

DAUGAVPILS PEDAGOĢISKĀ UNIVERSITĀTE
ANĢĻU VALODAS KATEDRA

H. MARŠAVS

**PHRASE STRUCTURE IN
MODERN ENGLISH
AND LATVIAN**



1998

Apstiprināts
Angļu valodas katedras sēdē
1998. gada 31. martā, protokols Nr. 6.

Vārdkopu struktūra mūsdienu angļu un latviešu valodā. – Daugavpils,
DPU izdevniecība "Saule", 1998. – 60 lpp.

Redkolēģija: **Harijs Maršavs** – atbildīgais redaktors
Zaiga Ikere
Tatjana Dubrovska

Recenzenti: Dr. paed. **B. Kalniņa** un
Dr. paed. **L. Rumjanceva**

Monogrāfijā tiek risinātas adjektīvo, verbālo, adverbiālo un prepozicionālo
vārdkopu problēmas.

Teksta salicēja
un maketētāja: **Marina Stočka**

ISBN – 9984-14-067-9

© DPU izdevniecība "Saule", 1998

PREFACE

This book is a sequel to “Substantīvās vārdkopas mūsdienu angļu un latviešu valodā” which is concerned with the analysis of noun phrases in English and Latvian. The present research is focused on the remaining types of phrase structures: adjective phrases, verb phrases, adverb phrases and prepositional phrases.

Each kind of phrase is described in a separate chapter. In its turn, each chapter contains information on the subcategorization of the wordclass functioning as a head word, i.e. the verb, the adjective, the adverb, and various types of complementation and modification as well as ways of their realization.

Throughout the book parallels are drawn between English and Latvian. As Indo-European languages English and Latvian have numerous common features. At the same time, there are many features which are quite different.

In general, the English language has been explored more extensively and thoroughly than its Latvian counterpart. Therefore, several syntactic phenomena in Latvian are described in a purely empirical way. Further research is badly needed in these areas.

The book is intended for students of the Humanities Department. It can be used in reading up for seminars and examinations, in writing term – and bachelor papers. It might be of some use for all those who are interested in the problems of phrase structure in Modern English and Latvian.

CONTENTS

Chapter One. The Adjective Phrase	5
1. Adjective subcategorization and combinability	5
2. Functional stipulation of adjective phrase structure and usage	12
3. Adjectives as heads of noun phrases and their combinability	17
Chapter Two. The Verb Phrase	21
1. The verb, its subcategorization and complementation	21
2. Verb phrases containing monotransitive verbs as their heads	25
3. Verb phrases containing intransitive verbs as their heads	30
4. Verb phrases containing ditransitive verbs as their heads	33
5. Verb phrases containing intensive verbs as their heads	37
6. Verb phrases containing complex transitive verbs as their heads	40
7. Verb phrases containing prepositional verbs as their heads	42
Chapter Three. The Adverb Phrase	45
1. The adverb, its subcategorization and combinability	45
2. The structure of adverb phrases	48
Chapter Four. The Prepositional Phrase	51
Conclusion	54
References	56

CHAPTER I

THE ADJECTIVE PHRASE

1. ADJECTIVE SUBCATEGORIZATION AND COMBINABILITY

Traditionally adjectives are defined as words qualifying nouns (Gordon 1980:261) or, in other words, as lexical units expressing the attribute of substances (Ganshina 1964:78, Rayevska 1976:89, Barabash 1975:31, Pauliņš 1978:64, Freidenfelds 1962: 61). In general one can maintain that an adjective is “a word that tells us something about a noun” (Chalker 1994:10). Besides adjectives there are words, phrases and clauses that function as an adjective. They are termed “adjectivals”: the **greenhouse** effect, an **I’m-all-right-Jack** attitude (Chalker 1994:9). Some grammarians loosely utilize the term “adjective” to include adjectivals, though it is useful to distinguish between true single-word adjectives and adjectivals (Chalker 1994:9).

In modern grammars the adjective is described in more precise linguistic terms.

Formally, the adjective as a part of speech should meet four grammatical requirements (Chalker 1994:10):

- 1) to be used attributively in a noun phrase: a **fine** day – **jauka** diena;
- 2) to occur in predicative position after copula verbs: the day is **fine**.
Diena ir **jauka**;
- 3) to be premodified by intensifiers: **very** beautiful – **ļoti** skaists;
- 4) to have comparative and superlative forms: a **younger** man – **jaunāks** cilvēks, **most unusual** – **visneparastākais**.

Not all adjectives meet these conditions. First, some adjectives are used only attributively or only predicatively: a **complete** fool – **pilnīgs** muļķis, but not *”The fool is **complete**” or *”Muļķis ir **pilnīgs**”. Or again: “The man is **asleep**”, but not *”The **asleep** man”.

Secondly, not all adjectives can be premodified by intensifying words: ***Very** utter – ***ļoti** galējs.

Thirdly, not all adjectives are gradable in English or in Latvian: **economic, southern, Japanese, vakarējs, vienīgs, zemniecisks**.

The adjectives which have the four basic grammatical parameters are termed central (Chalker 1994:10).

As a part of speech the adjective is characterized by duality, since grammatically it is far less definitive than the noun or the verb (Burlakova 1984:82). It is a well-known fact that the noun evinces the highest degree of temporal stability, whereas the lowest degree is inherent in the verb. As a result, notions that manifest the greatest degree of temporal stability are lexicalized as nouns, while those that show the least degree of temporal stability are lexicalized as verbs and those between the two above-mentioned categories as adjectives. Thus, according to their temporal stability the noun, the adjective and the verb constitute a certain continuous sequence of parts of speech (Burlakova 1984:82).

Since the adjective takes up the intermediate position between the noun and the verb, it shares some grammatical features with these classes of words. Some adjectives are closer to the noun, whereas some other adjectives are closer to the verb. This peculiarity serves as the basis for dividing adjectives into stative and dynamic (Quirk 1982:117). Stative adjectives denote permanent characteristics: **tall – garš, mild – maigs**. Stative adjectives cannot be used with the progressive aspect or with the imperative: *She is being **beautiful**. *Be **beautiful!** *Esi **skaista!** Dynamic adjectives are susceptible to change and therefore to subjective measurement. They include: **awkward, brave, calm, careless, cruel, extravagant, foolish, funny, good, greedy, impudent, naughty, noisy** and others (Quirk 1982:117). In contrast to stative adjectives they occur in imperative clauses or in clauses comprising a verb in the progressive aspect: Don't be **rude!** He is being **impudent**.

The double nature of adjectives is manifested in their combinability. Thus, adjectives referring to a temporary condition are exclusively assigned to predicative position and consequently can be followed by complements: He is **aware of it**. They are **anxious to do it**. Adjectives denoting permanent characteristics can be used both attributively and predicatively: A **clever** girl – The girl is **clever**. **Gudra** meitene – Meitene ir **gudra**. In English attributive adjectives cannot take complements: The girl is **good at mathematics** – *The **good at mathematics** girl.

Diversity in adjective combinability is also evident in its degree forms. The thing is that gradable adjectives can be modified by the intensifier **very** in the positive and superlative degree forms: **very good, the very best son** (Burlakova 1984:83) – **ļoti labs, pats labākais dēls**. It is not the case in the comparative degree, since in this form the adjective is not modified by **very**, but by **much**: He is **much younger**. Viņš ir **daudz jaunāks**. In this respect it is like the verb which is always modified by **much**.

The use of **much** with the adjectives in the comparative degree is due to semantic reasons, because the adjectives in this particular degree express a dynamic quality of “sliding along the scale of comparison and changing in time” (Burlakova 1984:83).

In traditional grammars, including those of the English and the Latvian language, adjectives are divided into two subcategories: qualitative and relative (Ganshina 1964:81, Kobrina 1985:217, Barabash 1975:31, Mūsdienų lit. val. gram. 1959:424).

Qualitative adjectives denote various gradable qualities: **red – sarkans, big – liels, long – garš.**

Relative adjectives describe properties through relation to materials, place, time or an action: **wooden, northern, daily, defensive.**

Instead of the designation “relative” some grammarians use the term “classifying” to identify something as being of a particular type: **Indian, wooden, mental** (Chalker 1994:62).

Relative (classifying) adjectives are not gradable.

It is to be noted that there is no rigid line of demarcation between the qualitative and relative adjectives, because in the course of language development relative adjectives can acquire qualitative meanings: a **wooden** chair – a **wooden** face, **kokaina** (**sastingusi** seja), a **leaden** plate – a **leaden** sky, (svina) **pelēkas** debesis (Rayevska 1976:89, Ganshina 1964:81).

There is still another type of categorization according to which the adjectives are classified into descriptive and restrictive (limiting, limiter) ones. Descriptive adjectives denote quality in a broad sense (**cold, green** etc.), but restrictive (limiting) adjectives particularize the reference of the noun (**main, only, precise, same**) (Quirk 1982:115).

This classification is old-fashioned, since modern grammarians assign most “limiting” adjectives to a separate determiner class” (Chalker 1994:111).

Some adjectives have a heightening or a lowering effect on the noun they modify (Quirk 1982:115). Intensifying adjectives (intensifiers) are classified into two semantic subcategories: emphasizees and amplifiers (Quirk 1982:115). Emphasizers are those which have a general heightening effect and are used attributively: a **certain** winner – **pārliecinošs** uzvarētājs, **pure** fabrication – **tīrs** safabricējums. Amplifiers “scale upwards from an assumed norm, denoting the upper extreme of the scale or a high point on the scale” (Quirk 1982:115): a **complete** victory – **pilnīga** uzvara, **extreme** condemnation – **galējs** nosodījums.

If amplifiers are used inherently (directly), they can occur predicatively: their **extreme** condemnation – Their condemnation was **extreme** (Quirk 1982:115). The same is observable in Latvian: Viņu **galējs** nosodījums – Viņu nosodījums bija **galējs**. But when amplifiers are used non-inherently (indirectly), they occur only in attributive position: a **close** friend – *a friend is **close**, **tuvs** draugs – *draugs ir **tuvs**.

Grammatical and semantic characteristics of adjectives and hence their subcategorization have a direct impact on their combinability which finds its expression in the way they are modified or complemented.

Modification is understood as “the fact or instance of a dependent word modifying the meaning of another word or another linguistic unit (Chalker 1994:244). Complementation is comprehended as the addition of a complement to a linguistic unit. A complement is any element needed to “complete an adjective, preposition, verb, or a noun (Chalker 1994:76, 78).

Gradable adjectives can be premodified or postmodified by words of various degrees of intensity: a high degree – **very** good, an excessive degree – **too** good, a sufficient degree – good **enough**, insufficient degree – **not** good **enough** (Close 1979:29). For the most part, intensifiers are premodifying adverbs, because otherwise the only postmodifying adverb is **enough**: good **enough**, strong **enough**. In Latvian its counterpart **pietiekams** is always used as a premodifier: **pietiekami** labs, **pietiekami** stiprs.

Premodifying intensifiers (degree adverbs) are: **very** – **ļoti**, **pretty** – **diezgan**, **rather** – **labāk**, **drizāk**; **quite** – **pavisam**, **almost** – **gandrīz**, **how** – **cik**, **so** – **tik**, **much** – **daudz**, **too** – **ārkārtīgi**, and -ly adverbs: **exceedingly** – **pārmērīgi**, **extremely** – **ārkārtīgi**, **sufficiently** – **pietiekami**, etc. Sometimes intensifiers are represented by pronouns **all** and **that**: **all** bloody – **viscaur** asiņains, **that** interesting – **tik** interesants.

Occasionally gradable adjectives are premodified by nouns which like adverb intensifiers express the degree of quality. Mostly these intensifying nouns are combined with adjectives denoting colour: **cold** black, **straw** yellow, **brick** red; duration: **life** long, **age** long; temperature: **ice** cold; state: **dog** tired; shape: **pencil** thin, **ruler** straight or some other quality: **iron** hard, **blade** sharp, **dirt** cheap, **mountains** high.

Phrases of this type do not occur in Modern Latvian. Similar ideas are expressed by other means: by compound adjectives – **ledusauksts** or by comparative phrases – **auksts kā ledus**.

A special group of intensifying premodifiers is represented by phrases **a trifle**, **a bit**, **a lot**: **a bit** stingy, **a bit** shy, **a bit** queer, **a trifle** inquisitive,

a lot longer – or by isolated nouns **lots** and **heaps**: It's **lots** better. It's **heaps** better.

In Latvian semantically similar phrases are used: **mazliet** kaunīgs, **nedaudz** rupjš, **daudz** isāks. Yet, they are different grammatically, because the intensifying elements are realized not by phrases or isolated nouns, but by adverbs.

In English adjectives as head words can be premodified by other adjectives. Generally head-words have the meaning of colour and the premodifiers denote particular shades of colour: **light** brown, **dark** blue.

In Latvian the adjective heads are premodified by adverbs: **gaiši** brūns, **tumši** zils.

Sometimes the head adjective and its premodifier refer to two different semantic subcategories: **red hot**, **white hot**, **mighty delightful** (Burlakova 1984:85). In this case premodifiers function as intensifiers.

In Latvian again the construction “an adverb + an adjective” is used: **milzīgi liels**, **kvēlojoši karsts**.

Non-gradable adjectives occasionally function as head words as they can be modified by adverbs: **quite** true, **very** particular. However, in the majority of cases they need no modifiers, because semantically they are self-sufficient and do not require any specification or particularization. In the first place, it concerns reference adjectives: **same**, **self-same**, **very**; identifying adjectives: **medical**, **political**; intensifying adjectives: **sheer**, **utter**; uniqueness adjectives: **only**, **sole**.

These adjectives are used in noun phrases as premodifiers, but, in their turn, they do not take any accompanying words. A similar phenomenon is found in Latvian, though its extent might be different: **politiska** patstāvība, **vienīgā** iespēja, **pilnīgs** vājprāts.

Adjectives (gradable and non-gradable) that occur in predicative position can be complemented by a prepositional phrase, an infinitive clause, an ing-clause and a finite clause.

Prepositional phrases include a preposition + a substantive. Prepositions are numerous and their use depends on the adjectives they combine with. Some examples: **bad at physics**, **successful in his work**, **conscious of danger**, **mad about dancing**.

