The Grammar of English and Telugu

(with reference to the English word of and its Telugu correspondences)

The aim of this chapter is to give an introduction to the English grammar related to the word of, and the corresponding Telugu grammar. Some general issues related to the prepositions, which ever thought needed, are also discussed in this chapter.

Though the study is based on description, some generalization is needed. Attempting to describe a language without having a theory of grammar is difficult because most of the languages are so big, in terms of usage, to be described. For example, Telugu or English sentences can be constructed as long as one needs to express some meaning. The number of sentences that have been spoken and written so far is vast, new ones are being produced every day around the world. The current aim of this study is to understand the grammar of of in English and come up with certain generalizations that would enable us to render English of constructions mechanically into acceptable Telugu equivalents.

Thus, as part of this exercise, the grammar of English of constructions and its Telugu corresponding phenomena have been discussed in the following sections.


2.1. Case in English:
It is necessary to discuss ‘case’ because in many instances there is a functional similarity between a noun in the genitive case and the same noun as head of a prepositional phrase with of.
The term case applies in the first instance to a system of inflectional forms of a noun that serve to mark the function of an NP related to the construction containing it.

i. I slept soundly. (the pronoun I functions as the subject of the clause and is in the nominative case.)

ii. Please help me. (me is the object of the clause and is in the accusative case)

iii. Where is my bag? (my is subj-det of NP and is in the genitive case)

At the general level, the nominative is a case whose primary function is to mark the subject of an intransitive or a transitive clause, while the accusative is a case whose primary function is to mark the direct object of a transitive clause. The genitive is somewhat different in that its primary function is to mark an NP as a dependent in the structure of a larger NP.

In the present day English, the morphological contrast between nominative and accusative is found with only a handful of pronouns. At the former stages of the language the contrast applied to the whole class of nouns but the inflectional distinction has been lost except for these few pronouns in the modern English.

i. The doctor slept soundly. (subject, plain case)

ii. Please help the doctor. (object, plain case)

iii. the doctor’s bag (subj-det on NP, genitive)

According to the traditional grammar, ‘doctor’ is nominative in i. and accusative in ii. but in fact there is no inflectional distinction between these two occurrences of the noun ‘doctor’. The difference in function is not marked by any difference in the internal form of the NP. In other words, there is no contrast of case here. Case is only one among a variety of possible markers of syntactic function, and as far as the present-day English is concerned the linear position of an NP relative to the verb plays a larger role in the marking of syntactic function than does inflectional case.
The earlier case system of English distinguished (morphologically) not only nominative, accusative, and genitive, but also dative. The loss of inflectional endings has resulted as dropping the morphological case out of the system altogether from the language. To an extent, it is not even retained in the personal pronouns.

i. We took him to the zoo. (direct object, accusative case)

ii. We showed him the animals. (indirect object, accusative case)

Although case is prototypically marked inflectionally a change in or addition to the form of a word which shows a change in the way it is used in sentences. Syntax tells us when a lexeme may or must carry a certain inflectional property, while inflectional morphology tells us what form it takes when it carries that inflectional property. For example, a rule of syntax stipulates that a verb in construction with the perfect auxiliary ‘have’ must carry the past participle inflection as in ‘They have killed it, She had rung the bell, while inflectional morphology describes how the past participles of verbs are formed from the lexical base: ‘killed’ is formed from the base ‘kill’ by adding the suffix –ed, ‘rung’ from ‘ring’ by changing the vowel, and so on), there are languages where case is marked analytically, by special grammaticised words. Japanese is a language of this type, with subject, direct object, and indirect object marked by distinct postpositions.

Genitive case: the form of a noun, pronoun, etc. in the grammar of some languages, which shows that the noun, pronoun, etc. possesses something.

English nouns have a two-case system: the unmarked common case (boy) and the marked genitive case (boy’s). Since the functions of the common case can be seen only in the syntactic relations of the noun phrase (subject, object, etc), it is the functions of the genitive that need separate scrutiny. In many instances there is a functional similarity between a noun in the genitive case and the same noun as head of a prepositional phrase with of.

Ex. What is the ship’s name?

What is the name of the ship?
Following are some of the examples where prepositional phrases represent genitive case.

**possessive genitive:** the gravity of the earth – the earth has gravity

\( \text{bhumyakarasana/bhumi akarsana} \)

my knowledge of Hindi – I know Hindi

\( nandyinama \)

**subjective genitive:** the rise of the sun – the sun rose

\( \text{suryadipadaudaya/suryodayam} \)

statement of the facts – …stated the facts

\( \text{vastavala prakatan} \)

**genitive of origin/source:** the wines of France – France produced the wines

\( \text{jans vains} \)

**descriptive genitive:** the degree of doctor – a doctoral degree/a doctorate

\( \text{daktaru patta} \)

**genitive of measure and partitive genitive:** an absence of ten days – the absence lasted ten days

\( \text{padirjula gairjaru} \)

the height of the tower – the tower is (of) a certain height

\( \text{tavar ettu} \)

part of the problem – the problem is divisible into parts

\( \text{samsya(loni)bhaga} \)
appositive genitive: the city of York – York is a city
యయర్్ నగరిం (yārk nagaraṁ)

the pleasure of meeting you – meeting you is pleasure
వయయర్్ కలవటింలోని ఆనందం (ninnu kalavaṭamloṇi ānandaṁ)

Some genitive case constructions:

a. Subject-determiner:

‘[Kittu’s father] has arrived’.

