute, and the apposition may belong either to the sentence level or to the phrase level.

"He did not tell *me anything about it*" (*Me, anything, about it* are objects to the verb-predicate – the sentence level).

"You are unhappy *about something*, aren't you?" (*About something* is an object to the predicative *unhappy*, which is part of the predicate – the sentence level).

"He will come *tomorrow*" (*Tomorrow* is an adverbial modifier to the verb-predicate – the sentence level).

"You seem *very* tired" (*Very* is an adverbial modifier to the adjective *tired*, which is part of the predicate – the sentence level).

"*Poor* Amy could not answer" (*Poor* is an attribute to the noun, which is the subject – the sentence level).

In other cases objects, adverbial modifiers, attributes and appositions are included in various phrases within which they are not usually treated separately, the whole phrase functioning as part of the sentence on the sentence level.

"He insisted *on going by train*" (*On going by train* is an object to the verb-predicate – the sentence level; within the phrase *on going by train* we distinguish an adverbial modifier *by train* referring to the word-form going the phrase level).

When analysing a sentence we deal mainly with the sentence level only, unless it is necessary for some reason to state the syntactical relations between the words within a phrase [10, p. 323].

To sum up, in studying the sentence, we are faced with a number of problems belonging to the science of language as a whole rather than to English philology. Among these are definition of a sentence, classification of sentences, structure, and many other problems of a similar character. One of the most important questions concerning the sentence which seems to remain disputable to this day is the definition of the sentence as a linguistic unit. There is a considerable diversity of viewpoints among grammarians concerning the problem of sentence analysis as well. To conclude, any definition of a sentence must include several basic items: 1) it must state the relation of the sentence, to thought; 2) it must take into account the specific structure of the language in question; 3) it must leave room for as many possible varieties of sentence as can be reasonably expected to occur in the given language.

References:
1. Arnold I. The English Word / I. Arnold. – M., 1973. – 303 p.
2. Baker N. In Other Words. A Course on Translation / N. Baker. – London and New-York : International Library, 1999 – 234 p.
3. Benveniste E. Problems de Linguistique Generale / E. Benveniste // Les Niveaux de L'analyse Linguistique. – Paris, 1976. – 229 p.
4. Celce-Murcia M. The Grammar Book / M. Celce-Murcia, D. Larsen-Freeman // An ESL/EFL Teachers Course. – Boston : International Library, 1999. – 252 p.
5. Close R. A Reference Grammar for Students of English / R. Close. – M., 1979 – 342 p.
6. Curme G. A Grammar of the English Languagmee / G. Curme. – London-New York, 1981. – 255 p.
7. Fedorenko O. English Grammar Theory / O. Fedorenko, S. Suchorolska. – Lviv : Lviv State University, 2008. – 359 p.
8. Hoey M. Patterns of Lexic in Text / M. Hoey. – Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1991. – 231 p.
9. Ilyish B. The Structure of Modern English / B. Ilysh. – M., 1975. – 268 p.
10. Kobrina N. An Outline of Modern English Syntax / N. Kobrina, E. Korneyeva. – M., 1985 – 312 p.
11. Rayevska N. Modern English Grammar / N. Rayevska. – K., 1976. – 304 p.
12. Шведова Н. Очерки по синтаксису русской разговорной речи / Н. Шведова. – Москва : Высшая школа, 1966. – 218 с.
13. Шмелев Д. О связанных синтаксических конструкциях в русском языке / Д. Шмелев // «Вопросы языкознания». – № 5, 1960. – 199 с.

Анотація
О. САМУСЕВИЧ. ОСНОВНІ ТА ДРУГОРЯДНІ ЧАСТИНИ РЕЧЕННЯ

Стаття присвячена дослідженню головних і другорядних частин речення в англійській мові. У роботі аналізуються структурні типи речення, а також незалежні елементи, які знаходяться за межами структури речення, проте є не менш важливими за попередні.
Ключові слова: лексичні категоріальні значення, синтаксичні одиниці, другорядні частини.

Аннотация
Е. САМУСЕВИЧ. ОСНОВНЫЕ И ВТОРОСТЕПЕННЫЕ ЧАСТИ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНИЯ

Статья посвящена исследованию основных и второстепенных частей предложения в английском языке. В работе анализируются структурные типы предложения, а также независимые элементы, которые находятся за пределами структуры предложения, но они не менее важны, чем предыдущие.
Ключевые слова: лексические категориальные значения, синтаксические единицы, второстепенные части.

Summary
O. SAMUSEVYCH. THE PRINCIPAL AND SECONDARY PARTS OF A SENTENCE IN MODERN ENGLISH

The article investigates the principal and secondary parts of a sentence in English. The paper analyzes the structural types of the sentence, as well as independent elements that are outside the structure of the sentence, but they are no less important than the previous ones.
Key words: lexical categorical meanings, syntactic units, secondary parts.