This type of complementation is common in Latvian too: **atkarīgs no laika apstākļiem**, **naidīgs pret mums**, **priecīgs par panākumiem**. Yet, in Latvian there are many instances where instead of the prepositional phrase a noun is used in the locative case without any preposition: **laimīgs dzīvē**, **sekmīgs darbā**. As is obvious from the examples, this occurs if the noun points out place or time.

Quite frequently English adjectives have participles in Latvian as their counterparts: **busy in work** – **aizņemts darbā**, **hungry for knowledge** – **izslāpis pēc zināšanām**, **confident of success** – **pārliecināts par panākumiem**.

In Modern English the adjective is often complemented by the infinitive clause. There are several varieties of this construction, the most exhaustive list of which is presented in R. A. Close's book "A Reference Grammar for Students of English" [3, 75 – 76].

They are:

1. He is **anxious to see her** = He wants (very much) to see her. The adjective **anxious** expresses a personal attitude to something that has not yet occurred. Some other adjectives of this kind are: **able, apt, curious, eager, free, keen, ready, reluctant, willing**.

A similar phenomenon can be observed in Latvian: **spējīgs izdarīt, gatavs palīdzēt**. Yet, it should be noted that on the whole the use of the infinitive here seems to be more restricted. For example: He is **anxious to help me** – Viņš ļoti vēlas man palīdzēt; She is **reluctant to study** – Viņa negrib mācīties.

2. He is **likely to see her** = He probably will see her. The adjective **likely** shows the speaker's attitude towards the future. The other adjectives of the same kind are **sure** and **certain**.

In Latvian no structural parallels are to be found.

3. He is **happy to see her again** = He is happy when (because) he sees her or has seen her again. **Happy** could be replaced by the **adjectives content, fortunate, glad, grateful, lucky, proud, sad, sorry, thankful** and others. These adjectives show personal attitudes or conditions in relation to something that has taken place.

Similar constructions occur in Latvian, though again there is no complete parallelism: I am **very sorry to hear it** – Man ļoti žēl to dzirdēt, but I am **glad to have done it** – Esmu laimīgs, ka esmu to izdarījis.

4. He is **foolish to meet her again** = It is foolish of him to meet her again. **Foolish** expresses an action which can be replaced only by such adjectives as **brave, clever, cruel, generous, kind, polite, reasonable, rude, selfish, sensible, silly, stupid, wicked**, etc.

In Latvian the infinitive seems to be out of place here. Complex sentences are used instead: Muļķīgi, ka viņš atkal ar viņu tiekas.

5. George is **quick to take offence** = He takes offence quickly. The adjective **quick** shows the mode in which an action is performed. A

similar semantic function is inherent in the adjectives **hesitant, prompt, reluctant, slow.**

No infinitive is used in rendering these adjective phrases into Latvian: She is **reluctant to do it** – Viņa negrib to darīt.

6. He is **easy to teach** = He is an easy pupil to teach. **Easy** could be replaced by other adjectives characterizing a person or an object: **agreeable, difficult, hard, hopeless, interesting, nice, pleasant.**

In this case the infinitive can also be used in Latvian, though it does not complement an adjective, but an adverb: Viņu **viegli mācīt**. Šo likumu **grūti saprast**.

Adjectives in Modern English are sometimes complemented by the gerund without any preposition. This occurs only occasionally, since there are only two adjectives which are followed by a contact ing-clause. They are **busy** and **worth**: They were **busy unpacking their suit-cases**. The book is **worth reading**.

The use of finite clauses as adjective complements is a common practice both in English and in Latvian. In the first place these are that-clauses: I'm **glad that you can go there** – Esmu **laimīgs, ka tu vari aizbraukt turp**.

Clauses complementing adjectival heads can also be introduced by wh-words or the conjunction *that*: It is not **clear who will help us** – Nav **skaidrs, kas mums palīdzēs**. The text was **longer than we thought** – Teksts bija **garāks nekā mēs domājām**. That-clause complements frequently have introductory **it** as their formal subject: **It's odd that she is here**.

In Latvian adjectival heads are replaced by adverbs: **Dīvaini, ka viņa ir šeit**.

Adjective heads may have discontinuous modification within the boundaries of one and the same phrase. In the book "English Syntactic Structures" F. Aarts and J. Aarts distinguish the following four cases (Aarts 1988:121 – 122):

1. **so + adjective + that-clause or as to-clause:**

in English: It was **so hot that I could not sleep**. His latest film is **so brilliant as to attract a lot of filmgoers**.

in Latvian: Viņa jaunākā filma ir **tik lieliska, ka pievelk daudz skatītāju**. It is clear from the structure of the sentence that the infinitive clause is replaced by a finite clause in Latvian.

2. **as (so) + adjective + as + (reduced) comparative clause or noun phrase:**

in English: She is **as pretty as her sister**.

in Latvian: Viņa ir **tīkpat skaista kā viņas māsa**.

in English: It weighs **as heavy as ten tons**. No parallel construction is found in Latvian. We say: Tas sver desmit mārciņas.

3. **more / less + adjective + than + (reduced) comparative clause or noun phrase:**

in English: He is **more handsome than his father**.

in Latvian: Viņš ir **glītāks nekā viņa tēvs**. In Latvian there is no adjective premodifier. However, it is not the case in constructions with *less*: The new film is **less interesting than the old one**. – Jaunā filma nav **tik interesanta kā vecā**.

4. **too + adjective + infinitive clause:**

in English: He is **too old to be her husband**.

in Latvian: Viņš ir **par vecu, lai būtu viņas vīrs**. Here the infinitive clause is replaced by a finite clause.

Adjective phrases analysed above could be regarded as structures containing both premodification and complementation. Since there is a close semantic interdependence between the two elements before and after the adjective head-word, it is more logical to look upon them as an instance of discontinuous modification. That is precisely what F. Aarts and J. Aarts suggest.

2. FUNCTIONAL STIPULATION OF ADJECTIVE PHRASE STRUCTURE AND USAGE

The construction of adjective phrases depends on several factors. One of them is associated with the area of semantics, since words can be combined only in those cases if they are compatible in their meanings. For instance, the adverb **seriously** generally modifies those adjectives which denote a physical or mental state: **serious complications** – **nopietni sarežģījumi**, whereas the adverb **vaguely** goes patterning with adjectives expressing physical or mental perception: **vaguely visible** – **neskaidri redzams** (Rayevska 1976:190).

More general and abstract restrictions apply to large groups of words. For example, degree adverbs can modify only gradable words whose meaning can be thought of in terms of a scale (Leech 1983:83): **very nice**

– **ļoti jauks, quite young – pavisam jauns**. Some degree adverbs – **absolutely, almost, extremely, quite**, etc. – actually apply to all descriptive adjectives.

Besides semantic factors there are some other linguistic phenomena which determine the structure and usage of adjective phrases. In the first place, these are peculiarities which stipulate their occurrence in attributive or predicative position in the structure of the sentence.

Most descriptive adjectives can function both attributively and predicatively: a very **tall** man – He is very **tall**, **ļoti garš** cilvēks – Viņš ir **ļoti garš**. However, there are adjectives which are exclusively either attributive or predicative (Kobrina 1985:223, Leech 1983:173, Close 1979:29). Hence, in accord with their functional properties adjectives may be divided into three groups:

+ attributive	+ attributive	- attributive
+ predicative	- predicative	+ predicative
red	main	asleep
big	total	awake
oval	mere	adrift

(Celce-Murcia 1983:394).

The adjectives of these three groups evince different potentials in forming adjective phrases. As a result, they differ in their structure and functioning.

Those adjectives which occur both attributively and predicatively generate phrases according to common phrase structure rules. In conformity with their semantic content and functional status they are modified by degree adverbs, nouns or adjectives in attributive position: **very** hot – **ļoti** karsts, a **light** blue sky – **gaiši** zilās debesis, **silver** grey – **sudraboti** pelēks and complemented by prepositional phrases, infinitive and finite clauses in predicative position: responsible **for this work** – atbildīgs **par šo darbu**, happy **to meet them** – laimīgs **viņus sastapt**, I am glad **that you saw it** – Esmu laimīgs, **ka tu to redzēji**.

Things become different if the adjective is used exclusively attributively or predicatively. Lists of adjectives which occur only in attributive position are presented in various grammar books (Kobrina 1985:223, Close 1978:156 – 157, Leech 1983:173, Krilova 1980:267). Generally, they point out the following three groups: 1) those that function rather as determiners: **chief, main, principal**; 2) those that function rather like intensifiers: **meer, sheer, utter**; 3) those that can be related to adverbials: **former – formerly, occasional – occasionally**.

A more exhaustive list was suggested by D. Bolinger in his paper “Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication” (Bolinger 1967:1 –

34). He distinguishes several semantic subcategories:

- 1) those adjectives that show the reference of the head-noun has already been determined: **very, particular, precise, same, self-same, identical, exact;**
- 2) those adjectives that show us the importance or rank of the head-noun: **main, prime, principal, chief;**
- 3) those adjectives that show the head-noun is recognized by law or custom: **lawful, rightful, legal, true;**
- 4) those adjectives that identify the reference of the noun itself: **medical, regular;**
- 5) those adjectives that qualify the time reference of the noun: **late, present, former;**
- 6) those adjectives that qualify the geographical reference of the noun: **southern, rural, urban.**

Two other subcategories were added by M. Celce-Murcia and D. Larsen-Freeman:

- 1) those adjectives that intensify or emphasize the head-noun: **total, sheer, utter;**
- 2) those adjectives that show the uniqueness of the head-noun: **sole, only, solitary, single** (Celce-Murcia 1983:393).

For the most part, the adjectives of the above-mentioned subcategories are not gradable and as a result they cannot be modified by degree adverbs. That means they cannot serve as head-words in adjective phrases. It would be wrong to say: **very main, *absolutely chief, *extremely medical*. However, this does not apply to all the adjectives under consideration. Occasionally they can be pre-modified by adverbs: It's a **very** particular case. On the whole it should be said that this occurs but seldom.

In grammar-books of the Latvian language adjectives have not been thoroughly studied from the point of view of their exclusive attributive or predicative usage. Yet, it seems quite possible, because a similar phenomenon is observable in it. Undoubtedly, its scope and significance are different and therefore, more precise conclusions could be drawn only after the analysis of a large bulk of material. However, even at this point, it is quite obvious that it is grammatical to use phrases like **legāla uzturēšanās** or **galvenā uzmanība**, whereas word chains **ļoti nelegāla uzturēšanās* or **ārkārtīgi galvenā uzmanība* sound very unusual and therefore do not seem to be grammatically acceptable.

In Modern Latvian adjectives of this kind do not function as head-words in phrases. For example, we could hear the following sentence on the Latvian radio: **Un to visu vadīs pilnīgs plānprātiņš Andris Bērziņš**. The

adjective **pilnīgs** in this context does not mean **stout** but **complete**. Thus, it is an amplifier, which according to the authors of "A Universal Grammar of English" scales "upwards from an assumed form, denoting the upper extreme of the scale or a high point on the scale" (Quirk 1982:115). For this reason in the above sentence it does not require any modifier to scale up its meaning. Just the other way about, the construction ***loti pilnīgs plānprātiņš** would seem very strange indeed and therefore utterly ungrammatical.

Predicative adjectives comprise lexical units of two semantic subcategories:

- 1) those referring to health: **ill, well, unwell**;
- 2) those denoting various states: **ablaze, adrift, afire, afloat, afraid, aghast, alight, asleep**, etc.

Words of group 2 are derived by adding to the root-word the prefix **a** (Close 1979:159, Leech 1983:173, Quirk 1982: 116 – 117). All these adjectives can be modified or complemented, thus giving rise to adjective phrases: He is **seriously ill**. I was **not aware of what he had done**. He was **not aware of the gravity of the situation**. She was **afraid to stop**.

In Modern Latvian health adjectives also occur in predicative position: Viņš ir **slims**. Viņa ir **vesela**. Unlike their counterparts in English they are used as attributes as well: Viņš ir **vesels (slims) cilvēks**.

The adjectives of the second type, i.e. those adjectives that point out a certain state, correspond to verbs or participles in Latvian: **afraid – nobijies, baidities; adrift – dreifēt, afire – degošs, degt; asleep – gulēt, aghast – šausmu pārņemts**, etc. On account of this factor the structure of the phrases in which the verbs or participles under discussion take up the position of the head-word has nothing in common with the corresponding English constructions.

If adjectives are followed by a complement, in Modern English they are always restricted to predicative position. Thus, it is absolutely correct to say **the man responsible for the accident**, but it would be quite wrong to use ***the responsible for the accident man** (Celce-Murcia 1983:395). The inability of complemented adjectives to function attributively is due to the fact that they always refer "to specific actions, processes, or events" (Celce-Murcia 1983:395). In this respect they are like all other predicative adjectives which tend "to refer to a temporary condition rather than a permanent condition" (Close 1979:159).

The predicative usage of adjectives with complementation after the head-word is also characteristic of Latvian: Viņš bija **priecīgs apmeklēt šo pilsētu** vs *Viņš bija **apmeklēt šo pilsētu priecīgs** which is grammatically

wrong. However, it is not always like that. So, it is admissible to say either: Šis cilvēks bija **ieciētīgs pret mums** or Šis cilvēks bija **pret mums ieciētīgs**. The latter example shows that the positional restriction of predicatively used adjectives has a narrower sphere of application in Latvian.

There is still another aspect to be considered in respect of attributive or predicative adjectives. It is concerned with the linguistic phenomena of homonymy and polysemy.

Some homonyms have a clear-cut distinction in being able to occur either attributively or predicatively. For instance, the homonyms **late** denoting, on the one hand, **dead** and **not early**, on the other hand, differ in relation to their position in the sentence. If **late** is used attributively, it means **dead**: the **late** George Lamb. If it occurs in predicative position, it has the meaning of **not early**: George was **late** (Close 1979:29).

Similar regulations are observed in the area of polysemy. This is due to the ability of adjectives to characterize the referent of the noun directly or indirectly. In "A Universal Grammar of English" the adjectives that characterize the referent directly are termed inherent and those that do not are termed non-inherent. This can be illustrated by the usage of the adjective **old**. It may denote age and occur both predicatively and attributively: The **old** man came. The man who came was **old**. **Old** can be used in a different sense as, for example, in the sentence **He is my old friend**. In this case **old** does not denote age but a quality of a person who has been a friend for a long time. In this meaning **old** is restricted only to attributive position. Thus, we can say **My old friend is here**, but we cannot say ***My friend is old and he is here**, because then it would mean that the friend is really old. In reality **my old friend** does not necessarily imply that the person is old. On the contrary, that person can be quite young, therefore we cannot relate **my old friend** to **My friend is old** (Quirk 1983:114).