In this example ‘Kittu’s’ is a genitive NP functioning as subject-determiner within the matrix NP ‘Kittu’s father’; genitive case marks ‘Kittu’ as standing in a relation of dependence within this matrix NP. ‘Kittu’s father’ itself has plain case and can occur in the full range of NP positions; it is interpreted as definite ‘the father of Kittu’, not ‘a father of Kittu’.

b. Subject of gerund-participial:

‘No one objected to [Kittu’s joining the party].’

In this example the genitive marks the subject of a gerund-participial clause in complement function the clause is object of the preposition ‘to’.

c. Fused subject-determiner-head:

‘Ravi’s attempt wasn’t as good as [Kittu’s].’

‘Kittu’s’ in this example is an instance of the fused-head construction.

d. Oblique genitive:

‘She’s [a friend of Kittu’s].’

Genitive referred as oblique because it is related to the head noun ‘friend’ obliquely, via the preposition of, rather than immediately, as in ‘Kittu’s friend’. In subject-determiner type genitives fill the determiner position where they mark the NP as definite, while the oblique allows the relation between subordinate and matrix NPs to be
expressed while leaving the determiner position free to be filled by other kinds of determiner. Compare,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-head</th>
<th>Post-head: oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. * a Kittu’s friend</td>
<td>a friend of Kittu’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. * those Kittu’s friends</td>
<td>those friends of Kittu’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Kittu’s friend</td>
<td>*the friend of Kittu’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Kittu’s friend that I met in Paris</td>
<td>the friend of Kittu’s that I met in Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. all/both Kittu’s friends</td>
<td>all/both friends of Kittu’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Kittu’s every move</td>
<td>every move of Kittu’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Predicative genitive:

‘All this is Kittu’s.’

The genitive marks the relation between Kittu and the predicate ‘all this’, a relation like that expressible by ‘belong + to’. Kittu’s here is thus not part of same matrix NP.

f. Attributive genitive:

‘He lives in [an old people’s home].’

In ‘an old people’s home’, the genitive is an attributive modifier within a nominal. At the top level of structure we have ‘an’ as determiner and ‘old people’s home’ as head: it is clear that ‘an’ can not belong within the genitive expression, which is here plural. These genitives, moreover, can be preceded by other attributes, as in ‘a luxurious old people’s home’, where ‘luxurious’ modifies ‘old people’s home’.

2.2. Prepositions: nature and distribution

In English, one of the important syntactic categories is a preposition. It has been studied for long time in the field of computational linguistics. It’s said to be a most polysemous word.
General definition:

Cambridge Advanced Learners Dictionary (2003): A word that governs and precedes a noun or pronoun and which expresses the latter’s relation to another word.

The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language (2006): A relatively closed grammatically distinct class of words whose most central members characteristically express spatial relations or serve to mark various syntactic functions and semantic roles.

The most central members have meanings which have to do with relations in space. The situation may be either

static: ‘Kittu is in Mumbai’ or
dynamic: ‘Kittu went to Mumbai’.

2.2.1. Properties of prepositions:

Here we discuss some of the important properties of prepositions.

2.2.1.a. Object or complement of prepositions:

2.2.1.a.i. Prepositions take NP complements.

Within the category of complement one can distinguish between core and non-core complements: characteristically core complements have the form of NPs while non-core ones are realized by PPs.

The only words that take NP complements are verbs and prepositions. This is the one of the properties of the prepositions.

If we compare this property (prepositions take NP complements) with other grammatical categories, we will find that no adverb takes an NP complement, and only four adjectives do:

- worth
- due
- like and
- unlike
2.2.1.a.ii. Prepositions also take complements that are not NPs:

i. The magician emerged from behind the curtain (PP),

ii. I didn’t know about it until recently (AdvP),

iii. We can’t agree on whether we should call in the police (Interrogative Clause – but some say that a word otherwise similar to a preposition but taking a declarative content clause complement is traditionally analysed as a ‘subordinating conjunction’),

iv. They took me for dead (AdjP).

Prepositions allow a wide range of complement types, a rather subset of those licensed by verbs. Most prepositions license an obligatory or optional complements, those that do not are almost wholly restricted to the spatial domain.

2.2.1.b. Prepositional modifiers of the verb:

Elements traditionally regarded as modifying the verb are adjuncts, but prepositions also occur as heads of phrases with this function. Almost every semantic type of adjunct can be realized by a phrase with either an adverb or a preposition as head.

i. She did it carefully/with great care. (manner)

ii. They communicate electronically/by email. (means)

iii. They live locally/in the vicinity. (spatial location)

iv. The prices went up astronomically/by a huge amount. (extent)

v. I haven’t seen her recently/since August. (temporal location)

vi. She’s working with us temporarily/for a short time. (frequency)

vii. They check regularly/at regular intervals. (duration)

viii. I loved her immensely/with all my heart. (degree)

ix. It failed consequently/for this reason. (reason)

2.2.1.c. Head of complement:

The ability of many prepositions to head phrases in complement function is an important property distinguishing them from adverbs. One such case is the goal
complement of certain transitive verbs such as ‘put’ or ‘place’ and a few intransitives such as ‘dart’ and ‘slither’:

i. a. I put it in the drawer. b. *I put it.

ii. a. He darted behind the curtain. b. *He darted.

‘a’ examples here have prototypical PPs consisting of preposition + NP complement. But other forms can be assigned to the PP category on the basis of their ability to occur in this position.

i. a. I put it in/downstairs/away (preposition); *I put it adjacently. (adverb)

ii. a. He darted off/indoors. (preposition); *He darted immediately. (adverb)

Phrases consisting of such words as in, downstairs, away, off, indoors by themselves are distributionally like uncontroversial PPs such as ‘in the drawer’ or ‘behind the curtain’, and are accordingly assigned to the same category. Prototypical adverbs, those formed from adjectives by suffixation of ‘-ly’, do not occur in these positions.

A second case of an obligatory complement is in clauses with the verb ‘be’ as head.

i.a. Giri is in the office. b. *Giri is.

ii.b. The proposal is without merit. b. *The proposal is.

Examples in ‘b’ above are admissible if elliptical, with a complement recoverable from the preceding text-ex. “What percentage was left?” “Twenty” (= 20 percent), but otherwise ‘be’ normally requires an internal complement. Leaving aside the specifying use of ‘be’ which allows complements of just about any category, adverbs cannot in general function as complement to ‘be’.

Some of the functions of the prepositions are discussed here.

2.2.1.d. Adjunct:
Prepositional phrase can function as an adjunct in clause structure that is not in a predicative relation to the subject (non-predicative adjunct). This is one of the main differences between prepositions and adjectives.

Ex.  
  i. a. Tired of the ship, the captain saw an island on which to land. (AdjP)  
  b. *Tired of the ship, there was a mall island.

  ii. a. Ahead of the ship, the captain saw an island on which to land (PP)  
  b. Ahead of the ship, there was a small island.

In i.a ‘tired of the ship’ is an AdjP predicated of the subject: it entails that the captain was tired of the ship. The deviance of i.b is then attributable to the fact that there is no appropriate subject for the AdjP to be predicted of. No such constraint applies to the PP ‘ahead of the ship’ in ii: ii.a does not entail that the captain was ahead of the ship, and ii.b is perfectly well-formed.

Many prepositions are arisen by conversion from adjectives, and it is the ability to occur as head of non-predicative adjuncts that shows such conversion to have taken place:

  i. [Opposite church] there is a path leading down to the lake.
  ii. [Contrary to popular belief,] Eskimos don’t have huge number of ‘snow’ words.

Occurrence as a non-predicative adjunct also distinguishes prepositions from gerund-participle and past participle forms of verbs. For example, ‘owing’ can be either a preposition or the gerund participle of ‘owe’.

  i. [Owing to my stupid bank,] there’s no money for the rent. (preposition)  
  ii. [Owing money to my stupid bank,] I have to live very frugally. (verb)  
  iii.*[Owing money to my stupid bank,] there’s no money for the rent. (verb)

As a preposition it takes a ‘to’ phrase complement and is non-predicative; as a verb, it can take a direct object + ‘to’ complement, but it then needs a predicand, an understood subject, such as ‘I’ in ii. ‘as I owe money to my stupid bank, I must live very frugally’. The lack of any such predicand iii makes the example ungrammatical. Example i is fine, the predicand requirement applies to ‘owing’ as a verb but not as a preposition.
2.2.1.e. Modifier of Prepositions:

There are a small number of adverbs such as ‘right’ and ‘straight’ which occur with a certain sense as modifiers of prepositions but not of verbs, adjectives or adverbs:

i. They pushed it [right under the bed] (preposition)
ii. *They were [right enjoying themselves]. (verb)
iii.*I believe the employees to be [right trustworthy]. (adjective)
iv.*The project was carried through [right successfully] (adverb)

Not all prepositions accept these modifications. They (modifications) occur primarily with prepositions indicating spatial or temporal relations.

Words with PP complements:

i. Every thing has been badly delayed [owing to a computer failure].
ii. [According to Kittu,] most of the signatures were forged.
iii. We had to cancel the match [because of the weather].
iv. She suddenly jumped [out of window].
v. They gave me a knife [instead of a fork].

The traditional definition of preposition excludes the underlined words, precisely because they are not followed by NPs. For the most part, these and other words of the same kind are therefore analysed as adverbs in traditional grammar.

Some prepositions can take modifiers like those found in other phrases:

i. She died [two years after their divorce].
ii. She seems [very much in control of things].
iii. It happened [just inside the penalty area].

These modifiers, are found also in AdjPs (two years old), NPs (very much a leader), and VPs (She [just managed to escape]).
2.2.2. Grammaticised uses of prepositions:

Some prepositions have become grammaticised in the sense of having specific syntactic roles in the language that are not determined by their meanings. A preposition like ‘under’ is an example of a preposition that is clearly not grammaticised. It is an ordinary lexical item with a meaning, and it is used where a preposition is permitted and the meaning that it has is the appropriate one. No rule of sentence formation or condition on complement licensing needs to single it out in any way. Any syntax of English that did make specific mention of it would be insufficiently general. In all contexts where it can appear, other prepositions can appear too: ‘Put it under the table’ can be ‘Put it above the table’, ‘Put it near the table’, etc.