Some other examples: The girl is **sorry** (= apologetic) vs the **sorry** girl (a sorry sight). The man is **responsible** (= is to blame) vs the **responsible** man (= trustworthy) (Celce-Murcia 1983:391).

As a result, the structure of the phrases in which polysemantic adjectives occur in different meanings and positions is far from being identical. This is clearly seen in the sentences **He is a very responsible man** and **He is responsible for the expedition**. At the same time constructions ***He is for the expedition responsible** or ***He is the very responsible man** would be grammatically impermissible.

As far as we know, the functional peculiarities of homonymic and polysemantic adjectives have not been systematically analysed in Modern Latvian. However, some examples show that similar regularities can be traced in it too, though, undoubtedly, they may differ in their scope and prevalence. By way of illustration we can analyse the polysemantic adjective **akls**. If this adjective means **blind**, it can be used both attributively and predicatively: **akls** cilvēks and **Šis cilvēks ir akls**. In a different sense it denotes **very dark**: **akla** nakts, **akla** tumsa (Latv. val. vārdnīca 1987:37). In this case it can be used only attributively, because it would be very strange indeed to hear something like ***Nakts ir akla** or ***Tumsa ir akla**.

There seem to be many other concrete instances which should be taken into account in further researches.

3. ADJECTIVES AS HEADS OF NOUN PHRASES AND THEIR COMBINABILITY

In the course of language development adjectives can change their grammatical status, since they accumulate substantive features and begin functioning like nouns. This process is not uniform in respect of all adjectives, therefore it manifests itself in different ways in the area of morphological categories and syntactic combinability.

In traditional grammars of the English language, both practical and theoretical, the linguistic units under consideration are subcategorized into wholly substantivized and partially substantivized adjectives (Barabash 1975:35 – 36, Blokh 1994:205 – 206, Ganshina 1964:87, Žigadlo 1965:44, Khaimovich 1967:80 – 81, Rayevska 1976:96).

Wholly substantivized adjectives acquire the categories of the noun, because they inflect for number and for the genitive case. They also take the article. Examples: **a native, a native's, natives**.

The group of wholly substantivized adjectives includes words denoting:

- a) classes of persons: **a native, a relative, a conservative, a liberal, a radical, a progressive, a savage, a criminal, a black, a white, a noble, an inferior, a superior, a primitive, a modern, a contemporary, an European, an Asiatic**, etc.;
- b) nationalities: **an American, a Belgian, a Czech, a German, a Greek, an Italian, a Norwegian, a Russian**;

- c) periodicals: **daily, weekly, monthly** (Barabash 1975:35 – 36, Ganshina 1964:89 – 90).

Some substantivized adjectives have only the plural form: **classics, chemicals, eatables, finals, greens, movables, necessities, valuables**.

Partially substantivized adjectives take a definite determiner, but they are not inflected for number or the genitive case (Barabash 1975:36, Ganshina 1964:88 – 89, Gordon 1980:265 – 266).

Partially substantivized adjectives usually denote:

- a) classes of persons possessing the quality expressed by various adjectives: **the young, the old, the poor, the rich, the healthy, the sick**, etc.;
- b) nationalities if the words end in -sh and -ch: **the English, the French, the Scotch, the Irish, the Welsh, the Dutch**;
- c) abstract notions: **the agreeable, the beautiful, the good, the impossible, the opposite, the picturesque, the useful**, etc. (Barabash 1975:36, Ganshina 1964:88).

A number of partially substantivized adjectives are used in set phrases: **for the better, for the best, on the contrary, at large, in the main, in particular, in short (brief), on the whole**.

The traditional subcategorization into wholly and partially substantivized adjectives is not recognized by all the linguists. Western linguists hold a view that “some items can be both adjectives and nouns” (Quirk 1982:130), therefore they are regarded either as nouns or adjectives in their own right. This concerns such items as **noble / a noble**, etc. The term “substantivization” is not utilized at all. For instance, one cannot find this term in “A Universal Grammar of English” by R. Quirk and his co-authors or in “A Communicative Grammar of English” by G. Leech and J. Svartvik. The term is not included in “The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar” either.

These linguists, however, maintain that adjectives “can often function as heads of noun phrases” (Quirk 1982:111, Leech 1983:176). The **wise** look to **the wiser** for advice. **The English** have been called ‘a nation of shopkeepers’.

A similar view has been put forward by some Russian linguists. Thus, I. P. Ivanova points out that some adjectives can function like nouns, since they perform the syntactic functions of subject and object. However, they are not converted into nouns, because they lack some basic properties of the noun, i.e. inflections for number and the genitive case (Ivanova 1981:36 – 37).

Wholly and partially substantivized adjectives are recognized in traditional grammars of the Latvian language (Mūsdienu latv. val. gram. 1959:471). Substantivization is regarded as a very old linguistic phenomenon which has been developing slowly and continuously up to this very day.

Several degrees of substantivization can be distinguished. The highest degree is observed in wholly substantivized adjectives which have been fully converted into nouns. Sometimes the adjectives the nouns have been derived from are extinct: **pirksteinis, priedaine, kviesaine, villaine, bēris, melnis, pelēcis** and others.

Partially substantivized adjectives can be used either as nouns or adjectives: **pelēkais, klibais, aklais, svešais**, utt. In a context actually any adjective can be substantivized (Mūsdienu latv. val. gram. 1959:475). In this respect Latvian is like many other inflected languages in which adjectives are freely substantivized (Ganshina 1964:87). This is due to the fact that the inflected forms of adjectives show the categories inherent in the noun: number, case and gender: **mazais – mazā, mazie – mazās, mazajiem – mazajām**.

Wholly substantivized adjectives or otherwise nouns derived from adjectives possess the same combinability as nouns proper. They can be premodified by adjectives, pronouns, numerals, nouns in the common or genitive cases: **her** relatives, **two** relatives, **that flax** blue, a **dark** brown, **these** radicals, an **old** conservative, **England's** liberals; **pagasta** vecākais, **tris** pagasta vecākie, **šis trakais** bezgalvis. They can also take postposed prepositional phrases and finite or non-finite clauses: a relative **of theirs**, the conservative **touring in Spain (who is touring in Spain)**; **ši vecā bez lakata**; **vecā, kas dzīvo šajā mājā**.

Partially substantivized adjectives or otherwise those items that take a definite determiner and function as heads of noun phrases display combinability that is peculiar both for the noun and for the adjective. On the one hand, preserving some of their adjective nature they can be modified by adverbs of degree: The **extremely** old need a great deal of personal reference (Quirk 1982:111). This is not grammatical with regard to nouns proper: *the **extremely** book or *the **completely** table. On the other hand, like nouns they can be modified by adjectives and pronouns or take prepositional phrases or clauses. In "A Universal Grammar of English" this is illustrated by the sentences (Quirk 1982:111): We will nurse **your** sick and feed **your** hungry. The young **in spirit** enjoy life. The rich will help only the **humble** poor. The old **who resist change** can expect violence. The **industrious** Dutch are admired by their neighbours.

Much the same occurs in Latvian, since adjectives under discussion also evince a dual combinability. Thus, it is quite grammatical to say: **šie** nabadzīgie, **šie drūmie** nabadzīgie; nabadzīgie, **kas bija ieradušies**. At the same time it is grammatical to modify a substantivized adjective by an adverb: **Joti** vājie, **ārkārtīgi** vājie. This undoubtedly is an instance of combinability characteristic of adjectives, but not of nouns.

In Modern English adjectives functioning as nouns are frequently used without any modifiers except for articles: books for **the young**, schools for **the deaf and dumb, the sick and the poor, the foolish and the reckless**.

No modification or complementation are observed in the majority of set phrases: **in brief, on the whole, to the quick**. However, they are possible: **at dead of night, at his best**.

CHAPTER II

THE VERB PHRASE

1. THE VERB, ITS SUBCATEGORIZATION AND COMPLEMENTATION

No other wordclass has such a varied system of subcategorization as the verb since it can be subdivided according to its form (regular and irregular verbs), meaning, function and combinability. Some classifications, both traditional and modern, are based not on one particular aspect, but a combination of different aspects.

Traditionally verbs are divided into lexical (content) verbs, modal verbs, auxiliary verbs and linking verbs. A lexical verb has a full lexical meaning. In a verb phrase it takes the position of a headword. In modern linguistics modal verbs are usually included in the category of auxiliary verbs (Chalker 1994:40, Frank 1993:48, Burton-Roberts 1994:117). Thus, two kinds of auxiliaries are distinguished: the primary auxiliary verbs (**do, have, be**) and the modal auxiliary verbs (**can, may, must, shall, will, need, dare, ought to**). The primary auxiliary verbs mark differences in tense, voice and mood. The modal auxiliary verbs add a semantic colouring such as ability, possibility, or necessity (Frank 1993:48).

The auxiliary verbs cannot occur independently and therefore they are used with a lexical verb. The only exception is their usage in elliptical sentences: "Can you do it?" "Yes, I **can**", or in structures of substitution: If only the train would stop! But it never **does**.

Only primary auxiliaries exist in Modern Latvian: **būt, tikt, tapt, kļūt, palikt** (Müsd. latv. val. gram. 1959:545). Though they are not numerous, they perform a very significant function because they are characterized by a high frequency of occurrence in communication.

Modal meanings are expressed by content verbs which in no way differ from other lexical verbs in their morphological forms: Es **varu** to izdarīt. Es **varēju** to izdarīt. Es **varēšu** to izdarīt.

Auxiliary and lexical verbs form verb groups: **is being done, have done – tiek darīts, ir izdarīts**, in which lexical verbs are modified by auxiliary verbs (Burton-Roberts 1994:71).

Since the objective of this section and a series of other sections, which will explore verb phrases of different types, is the analysis of syntactic

relationships between the lexical verb and its complements, the auxiliary modification of the headverb, except these general remarks, will not be further discussed.

As has already been mentioned above, the traditional scheme of subcategorization also includes linking (copula) verbs. They semantically join the predicative back to the subject (Chalker 1994:228). Contemporary linguists label them with another term: intensive verbs (Quirk 1982:22, Burton-Roberts 1994:74). Some intensive verbs, especially the verb **be**, have lost their lexical meaning to a great extent: The man **grew** thin. The leaves **turned** brown and yellow. However, a number of other verbs of this type (**stand, lie, sit, die – stāvēt, gulēt, sēdēt, nomirt**) have fully preserved their lexical meaning though they are regularly used to join the predicative to the subject of the sentence: She **died** young – Viņa **nomira** jauna.

According to semantic parameters verbs can be divided into numerous subclasses, e.g. verbs of physical perception, mental activity, motion, wish, etc.

Over the recent decades linguists have suggested several other types of verb subcategorization. Their brief summary is presented in V. V. Burlakova's book "Syntactic Structures of Modern English" (Бурлакова 1984:39 – 56). Some of them, though by far not all, are set out in the further exposition of this paper.

The development of the theory of valency brought about a classification which is based on the number and kind of syntactic connections a verb can form. Accordingly, the verbs are subcategorized into zero valent, monovalent, bivalent, etc. items. There are also ambivalent verbs, i.e. verbs whose valency can be described in terms of two or more types of combinability. For example, the verb **to kill** may be regarded as an operative verb which conveys the idea of affecting a patient, or as a factitive verb which expresses the notion of making something or causing a result (Chalker 1994:147). Thus, the valency of the verb **to kill** can be shown by the scheme:

- 1) affect (agent, patient);
- 2) produce (cause, effect).

It should be noted that the term valency is sometimes used instead of complementation. However, valency includes the subject of the clause, whereas it is excluded from complementation (Chalker 1994:413).

The semantic approach to verb subcategorization aimed at revealing the participants of an action and their semantic roles gave an opportunity to isolate a group of verbs which are called conversives. These verbs present one and the same situation from two different points of view. For

example, the verbs **to give** and **to receive** present the act of handing from the viewpoint of the giver, on the one hand, and the receiver, on the other. The number of actants is the same, yet the distribution of roles is different since in the process of giving the agent is the person who gives something, but in the process of receiving the agent is the person who receives something.

The semantic classification of verbs permits to differentiate another group of verbs. These are performative verbs which, instead of providing some information of an action, constitute an action in themselves. They are used in statements, spoken and written, that “do” something. E.g.: I **advise** you to reconsider. You are hereby **notified** that ... (Chalker 1994:290).

The advocates of semantic syntax distinguish between factive and non-factive verbs. A factive verb asserts the truth of a following clause (Chalker 1994:147): I **know** that you are busy. A non-factive verb leaves the proposition open: I **believe** you are busy.

The following verbs are usually considered to be factive: **amuse, bother, count, matter, forget, resent, regret, grasp, ignore, mind**, etc. The most frequently occurring non-factive verbs are: **seem, appear, happen, suppose, assume, claim, believe, fancy, charge, maintain** and some others.

The semantic differences between these two types of verbs determine the structural differences of those sentences in which they occur. Thus, the use of the noun **fact** before a subordinate clause is only permissible if the main clause contains a factive verb: I **regret** the fact that I can't do it, but not *I **happen** the fact that I can't do it.

Semantically verbs are also divided into stative and active ones. The active verbs are freely used in progressive tenses, whereas the occurrence of stative verbs in these tenses is rare: She **is running**, but not *She **is understanding** it.

Verbs are frequently subcategorized according to what other elements occur with them in verb phrases. In other words, “they are subcategorized in terms of their complementation types” (Burton-Roberts 1994:73, Quirk 1982:22). Taking into account these parameters verbs are divided into six main kinds:

- 1) transitive (monotransitive);
- 2) intransitive;
- 3) ditransitive;
- 4) intensive;
- 5) complex transitive;
- 6) prepositional (Quirk 1982:22).

This subcategorization is also valid for Modern Latvian since all six types occur in its structure.

A transitive verb requires a noun (a noun phrase) to complement it: John **bought a book** – Jānis **nopirka grāmatu**. The noun (noun phrase)

functions as its direct object.