2.2.2.1. Specific preposition:

In grammaticised prepositions, each of the grammaticised prepositions is specifically mentioned in the definition of at least one grammatical construction or the statement of some grammatical condition on the distribution of some class of lexical items.

For example, the verb ‘dispose’ (get rid, etc.) cannot be used correctly without *of* being present as the preposition marking its complement:

They disposed of the box.

*They disposed the box.

And other prepositions are not permitted where the *of* appears:

*They disposed at/below/on/through/under the box.

2.2.2.2. No independent meaning:

In the following examples the preposition has no identifiable meaning independent of the grammatical construction in which it occurs. Example i is a passive clause, and ‘by’ marks the element that is subject of the corresponding active, ‘The police
interviewed him’. ‘Of their king’ in ii is complement of the noun ‘death’, and corresponds to the subject of the clausal construction ‘Their king died’.

i. He was interviewed by the police. (passive)

ii. They were mourning the death of their king. (complement)

2.2.2.3. NP internal complement (of):

With very minor exceptions, nouns do not take NP as internal complement: instead, the NP is related to the head noun by a preposition. And of is the default preposition for this construction.

‘They destroyed the city’ (clause)
‘their destruction of the city’ (NP)

In the above example NP ‘the city’ is related to the noun ‘destruction’ by means of the grammaticised preposition of. Other prepositions than the default of are seen in ‘Kittu’s marriage to Radha’ and ‘the ban on smoking’. Adjectives behave in very much the same way: compare ‘proud of her achievements’, ‘keen on opera’ and ‘very pleased with yourself’.

2.2.2.4. VP. Complements:

Many verbs do take NPs as internal complement, but there are others that take a PP complement introduced by a certain grammaticised preposition:

It depends on the weather.
I owe everything to her.

2.2.2.5. Functions as inflections:

In their grammaticised uses, prepositions often serve the same kind of functions as inflectional cases. Compare,

the death of their king
their king’s death
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Here ‘their king’ related to the head noun by the preposition *of* and genitive case respectively. Similarly ‘to’ in ‘I gave it to Kittu’ marks a role that in many languages is marked by the dative case.

In such cases, prepositions cannot take modifiers like those in the following examples:

- She died [*two years after* their divorce].
- She seems [*very much in* control of things].
- It happened [*just inside* the penalty area].

And they are virtually restricted to occurrence with NP complements. However, there are a good number of uncontroversial prepositions that have no grammaticised uses: behind, below, since, underneath, etc.

The grammaticised uses of ‘by’, *of*, and ‘with’ in

- He was interviewed *by* the police.
- They were mourning the death *of* their king.
- You look very pleased *with* yourself.

may be contrasted with the non-grammaticised uses seen in

- I left the parcel *by* the back-door,
- That is *of* little importance’, and
- He’s *with* Angela.

An adequate account of prepositions must thus cover much more than the grammaticised uses.

**Prepositions are not case markers:**

Some grammars of English also postulate a certain amount of analytic case: ‘to’, for example, has been regarded as a marker of dative case and *of* as a marker of genitive case in NPs;

- I gave the money *to* Kittu.
- the father *of* the bride
But some say that English has only inflectional case, that prepositions are not case markers. The rationale for taking ‘to’ as a dative marker is that ‘to Kittu’ is allegedly an indirect object, but they argued in fact that is not – that although it has the same semantic role as the NP ‘Kittu’ of ‘I gave Kittu the money’ it does not have the same syntactic function. Leaving aside the nominative-accusative contrast in pronouns, the core syntactic functions in clause structure are not marked by inflectional case, and there is no justification for treating ‘to’ as an analytic case marker here but as an ordinary preposition in

‘I explained the matter to Kittu’,
‘I spoke to Kittu’,
‘He referred to Kittu’ and so on.

Similarly for of. Semantically, the relation of ‘the bride’ to ‘father’ is the same in ‘the father of the bride’ as in ‘the bride’s father’,

but syntactically there is a major difference: in the latter

‘the bride’ is determiner (or subject-determiner), whereas in ‘the father of the bride’ ‘of the bride’ is simply a complement, and as such it is similar to the post-head PPs in ‘a view of the river’, ‘a number of animals’, ‘his marriage to Jikki’, ‘her insistence on a recount’. There are a large number of prepositions in English and overall their role is very different from that of inflectional case markers.

2.3. Some more information:

2.3.1. verb + preposition combinations:

Our major focus in this section is on prepositional complements of verbs where the combination of verb and preposition is distinctive in one or more of the following ways:
2.3.1.i. **prepositional verbs**: The preposition is specifically selected by the verb rather than being in potential contrast with other prepositions. This construction can be called as prepositional verbs.

The preposition ‘to’ of

‘Kittu referred to your book’ is to be distinguished from that of

‘Kittu flew to Boston’

in that examples the latter may contrast systematically with such other prepositions as towards, round, from, over, and so on, whereas the former permits no such replacement.

Prepositional verbs are those which select a prepositional complement containing a specified preposition together with its own complement. This can have mobile (I referred to her book) and fixed (I came across some old letters) type of construction. The mobile ones behave in essentially the same way as unspecified prepositions, while the fixed ones do not permit variation in their position relative to the verb.

We can compare specified and unspecified prepositions with respect to four parameters: fronting of the preposition along with its complement, coordination of prepositional phrases, positioning of adjuncts before the preposition, formation of prepositional passives.

a. fronting of the preposition + NP:

Illustration with the cases that have an unspecified preposition.

The city **to** which I flew (relative)

To **which** city did you fly (open interrogative)

It was **to** Mumbai that I flew (it-cleft)

There are alternates with a stranded preposition (the city **which** I flew **to**) but it is the version cited in above that is of interest for present purposes, for it shows that ‘to’ and the following noun phrases form a constituent.
Behavior of specified preposition in these construction the mobile ‘to’ selected by ‘refer’ and the fixed ‘across’ selected by ‘come’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Fixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the book to which I referred</td>
<td>*the letters across which I came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To which book did you refer?</td>
<td>*Across which letters did you come?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was to her book that I referred.</td>
<td>*It was across these letters that I came.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mobile preposition behaves just like the unspecified one, where the fixed one does not. ‘Across’ cannot be moved to the left of ‘come’, so only the versions with stranded prepositions are admissible:

the letters which I came across

Which letters did you come across?

It was these letters that I came across.

b. coordination of prepositional phrases:

Unspecified prepositions can be readily repeated in coordination:

I flew to Mumbai and to New Delhi.

With specified prepositions we again find the mobile and fixed types behaving differently.

I referred to her book and to several others.

*I came across these letters and across some family photographs.

c. position of adjuncts:

An adjunct can be readily inserted between the verb and an unspecified preposition:

I flew regularly to Mumbai.

The same applies to mobile specified prepositions, but not to fixed ones:

I referred repeatedly to her book. *I came eventually across these letters.
d. prepositional passives:

In this construction preposition remains next to the verb, here we don’t have a systematic difference in behavior between mobile and fixed specified prepositions. With unspecified prepositions the prepositional passive is not generally admissible, but it is not wholly excluded. Passives are much more widely available with specified prepositions, but they are not admissible in all cases.

Ex.

1. *Mumbai was flown to next. This bed has been slept in.
2. *Such principles were stood for. Her book was referred to.
3. *Some old letters were come across. These matters must be seen to.

The example 1 has unspecified prepositions, 2nd has mobile specified ones (the principles for which we stand), and 3 has fixed specified ones (*the matters to which we must see).

The mobile vs fixed distinction applies also to prepositions following an object NP:

Ex. mobile prepositions fixed prepositions
1. He referred me to a specialist. He got me through the biology test.
2. the specialist to whom he referred me *the test through which got me
3. To whom did he refer you? *Through which test did he get you?
4. It was to a cardiologist that he referred me. *It wasn’t through the biology test, but not through the anatomy one.

In example of mobile we have the transitive use of ‘refer’, and as with the intransitive use considered above the specified preposition ‘to’ can be fronted along with its complement in relatives and open interrogatives, extracted with its complement in the ‘it’ cleft, and repeated in coordination. The examples of fixed contain the transitive idiom ‘get through’, and here the specified preposition ‘through’ cannot be moved or repeated.
The constituent structure of clauses containing specified prepositions is best regarded as identical to that of matching clauses with unspecified prepositions. This means that in all the above examples where the preposition immediately precedes an NP it combines with the latter to form a transitive PP.

Ex.
I [referred] [to her book].
I [came] across some old letters

Where the position of the preposition is fixed, we take the verb+preposition combination to be fossilized, i.e. it blocks the application of the syntactic processes that can normally apply to such combinations.

e. Complementation patterns found with prepositional verbs.

(O=object, prep=preposition, PC=predicative complement)

1. verb – [prep+O] I referred [to her book].
2. verb – O – [prep+O] I intended it [for Raju].
4. verb – [prep+PC] It counts [as her too short].
5. verb – O – [prep+PC] They regard it [as successful].

The NP in 1-3 is object of its governing preposition, while in 4-6 it is a predicative complement. The distinction we have drawn among complements of the verb between objects and predicatives applies also to the complements of prepositions, though the preposition governing a PC is almost always ‘as’.

1. verb – [prep+O]: This structure is similar to specified prepositions where the preposition + NP forms the only complement of the verb.

Ex.
dispose of
consist of (prepositional passives are not possible here like ‘Her book was referred to’)
call on
abide by
bank on etc

2. verb – O – [prep + O]: In this construction the verb has two complements, an object and a PP. The subject of related passives always corresponds to the object of the verb, not that of the preposition (It was intended for Kittu, *Kittu was intended it for). The preposition can almost always be fronted or extracted along with its complement and repeated in coordination, ‘refer… to’ as in examples under ‘mobile prepositions’ above. But there are a few informal expressions like the example ‘get-through’ in ‘fixed prepositions’ above where this is not possible.

   Ex. accuse…of
       assure …of
       convince…of
       deprive…of
       persuade..of
       rob…of
       suspect…of
       warn…of/about
       subject…to
       read…into etc.