An intransitive verb does not require any complement to complete its meaning: They **disappeared** – Viņi **pazuda**.

A ditransitive verb requires two nouns (noun phrases) as its complementation: William **gave Jane a spoon** – Viljams **iedeva Džeinai karoti**. The first complement **Jane (Džeinai)** functions as the indirect object of the ditransitive verb **give (iedot)** and the second complement **spoon (karoti)** functions as its direct object.

An intensive verb requires a subject-predicative. It can be complemented by an adjective (adjective phrase), a noun (noun phrase), or a prepositional phrase: She **is an engineer** – Viņa **ir inženiere**. She **is young** – Viņa **ir jauna**.

A complex transitive verb is complemented by a noun (noun phrase) functioning as a direct object and a noun (noun phrase), an adjective (adjective phrase), or a prepositional phrase functioning as an object – predicative: They **painted the door white** – Viņi **nokrāsoja durvis baltas**.

A prepositional verb is complemented by a prepositional phrase which functions as a prepositional complement: He **looked at the children** – Viņš **paskatījās uz bērniem**.

In reference to prepositional verbs it must be noted that they should not be confused with phrasal verbs. Some linguists define a phrasal verb in a broad sense as a verb followed by a particle expressed by an adverb, a preposition, or some combination of the two: He **got up** at 8 a.m. We **looked into** that. She **looked out of** the window. (Celce-Murcia 1983:265).

More narrowly a phrasal verb is understood as a verb plus an adverb particle, in contrast to a prepositional verb or a phrasal-prepositional verb (Chalker 1994:297).

The narrow definition of phrasal verbs seems preferable as it helps to make a clear distinction between phrasal verbs proper and prepositional verbs, therefore, it will be adhered to in this research.

The six types of verbs under discussion, their complementation and functions can be summarized as follows:

MONOTRANSITIVE – '(trans)':

subject – verb – direct object

(S) (V) (dO)

INTRANSITIVE – '(intrans)':

subject – verb

(S) (V)

DITRANSITIVE – '(ditrans)':

subject – verb – indirect object – direct object
(S) (V) (iO) (dO)

or:

subject – verb – direct object – to / for indirect object
(S) (V) (dO) (iO)

INTENSIVE – '(intens)':

subject – verb – subject-predicative
(S) (V) (sP)

COMPLEX TRANSITIVE – '(complex)':

subject – verb – direct object – object-predicative
(S) (V) (dO) (oP)

PREPOSITIONAL – '(prep)':

subject – verb – prepositional complement
(S) (V) (pC) (Burton-Roberts 1994:83).

The structure of various verb phrases will be explored in the following sections which will proceed from the division of verbs into the six above-mentioned subcategories. In each section attention will be focused on one particular subcategory.

2. VERB PHRASES CONTAINING MONOTRANSITIVE VERBS AS THEIR HEADS

As is well known, transitivity is understood as the ability of a verb to take a direct object.

Transitive verbs are divided into three main types: monotransitive, complex transitive and ditransitive. Monotransitive verbs take one direct object, complex transitive verbs take a direct object and an object-complement, but ditransitive verbs are complemented by an indirect and a direct object (Chalker 1994:405, Burton-Roberts 1994:83). This section is concerned with verb phrases which include monotransitive verbs.

E.g. She **bought a dress** – Viņa **nopirka kleitu**. In the verb phrase **bought a dress – nopirka kleitu** the verb **bought (nopirka)** is a governor and the noun phrase **a dress (kleitu)** is a complement which in the above-mentioned sentence performs the function of a direct object.

Transitive verb complements (direct objects) are mostly expressed by single nouns or noun phrases: They saw **Tom** – Viņi redzēja **Tomu**. They saw **an old woman** – Viņi redzēja **vecu sievieti**. It is usually possible to transform sentences of this type into passive constructions in which the direct object of an active sentence becomes the subject of a passive sentence (Quirk 1982:312): They saw **Tom** → **Tom** was seen by them. However, in Modern English there exists a small group of transitive verbs which normally do not allow a passive transformation of the sentence. For this reason they are sometimes regarded as non-transitive verbs taking noun phrases as their complements (Quirk 1982:313). These items include:

- 1) reciprocal verbs – **resemble, equal, mean**;
- 2) verbs of containing – **hold, comprise, lack**;
- 3) verbs of suiting – **suit, fit, become**.

Passive counterparts are missing in Modern Latvian by far more frequently because its grammatical structure often resists passive transformations. Thus, instead of **Toms tika redzēts** it would be more preferable to say **Tomu redzēja**. The prepositional phrase denoting the doer of the action (in English – the by-phrase) is usually omitted though sometimes it is expressed by “no + a noun or a pronoun”, e.g. no manis, no viņiem. There are verbs which cannot be used in the passive form at all: Šis signāls **nozīmē** trauksmi → but not *Trauksme **tika nozīmēta** ar signālu. Šie ieži **satur** dzelzs rūdu, but not *Dzelzs rūda **tiek saturēta** iežos.

Sometimes the usage of the direct object depends on the semantic subclass of the subject of the sentence. For example, if the verbs **to open** or **to close** are used in a sentence whose subject denotes a living being, then these lexical items are followed by a direct object: She **closed (opened) the door** – Viņa **aizvēra (atvēra) durvis**. However, if the direct object becomes the subject of the sentence and hence the action of closing or opening is presented as if taking place of its own free will the object position remains unfilled: The door **opened (closed)** – Durvis **atvērās (aizvērās)**.

Even the grammatical form of the subject may affect the structure of the sentence in reference to the direct object (Бурлакова 1984:61 – 62). For instance, the verb **to meet (satikt)** is complemented by a noun (noun phrase) if the subject of the sentence is used in the singular: The boy **met another boy** – Zēns **satika kādu citu zēnu**. Yet, the situation is reversed if the subject is used in the plural: The boys **met** – Zēni **satikās**. These two sentences show that after the same verb **to meet (satikt)** no explicitly expressed object is present.

Naturally, direct objects are often represented by pronouns: I read the book – Es izlasīju grāmatu. I read **it** – Es **to** izlasīju. In Modern Latvian personal pronouns in object position usually precede the verb, but not follow it: Es **viņu** nepazīstu. Mana uzvedība **viņus** ļoti pārsteidz.

The personal pronoun **it (tas)** can be used with or without a definite antecedent. So, in the sentences **He bought a car (Viņš nopirka mašīnu) – He bought it (Viņš to nopirka)** the pronoun **it (to)** replaces the noun **car (mašīnu)**. However, no definite antecedent is to be found in the sentences **I can't stand (bear) it – Es to nevaru izturēt (paciest)**, in which the pronoun **it (to)** is associated with a whole situation.

Transitive verbs both in English and Latvian can be complemented by non-finite clauses: He agreed **to help me** – Viņš piekrita **man palīdzēt**. Among non-finite clauses as direct object two types are differentiated: those without a subject and those with a subject: He wants **to come here** – Viņš grib **šurp atnākt**. I saw **him coming** – Es redzēju **viņu nākam**.

In constructions without a subject the direct object in English can be realized either by an infinitive or an ing-form. There are verbs which co-occur only with the infinitive: **agree, arrange, choose, decide, demand, expect, hope, learn, long, manage, offer, promise, refuse, want, wish**; or only with the ing-form: **avoid, deny, dislike, detest, fancy, finish, miss, postpone, resent, risk, suggest**; or those which are followed either by an infinitive or an ing-form: **delay, hate, intend, like, love, neglect, omit, prefer, start, try** (Quirk 1982:280).

E.g. She **promised to come** every week. He **denied having done** it.

In Latvian the direct object without its own subject can be realized only by an infinitive: Viņa solījās **atnākt**. In other cases English counterparts are represented by some other grammatical forms:

- 1) an infinitive – He enjoyed **reading** – Viņam patika **lasīt**;
- 2) a noun (noun phrase) – They put off **discussing** the question – Viņi atlika šī jautājuma **apspriešanu**;
- 3) a clause – She denied **having met him** – Viņa noliedza, **ka būtu viņu satikusi**.

In Modern English the non-finite clauses as direct object frequently have their own subject. It is true both in respect of the infinitive and the ing-form: I want **him to reconsider it**. I saw **them skating**. We liked **his singing**.

This type of construction also occurs in Modern Latvian, but its usage is restricted only to verbs of sense perception: **redzēt – to see, dzirdēt – to hear, novērot – to watch**. If these verbs are used in the form of the participle ending in -am, they can be preceded by a subject: Es dzirdēju **viņu runājam**

– I heard **him talking**. Es redzēju **viņu staigājam pa parku** – I saw **him walking in the park**. In other cases, the structures “a non-finite form with a subject” for the most part have a finite clause as their Latvian counterparts: I like **his playing** – Man patik, **kā viņš spēlē**. I want **him to translate it** – Es gribu, **lai viņš to iztulko**.

Sometimes the infinitive after a transitive verb can be introduced by a wh-word. This concerns not only English, but also Latvian, though by k-words: I don't know **what** to do. Es nezinu, **ko** darīt.

Quite frequently transitive verbs in Modern English and Latvian can be complemented by finite clauses. In the English language the transitive verbs taking a finite clause include:

- 1) factual verbs: **admit, agree, answer, believe, expect, hope, know**, etc.;
- 2) emotive verbs: **deplore, prefer, regret**;
- 3) volitional verbs: **command, demand, insist, order, propose, recommend, suggest**, etc. (Quirk 1982:314).

The finite clauses after these verbs are introduced by the conjunction **that** (in Latvian – **ka**) and in indirect questions by the conjunctions **if** and **whether** (in Latvian – **vai**): They hoped **that we could help them** – Viņi cerēja, **ka mēs viņiem varētu palīdzēt**. He asked **if I had already bought the book** – Viņš jautāja, **vai es jau esmu nopircis šo grāmatu**.

Besides **whether** other wh-words (k-words) can be used: **why, where, who, how** (in Latvian – **kāpēc, kur (p), kas, kā**): I don't know **why he is late** – Es nezinu, **kāpēc viņš kavējas**. We don't know **where he is going** – Mēs nezinām, **kurp viņš dodas**.

Both Modern English and Latvian have catenative verbs, i.e. lexical verbs that are “capable of linking with a following verb” (Chalker 1994:58): I **want to begin working** – Es **vēlos sākt strādāt**. The syntactic relationships between these verbs are qualified as those between a governor and its complement (direct object). Other chance juxtapositions are not regarded as catenative: He **stopped to talk** to the old man (= in order to talk) (Chalker 1994:58). The presence of object relations can be proved by the insertion of the elements **that** or **what**: I want (**what**) to begin (**what**) working. Es gribu (**ko**) sākt (**ko**) strādāt.

Phasal catenative verbs denoting the beginning, cessation, or continuation of an action are characterized by a peculiarity which distinguishes them from other catenatives, viz. they can be used without any object if the action of the verb which could potentially occur after the catenative verb is expressed by the subject of the sentence (Бурлакова 1984:63 – 64): They **began to sing** – **Singing began**. Viņi **sāka dziedāt** –

Sākās dziedāšana. They continued to argue – The argument continued. Viņi sāka strīdēties – Strīds turpinājās.

The length of the catenative chain is theoretically unlimited, though in practice it does not exceed 2 – 3 elements. The phrase **to decide to begin trying to stop smoking** (Бурлакова 1984:50) – **mēģināt sākt censties pārtraukt smēķēt**, certainly, sounds unnatural and clumsy.

According to their structure, catenative chains may be of two different kinds:

- 1) those which include only verb forms: **wanted to stop applauding – gribēja pārtraukt aplaudēt;**
- 2) those which besides verb forms also contain other elements: **wanted to stop applauding immediately – gribēja uzreiz pārtraukt aplaudēt.**

Catenative chains have another peculiarity which manifests itself in the fact that verbs are introduced in strict succession. For example, in the chain '**began trying to stop drinking**' **began** is complemented by **trying**, then **trying** by **stop**, which, in its turn, is complemented by **drinking**. Hence, immediate syntactic ties can be established between the verbs in contact position, but not by verbs separated by intervening verbs. This kind of restriction was explored by V. V. Burlakova and labelled with the term "syntactic barrier" (Бурлакова 1984:51 – 52).

Among transitive verbs there is a small group which is capable of taking two direct objects. It includes: **forgive, force, envy, let, strike, set** (Бурлакова 1984:66 – 67). E.g. We forgave **him his errors**. The syntactic status of both the objects **him** and **errors** can be verified by the test of deleting one of the objects: We forgave **him** and We forgave **his errors**. The resulting structures are grammatical and semantically complete. In either case the verb complements preserve the functional status of a direct object.

The element **him** denotes a living being and therefore it could be qualified as indirect object. However, this is not true, since indirect objects are used after ditransitive verbs together with direct objects: I gave **him a pen** – I gave **a pen to him**. Direct objects usually cannot be omitted because in that case the indirect object would acquire a different function, i.e. the function of a direct object: *I gave **him**. Undoubtedly, syntactic rules, like all other rules, have some exceptions. In this particular case it concerns the verbs **to ask, to owe, to pay, to tell, to show** which allow the direct object to be omitted: **I paid John** (Quirk 1982:324).

Like all other verbs, transitive verbs can be modified by adverbials (adjuncts) both in English and Latvian. The adjunct is understood as an item functioning like an adverbial which is "the most optional element of

clause structure" (Chalker 1994:14) and therefore it can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence in which it is used. For the most part adjuncts are expressed by adverbs (adverb phrases) denoting time, place or manner: He treated the patient **yesterday** – Viņš ārstēja šo pacientu **vakar**. She spotted the deer **quite accidentally** – Viņa ieraudzīja briežus **pilnīgi nejauši**.

The adjuncts of the transitive verbs can also be expressed by prepositional phrases: We met them **near the forest** – Mēs satikām viņus **pie meža** or by noun phrases such as **last year, the day before yesterday, the day after tomorrow, this afternoon**, etc.: She examined the student **the day before yesterday**.

In Latvian some of these phrases have adverbs as their counterparts: **aizvakar, parit, šogad**, and others. However, noun phrases also occur: **šajā gadā, nākamo trešdien, visu dienu**. For example: **Visu dienu** lija lietus. **Šajā gadā** ir notikuši vairāki neparasti atgadījumi.

Quite frequently adjuncts are realized by clauses: I resumed my work **when she came** – Es atsāku darbu, **kad viņa atnāca**.

The number of adjuncts is not limited, though in reality sentences with 1 – 3 adverbials are predominant.

3. VERB PHRASES CONTAINING INTRANSITIVE VERBS AS THEIR HEADS

Intransitive verbs take no direct object (Chalker 1994:211, Mūsd. latv. lit. val. gram. 1959:545 – 546). They occur in all Indo-European languages, including Modern English and Latvian: They **worked** hard – Viņi daudz **strādāja**.

Intransitive verbs should not be confused with those instances of transitive verbs when they are not explicitly complemented by direct objects. Here a clear distinction must be made between two entirely different phenomena.

The first phenomenon is observed in relative clauses in which the direct object of a transitive verb is shifted to the antecedent position in the main clause: **The picture** he bought a couple of days ago is very beautiful – **Glezna**, kuru viņš nopirka pirms pāris dienām, ir ļoti skaista. In these two sentences the object position after the transitive verb **bought (nopirka)** remains empty or, in other words, is represented by zero position. In modern linguistics zero is understood as an abstraction without any

morphological or syntactic realization (Chalker 1994:430). It can also be defined as a purely positional unit (Бурлакова 1984:57). Zero position cannot be filled with any item because such an operation would immediately affect the grammaticality of the structure in which it occurs. Thus, in the above-mentioned sentence it is impossible to say ***The picture he bought the picture a couple of days ago** or ***Glezna, kuru viņš nopirka gleznu pirms pāris dienām**. However, on the semantic level the relationship “an action + its object” is preserved (Бурлакова 1984:57).

The other phenomenon is concerned with the omission of a direct object after transitive verbs. This can be illustrated by the sentences: **He plays the piano** – He **plays** very well. **Viņš spēlē klavieres** – **Viņš spēlē ļoti labi**. In the sentences **He plays very well** – **Viņš spēlē ļoti labi** the direct object **piano (klavieres)** receives no verbal manifestation, but it can be easily filled in: **He plays the piano** very well – **Viņš spēlē klavieres ļoti labi**. In instances like these the object remains unrealized at the syntactic level, yet it is present at the semantic level (Бурлакова 1984:42).

The omission of a direct object is admissible in two cases:

- 1) if the object is known from the previous context;
- 2) and if it is of a universal character, i.d. it is one of a class of homogeneous objects.

For example, in the sentence **John smokes** “there is no object, but it is implied (understood object = cigars, cigarettes, etc.) (Leech 1983:283).

Besides verbs which may take explicit or implicit direct objects and therefore can be regarded as transitive verbs proper, there are numerous other verbs which can be used either transitively or intransitively: **She broke the glass** – **The glass broke**. **Viņa saplēsa glāzi** – **Glāze saplīsa**.

In the sentences **The glass broke** and **Glāze saplīsa** the syntactic position after the verbs **broke** and **saplīsa** cannot be filled with a direct object. In its turn, it signifies that both the verbs operate here as intransitive verbs.

It is interesting to note that with some verbs transitivity or intransitivity depends on whether their semantic object is used in subject or object position. For instance,

He began the lesson – **The lesson began**. **Viņš sāka stundu** – **Stunda sākās**. **He opened the door** – **The door opened**. **Viņš atvēra durvis** – **Durvis atvērās**. **He hung the lamp** – **The lamp hung**. **Viņš piekāra lampu** – **Lampa karājās**.

The verbs in their transitive or intransitive uses do not change their lexical meaning. Hence it follows that similar meanings can be expressed by different syntactic structures (Бурлакова 1984:43).

In Modern Latvian the verbs under consideration are represented by their reflexive forms: **apturēt mašīnu – mašīna apstājās, atvērt logu – logs atvērās, sākt sanāksmi – sanāksmes sākas** – in structures without objects.

A similar phenomenon is observed in sentences with symmetric predicates expressed by such verbs as **to meet, to marry, to divorce**, etc. (Бурлакова 1984:43 – 44). If the subject of these verbs is used in the singular, the symmetric predicate takes a direct object: **John married Ann. Jānis apprecēja Annu**. The plural subject is always followed by a verb with no object: **They married. Viņi apprecējās**.

In Modern Latvian the majority of symmetric verbs are complemented by prepositional phrases: **Jānis apprecējās ar Annu. Jānis izšķīrās ar Annu**.

In Modern English there are several groups of intransitive verbs which are frequently used without any accompanying words: He **shifted**. The sun **rose**. (Бурлакова 1984:59 – 60). These groups include verbs denoting:

- 1) gesticulation, mimicry, sensations: **chuckle, cough, frown, gasp, giggle, nod, relax, laugh, shiver, sigh, smile, sniff, snort, stare, stiffen, yawn;**
- 2) motion: **appear, approach, arrive, come, disappear, fall, gallop, go, jump, leave, move, pause, rise, run, start, turn;**
- 3) saying and mental perception: **agree, answer, consider, insist, interrupt, know, learn, prompt, speak, talk;**
- 4) loud sounds: **bang, crackle, ring;**
- 5) psychic state: **exaggerate, worry;**
- 6) some other heterogeneous states or actions: **help, hesitate, wait.**

Though the above-mentioned verbs are often used without any dependent elements, it does not mean that in the sentences in which they occur we have another instance of zero position, i.e. position that cannot be filled in. Undoubtedly, as intransitive verbs they cannot take a direct object, but they can be freely modified by adverbials: adverbs (adverb phrases), noun phrases, prepositional phrases and clauses which specify their meanings in reference to place, time, manner, etc.

For example, He answered **quickly** – Viņš **ātri** atbildēja. They live **in London** – Viņi dzīvo **Londonā**. They met **two weeks ago** – Viņi tikās **pirms divām nedēļām**. He smiled **when the girl came into the room** – Viņš smaidīja, **kad meitene ienāca istabā**.

The number of adjuncts is not theoretically limited, though for the most part their amount does not exceed 1 – 3 elements. This ensures the transparency of sentences structure and easy perception of meanings expressed.

It should also be pointed out that in accordance with the principle of end-weight in English there is a feeling that the predicate group should be “longer and grammatically more complex than the subject” (Leech 1983:168). This helps to explain why there exists a tendency to avoid single intransitive verbs as predicates. Therefore, instead of a single verb, phrases consisting of **to have, take, give, do + an abstract noun phrase** are often used, e.g. The man **shouted** – The man **gave a shout**. He **works little** – He **does little work**. He **rested** – He **took a rest** (Leech 1983:168).

No similar counterparts are found in Modern Latvian. Frequently intransitive verbs are used with the prefixes **ie-** and **pa-**: The man **gave a shout** – Cilvēks **ieklīdzās**. She **took a glance** – Viņa **paskatījās**.

Some other examples:

to look – **skatīties**, **to take a look** – **paskatīties**; **to bark** – **riet**, **to give a bark** – **ierieties**; **to breakfast** – **brokastot**, **to have breakfast** – **pabrokastot**.

4. VERB PHRASES CONTAINING DITRANSITIVE VERBS AS THEIR HEADS

A ditransitive verb requires two nouns (noun phrases) or pronouns as its complementation (Quirk 1982:323, Burton-Roberts 1994:76): She gave **the boy a ball** – Viņa iedeva **zēnam bumbu**. The first complement (**the boy** – **zēnam**) performs the function of an indirect object, whereas the second complement (**a ball** – **bumbu**) the function of a direct object. The indirect object normally denotes an animate being and the direct object a concrete thing.

The most typical verbs that take two objects are: **answer, ask, buy, give, hand, offer, pay, present, promise, sell, send, show, tell, whisper**, and some others.

Very often the direct object is realized by a personal pronoun. In English it is generally positioned before the direct object: We gave **her** flowers. Since in Modern Latvian the indirect object is expressed by a noun or pronoun in the dative case, but the direct object by a noun or pronoun in the accusative case, there is no danger of confusing their functional status. Therefore, the position of the indirect object is not strictly determined. It may occur before the ditransitive verb: Mēs **viņai** uzdāvinājām ziedus; or after the verb: Mēs uzdāvinājām **viņai** ziedus.

The structure “an indirect object + a direct object” can be reworded in such a way that the indirect object is placed after the direct object. In

this case it is preceded by the prepositions **to** and **for** (sometimes by **of**). The verbs which commonly permit this operation are: **ask (a question) of (John), bring to, do (a favour) for, do (a disservice) to, find for, give to, leave for / to, lend to, make for, offer to, owe to, pay for, pour for, promise to, read to, save for, show to, teach to, tell to, throw to** (Quirk 1982:323 – 324).

However, a few verbs disallow the structure with a prepositional phrase: **allow, refuse, wish** (Quirk 1982:324). The same is true in reference to phrases like **to give a kiss, to give a kick, to give a lecture**. The structures with the indirect object before its direct counterpart are permissible: He gave **her a kiss**. The reverse is erroneous: *He gave **a kiss to her** (Бурлакова 1984:68).

The positioning of the indirect object after the direct object is caused by different reasons. There may be grammatical reasons. First, if the prepositional phrase (indirect object) is longer than the direct object: He sold his old car **to one of his neighbours** (Hornby 1977:53). Secondly, when the indirect object is expressed by a noun and the direct object by a pronoun: Show it **to Tom**; or both objects are pronouns: Show it **to me**. In the latter case the preposition may be omitted in colloquial speech: Give **me** it / them or Give it / them **me** (Hornby 1977:50).

The indirect object can be moved also in Latvian: Atstāju **tēvam** dzīvokļa atslēgas → Atstāju dzīvokļa atslēgas **tēvam** (Freidenfelds 1962:193). However, the indirect object realised by a personal pronoun normally precedes the direct object: Iedevu **viņam** dzīvokļa atslēgas. The above-mentioned sentences show that the change of object position does not require the insertion of a preposition in Modern Latvian.

Sometimes the indirect object is moved to front position. This phenomenon is accounted for either by grammatical reasons as

- 1) in pronominal questions: **To whom** did you send the letter? / **Who** did you send the letter **to**;
- 2) in relative clauses: The man **to whom** she gave money / **who** she gave money **to** never came back (Kobrina 1986:60 – 61), or
- 3) by the communicative value of different parts of the sentences as, for example, in: **To his favourite daughter** he sent a cheque for £50, but **to his son** he sent only a cheap fountain-pen (Hornby 1977:53) – **Savai mīļotajai meitai** viņš aizsūtīja čeku par 50 sterliņu mārciņām, bet **dēlam** viņš aizsūtīja tikai lētu pildspalvu.

A. S. Hornby believes that the indirect object is moved up to front position for the sake of contrast and prominence (Hornby 1977:53). In terms of the theory of sentence actual division the movement of the indirect

object can be explained by the change of its informative value. It is well-known that in the position before the direct object the indirect object becomes topicalized and, as a result, it is assigned to the domain of the theme which imparts information that has already been furnished. Yet, when the indirect object is shifted either to end-position or front-position, its informative value acquires greater weight; consequently, it becomes the rheme, i.e. the element which provides new information (Бурлакова 1984:68).

It is to be noted that in Modern English there is a small group of ditransitive verbs which always join the indirect object by means of a preposition in all positions, including that before the direct object where the indirect object is commonly topicalized. These verbs are: **announce, ascribe, attribute, communicate, dedicate, dictate, disclose, explain, interpret, introduce, open, point out, repeat, submit and suggest**. For example: Then she explained **to me** the cause of her refusal (Kobrina 1986:59). In Latvian again no preposition is required: Viņa paskaidroja **man** sava atteikuma iemeslu.

Indirect objects can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence. He gave **me** a ticket → He gave a ticket. Viņš iedeva **man** biļeti → Viņš iedeva biļeti.

A group of verbs (chiefly **ask, owe, pay, teach, tell, show**) allow "each object to be omitted" I paid **John the money** → I paid **John**. I paid **the money**. Es samaksāju **Jānim naudu** → Es samaksāju **Jānim**. Es samaksāju **naudu**.

The indirect object can also be omitted after the verbs **read, write** and **sing**. **Read** and **sing** always take the preposition **to**, whereas **write** can be used without it: Will you sing **to us**? Write **(to) me** as soon as you arrive at your destination.

Since the direct and the indirect object in Modern Latvian are realized by two different cases (accusative and dative), the omission of one or the other object does not seem to be restricted: Es uzrakstīju **viņam vēstuli** → Es uzrakstīju **viņam**. Es uzrakstīju **vēstuli**. Es lasīju **viņiem stāstu** → Es lasīju **viņiem**. Es lasīju **stāstu**.

In the sequence "an indirect object + a direct object" the second element, i.e. the direct object, can be represented by a finite clause: He assured me **that he was innocent**. Viņš pārliecināja mani, **ka viņš nav vainīgs**.

With some verbs the indirect object before the finite clause can be omitted, though with some others it is obligatory. The authors of "A Universal Grammar of English" list these verbs in the following way:

- 1) indirect object obligatory: **advise, assure, convince, inform, persuade, remind, tell;**
- 2) indirect object optional: **ask (+ indirect question), promise, show, teach, warn** (Quirk 1984:326).

For example, Tom showed **us** that he was clever → Tom showed that he was clever. The same in Latvian: Toms parādīja **mums**, ka viņš ir gudrs → Toms parādīja, ka viņš ir gudrs.

The direct object in the structures under discussion can also be realized by a non-finite clause: They assured John that he could do it → They assured John **to do it**. In Latvian: Viņi pārliecināja Jāni, ka viņš to var izdarīt → Viņi pārliecināja (pierunāja) Jāni **to izdarīt**.

The replacement of a finite clause by a non-finite clause is possible if the indirect object of the main clause is identical with the subject of the direct object clause (Quirk 1982:327). This can be easily seen in the sentences given above.

If the indirect object in the main clause and the subject in the object clause denote two different persons, no corresponding form with a non-finite clause is possible: They assured John that Mary could do it → *They assured John Mary to do it. Or in Latvian: Viņi pārliecināja Jāni, ka Marija to var izdarīt → *Viņi pārliecināja Jāni Marija to izdarīt.

Not all verbs that take a finite clause in Modern English allow non-finite clauses as direct object or the other way round. For instance, the verbs **ask (= a request), encourage, force, help, order** permit only the non-finite clause (Quirk 1982:327). Examples: Ann helped me **to carry the heavy suitcase**. Anna palīdzēja man **nest smago čemodānu**. *Ann helped me that I might carry the heavy suit-case. *Anna palīdzēja man, ka es varētu nest smago čemodānu. The latter example shows that a similar regularity exists also in Modern Latvian.