3. verb – [prep+O]-[prep+O]: In this structure verb selects two prepositions:

   Ex. agree with…about

       argue with …about/over etc.

4. verb-[prep+PC]: This is the prepositional equivalent of the complex-intransitive construction. ‘Pass’ allows ‘for’ as the preposition, as in ‘He had passed for dead’.

   Ex. accept, cast, know, etc.

       Appoint, consider, rate, etc.
5. verb-O-[prep+PC]: This is the prepositional equivalent of the complextransitive construction. Again we have an exceptional case where ‘for’ is allowed as well as: He took it as obvious and ‘He took them for dead’.

6. verb-[prep+O]-[prep+PC]: This is relatively unusual construction. Here the predicand for the predicative is complement of the first preposition i.e. in the example ‘think [of it] [as indispensable]’ the predicative ‘indispensable’ applies to ‘it’.

Ex. think of
    conceive of
    agree on etc.

2.3.1.ii. Particle:

    The preposition can be positioned between the verb and a simple NP object.
    
    Ex. She put in her application.

    The distinctive property of particles is that they can be positioned between
    the verb and an NP object with the form of a proper noun or determiner +
    common noun.
    
    Ex. She brought down the bed. She brought the bed down
    *She brought downstairs the bed. She brought the bed downstairs.

    In above examples ‘down’ distinguishes from ‘downstairs’ as we
    mentioned.

    There is a large overlap between the particle and transitive preposition
    categories. Some of the differences between them as:

    i. The ‘particle+NP’ order can usually be reversed, ‘preposition+NP’
    cannot.
    
    Ex. She took off the label. She jumped off the wall.
    She took the label off. *She jumped the wall off.
ii. Only a transitive preposition can be followed by an unstressed personal pronoun.

The NP following a transitive preposition (its object) can have the form of an unstressed personal pronoun, but the P following a particle can’t. Objects of this kind must immediately follow the governing verb.

Ex. *She took off it. She jumped off it.

iii. Transitive PPs can normally be fronted/foregrounded, particle+NP sequences cannot.

Ex. *the label [off which she took] the wall [off which she jumped]

*Off which label did she take? Off which wall did she jump?

*It was off this label that she took. It was off this wall that she jumped.

iv. A transitive preposition can normally be repeated in coordination of phrases.

Ex. *Did she take off the red label or off the yellow one?

Did she jump off the wall or off the balcony?

v. A manner adverb can generally be inserted between verb and transitive preposition.

Ex. *She took carefully off the label. She jumped fearlessly off the wall.

vi. Homonymy:

There are, naturally, homonymous sequences between particles and transitive prepositions. It is not surprising that the same item can often be found with the same verb, interpreted now as particle, now as transitive preposition.

Ex.
Particle | Transitive preposition
--- | ---
He shouted *down* his opponent. | He shouted *[down the phone]*.
They turned *in* the fugitives. | They turned *[in the wrong direction]*.
She ran *off* another copy. | She ran *[off the road]*.
He got *over* his message clearly. | He got *[over his disappointment]* quickly.

These are easily differentiated by the criteria given above. The structural difference between the particle and transitive preposition members correlates with a very sharp difference in meaning, with all four of the examples and the last of the transitive preposition ones involving a rather high degree of idiomatisation.

### 2.3.1.iii. Verbal idioms:

a. With intransitive prepositions:

The verb+preposition forms an idiom, or is part of one idiom. Verb+intransitive preposition idioms are an important feature of the English vocabulary. They are very frequent and they are great number, especially in informal speech. Lexicalization may be accompanied in varying degrees by what is called fossilsation, the loss of the ability to undergo he range of manipulation found with comparable free combination.

Ex.

- I gave up the struggle (abandoned)
- This *gave the lie to* her critics (showed to be wrong)

Verbal idioms containing intransitive prepositions in free combinations will have locative meanings: in, out, up, down, etc. In free combinations we can add further locative specification:

Ex.

- I ran ahead (of him)
- I got out (of the box)
- I climbed down (the tree)
One can find a great range of meanings with prepositional verbs, from those where there is still a transparently clear connection with the literal locative relation to others which are much stronger. For example, ‘take in’ has seven different senses (move into the house, renting to, tighten, includes, see, grasp, deceived).

Constructions containing verb+intransitive preposition idioms (leaving aside those containing subordinate clauses as complement):

i. verb – prep

   He have in.

ii. verb – prep – O

   She mixed up [the tickets].

iii. verb – O’ – prep - Oº

   I ran [him] off [another copy].

iv. verb – prep – transitive PP

   We look forward [to your visit].

v. verb – O – prep – transitive PP

   I let [her] in [on a little secret].

vi. verb – prep – (as) PC

   She ended up [(as) captain].

vii. verb – O – prep – [as + PC]

   This showed [him] up [as spineless].

‘prep’ here stands for the intransitive preposition functioning as a complement of the verb.

The details of the above structures are not discussed here thinking that of construction are rare in these constructions.

b. With NP + transitive preposition:

   Here we will see the underlined sequences of the following examples.

i. We lost sight [of out goal].

ii. They made good use [of the extra time].

iii. She lost patience [with the secretary].

iv. They cast doubt [on his motives].