Among the common verbs that permit non-finite and finite clauses are **ask (with wh-indirect questions), persuade, remind, teach, tell** and **warn** (Quirk 1982:327).

5. VERB PHRASES CONTAINING INTENSIVE VERBS AS THEIR HEADS

Intensive verbs are those verbal elements which link the subject of the sentence with its complement. The syntactic ties that exist between the subject and its complement are called intensive relationship (Quirk 1982:157). Unlike all the other verbs (extensive verbs) intensive verbs can be complemented by adjectives: The girl **is beautiful** – Meitene **ir skaista**.

At first glance, some structures with intensive verbs do not seem very different from those with a monotransitive verb + a direct object: John **saw a teacher** vs John **is a teacher**. In both sentences the verb (respectively **saw** and **is**) is followed by a noun phrase (**a teacher**), but the semantic relationship between the verbs **is** and **saw**, on the one hand, and the noun phrases **John** and **a teacher**, on the other, is quite different. In the former sentence the nouns **John** and **teacher** have two different referents, whereas in the latter sentence only one person **John** is mentioned. The rest of the sentence (**is a teacher**) is used to characterize the subject **John**, i.e. “to attribute to him a property” (Burton-Roberts 1994:79), that of being a teacher.

The function of a verbal unit after an intensive verb is qualified as subject-complement or subject-predicative.

In traditional linguistics intensive verbs are known as linking verbs or copulas. They are regarded as auxiliary or semi-auxiliary verbs (Бурлакова 1984:40). In present-day linguistics there exists a different view because they are considered to be main verbs which link the subject with its complement (Leech 1983:193).

In traditional grammars it is generally pointed out that some linking verbs have lost their lexical meaning to a greater or lesser extent. Accordingly, all the copulas are divided into three groups:

- 1) those that have completely lost their lexical meaning (**be, get**);
- 2) those that have partly lost their lexical meaning (**remain, become, grow, turn, look, seem**);
- 3) those that have fully preserved their lexical meaning (**elect, call, leave, keep, make**) (Kobrina 1986:42 – 43).

The differentiation of linking verbs with respect to the preservation or loss of their lexical meanings is also made in Modern Latvian. In the Academic Grammar of the Latvian Language it is asserted that some linking verbs have only grammatical functions, whereas some others have

to a greater or lesser extent retained their lexical meaning (Müsd. latv. lit. val. gram. 1962:235).

The problem of weakened or fully-retained lexical meanings is controversial. So, if we take two sentences: He **was** a doctor and He **became** a doctor, we immediately feel the difference in meaning and this is due to the semantic difference of the respective verbs **was** and **became**. Therefore, it is doubtful that the copula **be** has altogether lost its meaning. On the other hand, it is quite true that lexical meanings are not homogeneous. They may be very abstract and they may be quite concrete as, for example, in phrases **to be quiet** vs **to sit quiet**. This concerns not only verbs, but also nouns: **a table, a book** vs **a category, a gender**, etc.

In traditional linguistics linking verbs are classified into three groups:

- 1) those of being (**be, feel, sound, smell, taste, look**);
- 2) those of becoming (**become, grow, turn, get, make**);
- 3) those of remaining (**remain, continue, keep, stay**) (Kobrina 1986:43).

Occasionally, a fourth group is differentiated – the linking verbs of seeming or appearing (Ganshina 1964:348). V. V. Burlakova holds the view that the first three groups should be placed together under the heading of linking verbs of physical state. The remaining fourth group could be labelled as linking verbs with modal meaning (Бурлакова 1984:72). In the book “A Universal Grammar of English” all copulas are divided into three groups:

- 1) the most common copula **be**;
- 2) current copulas (**appear, feel, look, remain, seem, smell, sound, taste**);
- 3) resulting copulas (**become, get, go, grow, turn, make**). The last two groups of copulas show “whether the role of the subject-complement is that of current attribute or attribute resulting from the event described in the verb” (Quirk 1982:307).

Besides general semantic parameters, the intensive verbs (in the further exposition this term will be adhered to) can be characterized according to the semantic subcategorization of their complements. For example, the intensive verb **come** complemented by P II in un- denotes an undesirable or unsatisfactory action: **come undone, come untied, come unstitched**. **Go** denotes a definite change, usually one for worse: **go wrong, go sour, go pale, go bald**. The verb **turn** complemented by a noun without the definite article indicates an unexpected or undesirable development: **turn traitor, turn politician** (Hornby 1977:109 – 110).

Subject-complements differ according to the number of intensive verbs they can be used with. Some subject-complements can co-occur with several intensive verbs: **grow / get / become dark, get / grow old, become**

/ **grow suspicious, go / turn pale**, etc. Some other complements co-occur only with one definite intensive verb: **come true, fall asleep, fall ill, fall due, run dry, run low, run short** (Hornby 1977:107, 109 – 111).

The intensive verbs can also be subcategorized according to their combinability with wordclasses. For instance, the verbs **get, grow** can be complemented by an adjective, P II or an infinitive: It's **getting / growing light**. He's **getting to be quite a good painter**. She's **growing to be more and more like her father**.

The intensive verbs **be** and **become** can be complemented not only by an adjective, but also by a noun: He **is an actor** / He **became a sportsman**.

By contrast, the intensive verb **make** cannot be followed by an adjective, but it can be complemented by a noun: She **will make a good wife**.

In Modern Latvian the problem of intensive verbs has not been sufficiently explored. It is pointed out that some verbs (**būt**) are used very often, some (**klūt**) rather frequently and some others (**tapt, tikt**) less frequently (Mūs. latv. lit. val. gram. 1962:235 – 242). No detailed semantic or grammatical classification is presented. The same is true in respect of semantic restrictions. However, considerable space is allotted to their complementation in terms of wordclasses.

On the whole, the category of intensive verbs seems to be by far less developed and ramified in Modern Latvian than in Modern English. Quite frequently several intensive verbs in English have one and the same counterpart in Latvian: She **will make** a good cook – Viņa **klūs** par labu pavāri. He **grew** old – Viņš **kļuva** vecs. Leaves **turned** yellow – Lapas **kļuva** dzeltenas. They **became** engineers – Viņi **kļuva** par inženieriem. The weather **is getting** cold – Laiks **klūst** auksts. She **went** pale – Viņa **kļuva** bāla.

Very often the meanings expressed by the structure “an intensive verb + a subject-complement” are conveyed by verbs with prefixes **ap-, at-, ie-, iz-, no-, sa-**: **become acquainted – iepazīties, grow dark – satumst, come untied – atraisīties, go sour – saskābt, go rotten – sapūt, wear thin – izdilt, run dry – izžūt, fall ill – saslimt, grow pale – nobālēt, go dead – apklust**.

Sometimes English intensive verbs and their complements correspond to single lexical verbs or phrases in Latvian: **come true – īstenoties, go mad – sajukt prātā**.

As was illustrated above, the valency of intensive verbs varies from verb to verb. Disregarding individual features the complementation of

intensive verbs can be presented by an overall scheme which includes all major lexical and phrasal categories the subject-predicative can be realized by. Thus, the intensive verbs in Modern English and Latvian can be complemented by:

- 1) an adjective (adjective phrase): He became **attentive** – Viņš tapa **uzmanīgs**.
- 2) a noun (noun phrase) or pronoun: It's **me** – Tas esmu **es**.
- 3) a numeral: I'm **the second** – Es esmu **otrais**.
- 4) a prepositional phrase: I am **with this man** – Es esmu **ar šo cilvēku**.
- 5) a non-finite clause: The theme seemed **well-chosen** – Tēma šķita **labi izvēlēta**.
- 6) a finite clause: She is no longer **what she used to be** – Viņa vairs nav tā, **kas viņa bija**.
- 7) an adverbial: He is **away** – Viņš ir **prom**.

The authors of "A Universal Grammar of English" maintain that "the only copula that allows adverbial complementation is **be**" with a- adverbs: **aboard, abroad, around, away** (Quirk 1982:129, 308). Otherwise adverbials in this position are termed predicative adjuncts of place and time (Quirk 1982:308): They are **outside** – Viņi ir **ārā**. The meeting will be **at 4 o'clock** – Sanāksme būs **četros**.

For the most part, the intensive verbs both in English and Latvian are complemented either by an adjective or by a noun (an adjective phrase or a noun phrase).

6. VERB PHRASES CONTAINING COMPLEX TRANSITIVE VERBS AS THEIR HEADS

Complex transitive verbs combine monotransitive complementation with intensive complementation because they are complemented by a noun (noun phrase) or some other element functioning as a direct object and by an adjective (adjective phrase), a noun (noun phrase) or some other element functioning as a predicative (Burton-Roberts 1994:81): They painted **the door white** – Viņi nokrāsoja **durvis baltas**. In these two sentences the direct object the **door (durvis)** is realized by a noun phrase (in Latvian by a single noun) and the predicative **white (baltas)** by an adjective.

Since the predicative in sentences of this type characterizes the direct object, it is differentiated from the subject-complement and is therefore

labelled by the term object-predicative. However, the nature of syntactic relationship in both cases is the same, viz. predicative. This assertion can be proved by transformations: They painted **the door white** – They painted **the door** and it **became white**. Viņi nokrāsoja **durvis baltas** – Viņi nokrāsoja **durvis**, un tās **kļuva baltas**.

Sentences with subject-complementation and object-complementation sometimes look very much alike and therefore they can be easily confused. For example, They named **the baby Richard** (object complementation) vs Jill has made Jack **an excellent wife** (subject complementation) (Hornby 1977:74). The difference is that in the former sentence the direct object **the baby** and its complement **Richard** have one and the same referent (**the baby = Richard**), whereas in the latter sentence the indirect object **Jack** and the subject-predicative **an excellent wife** denote two different persons. This can be explicitly shown by the following rephrasing [Jill has made **Jack an excellent wife**. → Jill has been **an excellent wife for Jack**] (Hornby 1977:75).

Structures with an object-predicative can also be confused with the direct object realized by a non-finite clause with a subject: I knew **it to be nonsense**. vs She wrenched **it free** (Kobrina 1965:33 – 34). The first sentence can be transformed into a complex sentence with an object clause: I knew **that it was nonsense**. Hence the structure **it to be nonsense** is a direct object. The second sentence is equal to two coordinate clauses: **She wrenched it** and **it became free**. In its turn, it signifies that the adjective **free** functions as object-predicative of the direct object **it**.

The sentences given at the beginning of this section testify that the object-predicative also exists in Modern Latvian. Unfortunately, it has not been explored as yet. Anyhow, no information is to be found in the Academic Grammar of the Latvian Language and in other grammar books available. As a result, its analysis in this book is somewhat fragmentary. Yet, some possible instances of its usage will be presented in comparison with their counterparts in English.

The object-predicative is used after some verbs denoting social activities. Their more or less complete list is offered in R. A. Close's book "A Reference Grammar for Students of English" (Close 1979:79). Generally, they include the following items: **appoint, baptise, call, choose, christen, crown, declare, elect, find, make, name, nickname, nominate, proclaim, pronounce, prove, vote**.

The object-predicative is commonly realized by:

- 1) an adjective (adjective phrase) or participle: They left the door **open** – Viņi atstāja durvis **atvērtas**.

- 2) a noun (noun phrase) or pronoun: The team have voted me **their new captain** (Hornby 1977:74). There seems to be no counterpart in Latvian.
- 3) a prepositional phrase: They declared the decision **of no importance**. Sanāksmes dalībnieki ievēlēja viņu **par priekšsēdētāju**.
- 4) an adverb: They left him **alone**.
- 5) a clause: It is he who made the group **what it is** – Tieši viņš izveidoja grupu tādu, **kāda tā ir**.

Occasionally, the complex transitive verbs take a direct object followed by an obligatory adverbial. It occurs after verbs of motion: **put, place, lay** (Frank 1993:46). In Modern English these verbs are considered to be complex transitive (Quirk 1982:155). For example, I put **the plate on the table**. Es uzliku **šķīvi uz galda**. In Latvian an adverbial after the verbs **likt, novietot** is also obligatory, because otherwise the meaning of the sentences would be incomplete.

7. VERB PHRASES CONTAINING PREPOSITIONAL VERBS AS THEIR HEADS

Prepositional verbs are defined as verbal elements “consisting of a lexical verb plus a preposition” (Chalker 1994:312). The preposition generally comes before its object: She looked **at** her friend – Viņa paskatījās **uz** savu draudzeni.

Constructions on the pattern “verb + preposition + noun (noun phrase) or pronoun” are very common in Modern English and Latvian. According to the usage of preposition the verbs under consideration are divided into two kinds:

- 1) those taking a set of different prepositions: e.g. **go to (into, along, about over) – iet uz (pa, gar, caur)**;
- 2) those taking a fixed preposition: **depend on – atkarāties no, rely on – paļauties uz**.

The second type is designated by the term “prepositional verbs” (Close 1979:26, Quirk 1982:304). They always require a complement.

Constructions with prepositional verbs can be analysed in two different ways. For instance, the authors of “A University Grammar of English” write that in the sentence **He looked at the girl** the phrase **looked at the girl** can be understood as consisting of an intransitive verb (**looked**) and a prepositional phrase (**at the girl**) which functions as adverbial, or as comprising a transitive verb (**looked at**) and a noun phrase (**the girl**) as its

direct object (Quirk 1982:305).

A similar view is voiced in V. V. Burlakova's book "Syntactic Structures of Modern English". Since a preposition is always used after the verbs under study, and, consequently, they formally differ from monotransitive verbs, she like some other linguists, calls them "indirectly transitive verbs" (Бурлакова 1984:44 – 45).

It is true that prepositional verbs have some peculiarities that make them similar to transitive verbs. First, sentences in which they occur can be passivized: cf. **He took the book – The book was taken. He looked at the girl – The girl was looked at.** Secondly, prepositional verbs allow pronominal questions with **who(m)** and **what**. For example: They called on their neighbour – **Who(m) did they call on?**, but not ***Where did they call?** It depends on the circumstances – **What does it depend on?**, but not ***Where (when) does it depend?**

At the same time, the prepositional verbs have some properties which make them different from the transitive verbs. First, they allow adverbs to be placed between them and a prepositional phrase: They looked **angrily** at the children. Transitive verbs, as a rule, do not permit this operation: ***They watched angrily** the children (Quirk 1982:306). Secondly, monotransitive verbs require a direct object which may be realized by a noun (noun phrase), a finite or non-finite clause. Prepositional verbs do not admit a finite direct object that-clause or an infinitive clause as direct object: e.g. They approved **of the meeting**, but not ***They approved of that the meeting should take place**, or ***They approved of the meeting to take place** (Quirk 1982:312).

Taking into account all these restrictions, some linguists have arrived at another decision, viz. they regard prepositional verbs as lexical items which are followed by a prepositional complement (Burton-Roberts 1994:82). This decision seems quite reasonable since the verbs under discussion are used with prepositions and, as was stated above, in some parameters they differ from monotransitive verbs.

Confusion can also arise in reference to phrasal verbs, which constitute a separate category, though occasionally they may seem very similar to prepositional verbs. However, they are different at least in four respects:

- 1) the adverb in phrasal verbs is normally stressed, whereas prepositions are not: The girl called up the street. vs The girl called 'up (telephoned) her friend.
- 2) the preposition comes before the object, though the adverb in a phrasal verb may follow its object: The girl called **up** the road. vs The girl called her **up**.

- 3) an adverb can be placed between the prepositional verb and the preposition: The girl called **loudly** up the street, but not between the constituents of a phrasal verb: *The girl called **suddenly** up her friend.
- 4) the prepositional verb takes a relative pronoun after the preposition: The man **on whom** they called, but not *The man **up whom** they called in a sentence with a phrasal verb (Quirk 1982:305).

Lists of prepositional verbs are presented in several books (Quirk 1982:305, Leech 1983:244, Бурлакова 1984:70). Generally, they include: **add to, allow for, ask for, amount to, approve of, attend to, believe in, belong to, care for, conform to, consent to, deal with, depend on, insist on, laugh at, live on, long for, look at, look for, part with, refer to, resort to, shout for, smile at, succeed in.**

Some phrasal verbs are also used with fixed prepositions, therefore, they acquire the status of phrasal prepositional verbs. They are: **back out of, catch up on, catch up with, drop in on, face up to, get down to, look down on, make away with, stand up for** (Leech 1983:245).

In grammar books of the Latvian language no distinction is made between verbs followed by prepositions and prepositional verbs proper. Yet, this distinction does exist because there are verbs which are used with fixed prepositions: **atkarāties no, darboties ar, ilgoties pēc, ķerties pie, paļauties uz, rūpēties par, skatīties uz, šķirties no**, etc. Their thorough analysis in all their syntactic environment is still to be made.

It was already pointed out that the verbs discussed in this section take prepositional complements which are realized by prepositional phrases: I rely **on you** – Es **uz tevi** paļaujos. In Latvian a prepositional phrase may be placed before the verb if it contains a personal pronoun. If a phrase includes a noun, it is generally placed after the noun: cf. I rely **on you** – Es **uz tevi** paļaujos. vs I rely **on this man** – Es paļaujos **uz šo cilvēku**.

In Modern English and Latvian there are a few verbs which admit two prepositional phrases: **agree with somebody on something, depend on somebody (something) for something, hear about something from somebody, speak / talk with somebody about something – vienoties ar kaut ko par kaut ko, atkarāties no kaut kā par kaut ko, runāt ar kaut ko par kaut ko.**

Prepositional verbs are frequently modified by adverbials realized by prepositional phrases, noun phrases, or adverbs both in English and Latvian: She looked at me **in a friendly way** – Viņa **draudzīgi** paskatījās uz mani. We agreed with him on all the points **in all their particulars** – Mēs ar viņu saskaņojām visus punktus **visos sīkumos**.

CHAPTER III

THE ADVERB PHRASE

1. THE ADVERB, ITS SUBCATEGORIZATION AND COMBINABILITY

The adverb belongs to the four major word classes which include the noun, the verb, the adjective and the adverb. Taking into account semantic, structural and functional characteristics and their relative importance the adverb can be and actually is defined in different ways.

In the majority of the traditionally-oriented grammar books the adverb is comprehended as “a part of speech which includes words qualifying an action or a quality, or expressing various circumstances in which an action occurs” (Ganshina 1964:298). Approximately the same sense is expressed in the definition presented in the book “An English Grammar. Morphology” (Kobrina 1985:269): “The adverb is a word denoting circumstances or characteristics which attend or modify an action, state, or quality.” A shorter version of the semantic definition is offered by T. A. Barabash who understands the adverb as “a part of speech specifying actions and qualities” (Barabash 1975:37).

Thus, the authors of the quoted books have proceeded from the semantic factors in defining the adverb.

A different approach is manifest in the definition: the adverb is “a word that usually modifies or qualifies a verb, an adjective, or another adverb” (Chalker 1994:13). In this case syntactic features, i.e. adverb combinability, come to the fore.

To give a more representative and exhaustive definition of the adverb it seems reasonable to take into consideration not one, but all the major factors that characterize this word class. Consequently, the adverb could be defined as a part of speech which modifies a verb, an adjective, or another adverb and specifies actions and qualities.

In English grammatical tradition there is another term “adverbial” which is related to the term “adverb”. The adverbial is understood as “any word, phrase, or clause used like an adverb (including the simple adverb alone)” (Chalker 1994:14). The adverbials may be expressed by adverbs proper: He did it **carefully**; by noun phrases: They met **last week**; by prepositional phrases: They lived **in a little town**; by clauses, finite or

non-finite: They grew happier **when their friends came**. **Looking through the book**, she came across a very interesting sentence (Quirk 1982:25).

R. Huddleston holds the view that “the major kind of expression which can function like an adverb is a prepositional phrase” (Huddleston 1991:123). This is due to the fact that adverbs can usually be matched with prepositional phrases that have the same function and essentially the same meaning: **carefully = with care, in a careful way; soon = in a short while; usually = on most occasions**.

In this book adverbials will not be discussed any further. Attention will be focused only on those items which are understood as adverbs proper.

Grammarians analysing adverbs usually point out that they include “the most disparate elements” (Frank 1993:141). Their heterogeneity is manifested in the areas of meaning, function and form. In meaning they range from those lexical items that have a clearly expressed semantic content to those that are used merely for emphasis (**here, yesterday vs. merely, simply**). In function they range from close modifiers of single words to loose modifiers of sentences (**partially** recovered vs. **Fortunately**, no one was injured). In form they range from clearly marked adverbs to those that formally coincide with other parts of speech (**often, seldom vs. late, down, on**).

For this reason the distinction between adverbs and some other parts of speech is not always clearcut. It also causes considerable difficulties in subcategorizing adverbs.

There are various parameters according to which adverbs can be classified. The most important ones are again meaning, function and form.

Proceeding from meaning the adverbs are traditionally classified into two major groups: qualifying adverbs and circumstantial adverbs (Ganshina 1964:298 – 299). Qualifying adverbs are further subcategorized into adverbs of manner: **slowly – lēnām, badly – slikti, fast – ātri**; intensifying adverbs (quantifiers and emphasizees): **terribly – briesmīgi, awfully – šausmīgi, especially – īpaši, merely – tikai**.

Adverbs denoting various circumstances fall into: adverbs of time and duration: **always – vienmēr, recently – nesen, soon – drīz, already – jau**; adverbs of place and direction: **here – šeit, outside – ārā, straight – taisni**; adverbs of frequency: **seldom – reti, often – bieži, usually – parasti**; adverbs of cause and purpose: **why – kāpēc, therefore – tāpēc**.

According to function adverbs are divided into sentence adverbs: **presumably – iespējams, decidedly – neapšaubāmi**; conjunctive adverbs: **however – tomēr, accordingly – atbilstoši**; relative and interrogative

adverbs: **when – kad, where – kur, why – kāpēc, how – cik**; explanatory adverbs: **namely – proti**; exclamatory adverbs: **how – cik. How beautiful she is! – Cik viņa ir skaista!**

In respect of form adverbs are represented by two groups: lexical adverbs having their own roots or formed from other roots: **never – nekad, always – vienmēr, well – labi, highly – augsti, courageously – varonīgi**; pronominal adverbs formed from the roots of pronouns: **then – tad, when – kad, there – tur, so – tā, why – kāpēc** (Barabash 1975:37).

Like other word classes the adverb can combine with other lexical units and form adverb phrases. Its combinability potential depends on its valency or, in other words, on “the number and kind of syntactic connections with other units it can form” (Chalker 1993:413).

As could be anticipated, the valency properties of different types of adverbs are not the same. First of all this is manifested in the fact that there are a great number of adverbs which resist both pre- and postmodification (Aarts 1988:69). They are: adverbs of place: **ashore, indoors, underfoot**; adverbs of time: **afterwards, formerly, nowadays**; interrogative adverbs: **how, when, whence**; intensifying adverbs and adverbs of degree: **enough, greatly, hardly, utterly**; conjunctive adverbs: **again, also, equally**; some other adverbs: **clockwise, perhaps, reciprocally**.

A similar phenomenon is observed in Modern Latvian, since the above-mentioned types of adverbs also resist modification. Thus, the adverbs **vakar, patlaban, tur, turp, kā, kad, ļoti, ārā, laikam**, etc. are actually always used without any modifiers.

Certainly, there are some exceptions, because sometimes adverbs of time and place occur with modification: **shortly afterwards – nedaudz vēlāk, exactly here – tieši šeit**.

The majority of adverbs which are either pre- or postmodified are qualifying adverbs expressing manner: **cheaply – lēti, quickly – ātri, diligently – čakli, distinctly – skaidri**. For instance, **extremely cheaply – ārkārtīgi lēti, quite distinctly – pavisam skaidri, well enough – pietiekami labi**.

Qualifying adverbs under discussion can be modified since they name qualities that are gradable: **distinctly – more distinctly – most distinctly** and therefore quite often they are specified by words which show the degree of the qualities expressed.

If the adverbs are not gradable, they naturally resist any modification and, as it was stated above, occur as simple adverbs alone in the structure of the sentence.

A more detailed description of the structure of adverb phrases will be presented in the next section.

2. THE STRUCTURE OF ADVERB PHRASES

The adverb phrase is a phrase containing an adverb as head: **very late** – **ļoti vēlu**, **exceedingly beautifully** – **ārkārtīgi skaisti**. The head adverbs **late** (**vēlu**) and **beautifully** (**skaisti**) are premodified by intensifiers **very** (**ļoti**) and **exceedingly** (**ārkārtīgi**).

In English grammar the adverb phrase is also understood as a syntactic unit functioning as an adverbial. It does not matter whether it contains an adverb or not: We'll be with you **in a moment**. They arrived **last night** (Chalker 1993:15).

In this book are analysed the phrases of the first type, i.e. only those phrases which contain an adverb as head. They are studied in terms of complementation and modification of their head-words.

Before discussing concrete instances it is to be noted that adverbs take a more limited range of dependent elements than do the adjectives from which the corresponding adverbs are derived. Thus, we can say **very eager** and **very eagerly**. Both the phrases are grammatically correct. It is also right to say **eager to please us**, whereas the structure ***eagerly to please us** is no longer grammatical (Huddleston 1991:14).

Complementation is not a prototypical adverbial function and therefore very few adverbs take complements which are always expressed by prepositional phrases: independently **of her efforts** (Huddleston 1991:121) – neatkarīgi **no viņas pūlēm**.

Complementation seems to be more current in Modern Latvian: līdzīgi **bērnām**, lejup **pa upi**, tuvu **pie mājām** (Müsd. latv. lit. val. gram. 1962:107). This peculiarity is accounted for by several facts. First, complements can be expressed by single nouns: līdzīgi **bērnām**. Secondly, prepositions in English may have adverbs as their counterparts in Latvian: **down** the river – **lejup** pa upi, **near** the house – **tuvu** pie mājām. As a result, adverbs take complements and thus form adverb phrases.

Since modification is a prototypical adverbial function, it occurs in adverb phrases much more frequently than complementation.

Adverbial premodifiers are usually represented by intensifiers both in Modern English and Latvian. The most frequently used intensifiers are: **very**, **so**, **pretty**, **rather**, **unusually**, **quite**, **unbelievably** (Quirk 1982:119)

and some others. Examples: **very** fluently – **Ķoti** tekoši, **quite** well – **pavisam** labi, **rather** late – **diezgan** vēlu.

The intensifier **very** is used to premodify the adverb in the positive degree: **very** nicely – **Ķoti** jauki, **very** quickly – **Ķoti** ātri. **Much** is used to premodify adverbs in the comparative degree: **much** better – **daudz** labāk, **much** slower – **daudz** lēnāk. **Much** may be further intensified by **very**, or, as M. Frank points out, by **ever so** or **so very**: He works **very (or ever so, so very) much** more rapidly than the other employees (Frank 1993:158).

This kind of usage is not typical of the Latvian language. The sentence ***Viņš strādā Ķoti daudz ātrāk nekā citi ierēdņi** would sound very strange indeed.

In Modern English the head adverb can also be premodified by the intensifying phrase **by far**: He works **by far the hardest** of anyone in his office (Frank 1993:158). In this case the premodified adverb is used in the superlative degree.

Sometimes the head adverbs are premodified by several coordinated intensifiers: He turns up **exceedingly and suspiciously often** (Aarts 1988:69) – Viņš parādās **ārkārtīgi un aizdomīgi bieži**. The use of two or more intensifiers enhances the emphatic value of the adverb phrase.

The only postmodifying adverb in Modern English is **enough**: cleverly **enough**, correctly **enough**. Its counterpart **pietiekami** is always used as a premodifier in Latvian: **pietiekami** gudri, **pietiekami** pareizi.

The other adverbial postmodifiers are generally expressed by comparative phrases or clauses both in English and Latvian: We were driving faster **than 80 k. p. h.** – Mēs braucām ātrāk **nekā 80 km stundā**. We were driving slower **than we wished** – Mēs braucām lēnāk **nekā mēs vēlējamies**.

There are no adverb phrases in which the head is simultaneously premodified and postmodified. However, there are structures in which the adverb head has some elements before it and after it. Since there is always a close semantic interdependence between these elements, then it is better to look upon the two constituents “as instances of discontinuous modification” (Aarts 1988:69). For example, The problem was discussed **too broadly to provide any real insight** – Problēmu diskutēja **tik plaši, ka nebija iespējams gūt nekādu reālu priekšstatu par to**.