This structures mostly concerns with the passive form. The idioms cited are all different in that iii takes no passive, iv an ordinary passive, i a prepositional passive, and ii a passive of either kind:
Ordinary passive prepositional passive

i. *Sight was lost of our goal
   Our goal was lost sight of.

ii. Good use was made of the extra time.
    The extra time was made good use of.

iii. *patience was lost with the secretary.
    *The secretary was lost patience with.

iv. Doubt was cast on his motives.
    *His motives were cast doubt on.

List of idioms which fall under the above four types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No passive</th>
<th>ordinary passive</th>
<th>prepositional passive</th>
<th>either type passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>get the better</td>
<td>make mention of</td>
<td>catch sight of (fossilised)</td>
<td>make a fuss of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of (fossilised)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give birth to</td>
<td>do justice to</td>
<td>lay hold of (fossilised)</td>
<td>make an example of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give the lie to</td>
<td>keep tabs on</td>
<td>lose sight of</td>
<td>make use of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lose touch with (fossilised)</td>
<td>see much/little of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>make fun of (fossilised)</td>
<td>take advantage of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>make love to</td>
<td>take note of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2. Idiomatic expressions:

English is rich with idiomatic and semi-idiomatic constructions where prepositions enter. Many consist simply of preposition + noun, or preposition + determinative + noun: ex. in abeyance, in person, after a fashion, in a word, on the spot, etc. These are simply PPs with a preposition as head and an NP as complement. But, structure with second preposition (‘in accordance with + NP’) is not that simple. It can be represented as:

[Prep1 + (Article) N1 + Prep2 + Nx ]

(where Nn is the variable with different form)

Characteristics of this structure:

- The article is usually ‘the’, but ‘a’ is also found, as in
  ‘with a view to finishing the report’.
- In some cases even the Nn element is specified as part of the idiom,
  ‘in point of fact’,
‘in the nick of time’,
‘in the twinkling of an eye’, so on.

- Usually Nx is independently variable, countless NPs could be replaced.
- Fixed expressions.

A sample list of such expressions, excluding Nx:

under the aegis of in accordance with on account of
in addition to in back of in charge of
in aid of under the auspices of at the behest of
in case of in charge of in comparison with
in compliance with in conformity with in consequence of
in contact with by dint of with effect from
with the exception of in exchange for at the expense of
in (the) face of in favour of by (the) force of
in front of on (the) ground(s) of at the hands of
in league with in lieu of in (the) light of
in line with at odds with by means of
in the name of on pain of in the name of
on the part of in place of in (the) process of
in quest of in/with reference to in/with regard to
at (the) risk of for (the) sake of in search of
in spite of in step with on the strength of
in terms of on top of in touch with
in view of at variance with with a view to
by way of by virtue of for/from want of

These are in varying degrees idiomatic, so that the meaning of the whole is not derivable in a fully systematic way from the meanings of the components. And they do not permit the full range of syntactic manipulation (additions, omissions, and replacements) that applies with free expressions. Those where no manipulation at all of the pre-Nx sequence is permitted are said to be fully fossilized.
Compare examples: She put it [on the photo of her son]

i. She has lost [the photo of her son] (occurrence without Prep1)

ii. She put it [on the photo] (omission of Prep2 + Nx)

iii. She put it [on the crumpled photo of her son] (modification of N1)

iv. She put them [on the photos of her son] (number change in N1)

v. She put it [on this photo of her son] (determiner change)

vi. She put it [on her son’s photo] (genitive alternation)

vii. She put it [on the photos and drawings of her son] (coordination of N1)

viii. She put it [on the photos of her son and of Kittu] (coordination of Prep2 + Nx)

ix. *the son of whom she put it [on the photo] (froniting of Prep2 + Nx)

In i the sequence following Prep1 occurs on its own as an NP in object function.

In ii the sequence following N1 (‘of Nx’) has been dropped.

In iii an attributive adjective has been added, modifying N1.

iv contrasts with the original with respect to the number of N1, plural instead of singular.

In v there has been a change in the determiner, from ‘the’ to ‘this’.

In vi we have a genitive subject-determiner in place of the original ‘the’ as determiner + ‘of her son’ as complement.

The next two examples involve coordination.

In ix Nx has been relativised and placed in prenuclear position in the clause, along with Prep2, and in this case the result is ungrammatical.

The most fossilized expressions disallow all of these manipulations.

Ex:

by dint of
in case of
in lieu of
by means of
on pain of
in quest of
in search of
in spite of
in view of
by virtue of
by way of

i. *[Dint of hard work] achieves wonders. (occurrence without Prep1)
ii. *She achieved this [by dint]. (omission of Prep2 + Nx)

The less fossilised expressions allow one or a few changes, but none of them allow all. Moreover, the manipulations cannot be ordered in a strict hierarchy such that if a given manipulation is permitted then all others below it in the hierarchy will be permitted too.

For example, ‘in/on behalf of’ allows genitive alternation but not omission of Prep2 + Nx, but it is the other way round with ‘in front’.

2.4. Syntactic use of grammaticised preposition of:

The following is an illustration to see the syntactic uses of grammaticised preposition of. Of is the most grammaticised of all prepositions. Apart from its basic locative meaning ‘away’ ‘away from’, it has concepts like geographic origin, belonging, selection from a set, and many others. Let’s see some of the uses of the prepositions of.