F. Aarts and J. Aarts distinguish four patterns of discontinuous modification in adverb phrases (Aarts 1988:123 – 124):

1. **so + adverb + that-clause** or **as-clause**.

They worked **so hard that they finished before five**. – Viņi strādāja **tik centīgi, ka pabeidza savu darbu līdz pieciem**. He spoke **so eloquently as**

to convince everyone – Viņš runāja **tik** izteiksmīgi, **ka** ikvienu pārliecināja.

2. **as + adverb + (reduced) comparative clause or noun phrase.**

My dog runs **as** fast **as** yours. – Mans suns skrien **tikpat** ātri **kā** tavējais.

3. **more / less + adverb + than (reduced) comparative clause or noun phrase.**

The boy participates **much more** actively **than we expected**. – Zēni piedalās **daudz** aktīvāk **nekā** mēs gaidījām.

4. **too + adverb + infinitive clause.**

The boy was running **too** fast **for the policeman to overtake him**. – Zēns skrēja **par daudz** ātri, **lai viņu panāktu policists**.

The translation of the sentences shows that in all four cases discontinuous modification is also used in the Latvian language. The only difference is that instead of infinitive clauses Modern Latvian makes use of finite clauses (patterns 1 and 4).

In Modern English there is a clearcut distinction between adverbs that function only on phrase level or only on sentence or clause level (Aarts 1988:70 – 71). As has already been mentioned, most of the intensifying adverbs can only function as premodifiers in adverb phrases. The adverbs that function on sentence or clause level are conjuncts (the connecting link between the sentences): **However**, he did not do it; disjuncts (comment words): **Frankly**, I didn't like it.

There are a few adverbs that can function on both phrase and sentence level. Usually there is a clear differentiation of meaning between the two usages. Compare, for example, **Quite incredibly**, he possesses a large fortune. He possesses a **quite incredibly** large fortune (Aarts 1988:71).

Since the subject-matter of this book is concerned only with adverb phrases on phrase level, the usage of adverbs on sentence or clause level will not be further discussed here.

CHAPTER IV

THE PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE

The prepositional phrase is understood as a structure consisting of a preposition and its complement. It is “a formal class rather than a functional one” (Chalker 1994:312): e.g. **at the table – pie galda, near them – blakus viņiem.**

Neither constituent of a prepositional phrase can be omitted. The presence of the preposition depends on its complement and the complement depends on the presence of the preposition. Thus, there is a mutual dependence between the two constituents. In the phrases given above the preposition **at (pie)** requires the presence of the noun phrase **the table (galda)** to complete its meaning, whereas the preposition itself is described as the governor of the noun phrase (**table – galda**) (Burton-Roberts 1994:41). In general, in a relationship of complementation the governor is always the first element.

A prepositional phrase is not to be confused with a preposition group which is a structure consisting of a preposition with its modification: **immediately after, right in front of** (Chalker 1994:312). A preposition group functions like a preposition: **immediately after dinner – uzreiz pēc pusdienām, right behind the house – tieši aiz mājas.**

A prepositional phrase can also be modified by a noun phrase (Aarts 1988:126): **some time after the war – kādu laiku pēc kara, a kilometre from the village – kilometru no ciema.**

Prepositional phrases function mainly as complements and adjuncts (postmodifiers or adverbials) in various types of phrases, viz. noun phrases, adjective phrases, verb phrases, adverb phrases and rarely in prepositional phrases.

In noun phrases prepositional phrases can function both as complements or postmodifiers (adjuncts). For example, in the phrase **a student of Physics with long hair** (Radford 1992:176) the prepositional phrase **of Physics** specifies what the student is studying and therefore it complements the noun phrase **a student**. The noun phrase **with long hair** gives additional information about the student. Hence it postmodifies the noun phrase **a student**.

Much the same is characteristic of Modern Latvian. So, in the phrase **their struggle for independence a few years ago – viņu cīņa par neatkarību pirms dažiem gadiem** the prepositional phrase **par neatkarību** complements

the noun phrase **viņu cīņa**, but the prepositional phrase **pirms vairākiem gadiem** modifies the same noun phrase.

Complements are always closer to the head noun than adjuncts (postmodifiers) (Radford 1992:177): **the student of Physics with long hair**, but not ***The student with long hair of Physics** or **viņu cīņa par neatkarību pirms vairākiem gadiem**, but not ***viņu cīņa pirms vairākiem gadiem par neatkarību**.

On the whole, the distinction between complements and modifiers in noun phrases is not clearly defined because “there are no clear cases of nouns that require a complement” (Huddleston 1991:93). In this respect R. Huddleston points out that “complements depend for their occurrence on the presence of a noun head of the appropriate class” (Huddleston 1991:93 – 94). The distinction between a complement and a modifier is clearly evident in the pair: **his reliance on the premier** (complement) vs **the book on the table** (modifier). The noun **reliance** takes the complement **on the premier** with the preposition **on** which is specially recorded in its lexical entry in a dictionary, whereas the preposition **on** in the modifier **on the table** can be replaced by any other preposition of place (Huddleston 1991:94).

It is interesting to note that the most central types of complement in verb phrases are commonly realized by noun phrases: He wrote **the story**. In corresponding noun phrases the complement is usually realized by a prepositional phrase: the writer **of the story**.

In adjective phrases prepositional phrases also function either as complements or adjuncts (postmodifiers): He has been hostile **to us** (complement) **since September** (adjunct) – Viņš ir naidīgs **pret mums** (complement) **kopš septembra** (adjunct).

The same is true in reference to verb phrases in which prepositional phrases complement ditransitive, intensive and prepositional verbs or modify all types of verbs: We rely **on them** (complement) – Mēs paļaujamies **uz viņiem** (complement). Some sheets of paper were scattered **on the floor** (adjunct) – Dažas papīra lapas bija izkaisītas **uz grīdas** (adjunct).

Adverb phrases take complements rarely: independently **of her efforts** – neatkarīgi **no viņas pūlēm**. They can take adverbials realized by prepositional phrases: yesterday **in the morning** – vakar **no rīta**.

Prepositional phrases may complement prepositions, but such structures occur very rarely: from **under the table**, from **behind the clouds**. There seem to be no counterparts in Latvian.

Further information on the usage of prepositional structures in verb, adjective and adverb phrases can be found in the previous sections of this book.

The analysis of some phrases is controversial. They can be analysed either as prepositional phrases modified by an adverb or as adverb phrases with a prepositional phrase in postmodification (Aarts 1988:126). Thus, in the phrase **up at the farm 'up'** may be regarded as an adverb modifier of the prepositional phrase **at the farm** or it may be looked upon as the head adverb with its postmodifier realized by the prepositional phrase **at the farm**.

Other examples of the same type: **back in the spring, down by the river, up in the mountains**.

CONCLUSION

The structure of phrases depends not only on the lexical categories of their head words, but also on the subcategorization of these words.

Adjectives are generally divided into gradable and non-gradable. All adjectives, gradable and non-gradable, that occur in predicative position can be complemented by a prepositional phrase, an infinitive clause, a gerund clause and a finite clause. Prepositional phrases and finite clauses are a common phenomenon both in English and Latvian. However, gerund clauses occur only in English. The use of infinitive clauses as adjective complements is somewhat restricted in Latvian, though they are used very often in English.

Gradable adjectives in the English language can be premodified and rarely postmodified. They are premodified by intensifiers, adjectives and nouns. In Latvian gradable adjectives are generally premodified by intensifiers and other adverbs, but not by adjectives or nouns.

Adjective phrases with simultaneous premodification and complementation exist both in English and Latvian.

In the majority of cases non-gradable adjectives need no modifiers because semantically they are self-sufficient and do not require any specification or particularization.

Besides general semantic or grammatical factors, there are some functional peculiarities which determine the ability of adjectives to form adjective phrases. With respect to these peculiarities adjectives in English and Latvian are subcategorized into three groups: 1) those occurring attributively and predicatively; 2) those occurring only attributively; 3) those occurring only predicatively. The adjectives which occur both attributively and predicatively generate phrases in accord with common phrase structure rules, i.e. they can be either modified or complemented. The attributive adjectives are seldom premodified by adverbs, for the most part they are used singly. The adjectives that are restricted to predicative position take only complements.

Being the central wordclass, the verb admits various types of subcategorization. One of them is based on their ability to take complements. In this respect verbs are divided into six subclasses: monotransitive, intransitive, ditransitive, intensive, complex transitive and prepositional. This scheme is valid both for English and Latvian.

The complementation of monotransitive verbs is mostly realized by noun phrases, finite clauses and non-finite clauses. Non-finite complements fall under two distinct subgroups: those with subject and those without

subject. In English both types occur frequently, whereas in Latvian the use of the first type is restricted to the verbs denoting sense perception.

The usage of intransitive verbs which take no object complements is a common practice both in English and Latvian. They can be modified by various adjuncts.

Object complements realized by prepositional phrases after ditransitive verbs in Modern English have no exact parallels in Modern Latvian because no prepositions are used and their place is not strictly determined in the structure of the sentence.

The category of intensive verbs is highly developed in Modern English. In Modern Latvian their scope is much more limited. First, fewer lexical items are available for the linking functions and, secondly, instead of English copulas, regular lexical verbs derived on the pattern "a prefix + a verb" are often used.

Complex transitive and prepositional verbs exist in Latvian, though their syntactic environment has not been sufficiently explored as yet.

All types of verbs can be modified by adverbs, noun phrases and prepositional phrases in both the languages.

Adverbs take a more limited range of dependent elements than do the adjectives. Complementation is not a prototypical adverbial function, therefore, very few adverbs take complements realized by a prepositional phrase. In general, complements seem to be more current in Modern Latvian because rather often adverb phrases with prepositional complements may correspond to English prepositional phrases.

There are a great number of adverbs (both in English and Latvian) that resist complementation and modification. These are adverbs of place, time, degree as well as intensifying, interrogative and conjunctive adverbs.

Since modification is a prototypical adverbial function, it occurs in adverb phrases much more frequently than complementation. Adverbial premodifiers are usually represented by intensifiers in both the languages. Adverbial postmodifiers are commonly realized by comparative phrases and finite clauses. Adverb phrases can also include discontinuous modification.

Prepositional phrases consist of a preposition and its complement. The complements are generally realized by noun phrases or pronouns. In the sentence structure they function as prepositional complements or adjuncts. Prepositional phrases are characterized by a very high frequency rate of occurrence not only in English, but also in Latvian.

REFERENCES

1. Aarts, F. Aarts, J. (1988) *English Syntactic Structures*. New York, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo, Singapore: Prentice Hall and Martinus; Leyden, Antwerp: Martinus Nijhoff.
2. Barabash, T. A. (1975) *A Guide to Better Grammar*. Moscow: Foreign Relations.
3. Bloch, M. Y. (1994) *A Course in Theoretical English Grammar*. Moscow: Vysšaja Škola.
4. Bolinger, D. (1967) *Adjectives in English: Attribution and Predication*, *Lingua* 18, 1 – 34.
5. Burton-Roberts, N. (1994) *Analysing Sentences. An Introduction to English Syntax*. London and New York: Longman.
6. Chalker, S. Weiner, E. (1994) *The Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. London: BCA.
7. Celce-Murcia, M. Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983) *The Grammar Book. An ESL / EFL Teacher's Course*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
8. Close, R. A. (1979) *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
9. Frank, M. (1993) *Modern English. A Practical Reference Guide. Second Edition*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Regents / Prentice Hall.
10. Freidenfelds, I. Jankevics, A. Kārklīņš, J. Laua, A. Martinsone, I. Soida, A. (1962) *Latviešu valodas mācība*. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība.
11. Ganshina, M. A. Vasilevskaya, N. M. (1964) *English Grammar*. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House.
12. Gordon, E. M. Krilova, I. P. (1980) *A Grammar of Present-Day English*. Moscow: Vysšaja Škola.
13. Hornby, A. S. (1977) *Guide to Patterns and Usage in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
14. Huddleston, R. (1991) *English Grammar: An Outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Khaimovich, B. S. Rogovskaya, B. I. (1967) *A Course in English Grammar*. Moscow: Vysšaja Škola.

16. Kobrina, N. A. Korneyeva, E. A. (1965) *An Outline of Modern English Syntax*. Moscow: Higher School Publishing House.
17. Kobrina, N. A. Korneyeva, E. A. Ossovskaya, M. I. Guzeyeva, K. A. (1985) *An English Grammar. Morphology*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
18. Kobrina, N. A. Korneyeva, E. A. Ossovskaya, M. I. Guzeyeva, K. A. (1986) *An English Grammar. Syntax*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
19. Leech, G. Svartvik, J. (1983) *A Communicative Grammar of English*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye.
20. *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca*. (1987) Rīga: Avots.
21. *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika. I. Fonētika un morfoloģija*. (1959) Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.
22. *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika. II. Sintakse*. (1962) Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas izdevniecība.
23. Quirk, R. Greenbaum, S. Leech, G. Svartvik, J. (1982) *A University Grammar of English*. Moscow: Vysšaja Škola.
24. Radford, A. (1992) *Transformational Grammar. A First Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
25. Rayevska, N. M. (1976) *Modern English Grammar*. Kiev: Vyšča Škola.
26. Бурлакова, В. В. (1984) *Синтаксические структуры современного английского языка*. Москва: Просвещение.
27. Жигadlo, В. Н. Иванова, И. П. Иофик, Л. Л. (1956) *Современный английский язык*. Москва: Изд. лит. на иностр. языках.
28. Иванова, И. П. Бурлакова, В. В. Почепцов, Г. Г. (1981) *Теоретическая грамматика современного английского языка*. Москва: Высшая школа.

H. MARŠAVS
**PHRASE STRUCTURE IN
MODERN ENGLISH AND LATVIAN**

Datorsalikums. Parakstīts iespiešanai 30.11.98.
Izdevējdarbības reģistr. apliec. Nr. 2-0197.
Formāts 60x90/16; 3,8 iespiedl., 2,7 izdevn. l.
Pasūtījuma Nr. 94. Metiens 80 eks.
Iespēsts DPU izdevniecībā «Saule» —
Saules ielā 1/3, Daugavpils, Latvija, LV-5400, 1998. g.