2.4.1. Complement in the structure of NPs:

With some exceptions, nouns do not take non-genitive NPs as complement. Subordinate NPs are related to the head noun by genitive case by prepositions, and of is the default preposition used for this function.

Ex. i. the actor died.
   ii. the actor’s death
   iii. the death of the actor

They assassinated the actor. (clauses)
the actor’s assassination (NPs)
the assassination of the actor (NPs)
In i ‘the actor’ is related directly to the verb (as subject in first and direct object in second). In ii the subordinate NP is marked by genitive case, functioning as subject-determiner, and in iii it is complement of of.

The NPs in ii and iii are nominalizations: the head noun is morphologically derived from a verb. The alternation between the genitive and of construction is found with other head nouns too, but the of construction allows a much wider range of semantic relations between the subordinate NP and the head, as illustrated in following examples.

- Her former husband’s house, the house of her former husband
- Patel’s son-in-law, the son-in-law of Patel
- *the students’ majority, the majority of the students
- *water’s glass, a glass of water

2.4.2. Complement in the structure of VPs and PPs:

Verbs and prepositions do take NP complements, so prepositions in general, and of in particular, play a smaller role in their complementation. There are a number of verbs and prepositions which do select of complements.

2.4.2.1. V+Prep:

- She approves of the plan.
- Beware of the dog.
- He disposed of the old bulb.
- We partook of a simple meal.
- The book treats of the fauna of New Zealand.

- We apprised her of the facts.
- I convinced her of his guilt.
- They deprived him of his liberty.
- You expect too much of them.
- He robbed me of my wallet.
2.4.2.2. Prep+Prep:

- ahead of her rival
- instead of tea
- out of the box

2.4.2.3. die+of:

*of* indicating cause may be included here as it is virtually restricted to occurrence with ‘die’.

Ex.

He died of a broken heart.

2.4.2.4. of/about:

There are also cases where it alternates with ‘about’ which has its ordinary lexical meaning:

Ex.

- They had spoken of/about their wartime experiences;
- He’s thinking of/about moving to Bangalore.

**2.4.3. Complement in the structure of AdjPs and AdvPs:**

Like nouns, adjectives do not take NPs as post-head complement. Subordinate NPs are related to the head adjective by means of a preposition, and *of* can be the default preposition in this construction.

Ex:

- I feel ashamed of myself.
- They seem bereft of ideas.
- She is convinced of his guilt.
- It is full of water.
- It is good of you to help.
- We’re short of money.
- He was afraid of dogs.
- They are mindful of the danger.
They were heedless of the danger.

A list of adjectives which take of complements:

- afraid, ashamed, aware, beloved, bereft
- capable, certain, characteristic, cognizant, conscious
- convinced, desirous, destructive, devoid, distrustful
- productive, proud, reminiscent, representative, respectful
- scared, short, suggestive, supportive, sure
- tired, wary, worthy

Following adjectives are commonly occur in combination with it+extraposed subject, ex. ‘It was very kind of you to wash the dishes’, alternating with a construction with a personal subject, ‘You were very kind to wash the dishes’.

- careless, considerate, generous, good, honest
- idiotic, kind, naive, noble, pleasant
- silly, stupid

2.4.4. Other functions of of PPs:

There are a few cases where of is not selected by the head and thus makes an independent contribution to the meaning. In the following examples of phrase is

i. Modifier in NP structure:

- a matter of no importance
- a frame of steel
- a girl of a sunny disposition
- a man of honour
- a boy of sixteen
- the best novelist of her time

ii. Predicative complement:

- It is of no importance.
The frame is \textit{of steel}.
She is \textit{of a sunny disposition}.

iii. Adjunct in clause structure:
We like to go to the beach \textit{of a week-end}.
He did it \textit{of his own accord}.

The predicative complements in ii match the modifiers in i, but the predicative construction allows a narrower range of semantic types. Compare,

*’The man is of honour’
  or
*’The boy is of sixteen’.

Leaving aside idioms and fixed phrases such as ‘of course’, ‘of late’, ‘of necessity’, etc., \textit{of} PPs are rarely found as clause adjuncts. The only productive case is for indicating time in multiple situations, as in the ‘of a week-end’ in the example iii: the NP denotes a time period and must begin with the indefinite article.

\textbf{2.4.5. Subject-determiner genitives and \textit{of} construction:}

In the structure of NPs, as in the structure of clauses, we often find that an element with a given semantic role may be aligned with complements of different kinds:

\begin{align*}
  \text{the flood’s consequences} & \quad \text{(cause as subject-determiner)} \\
  \text{the consequences of the flood} & \quad \text{(cause as \textit{of} oblique)}
\end{align*}

\textbf{2.4.5.1. Bivalent construction (contained two complements):}

In event nominalisations corresponding to transitive clauses, we typically have three possible alignments:

i. \textit{Alexander the Great’s conquest of Persia} [subject-determiner +\textit{of} oblique]
ii. \textit{Persia’s conquest by Alexander the Great} [subject-determiner +’by’ oblique]
iii. The conquest of \textit{Persia} by \textit{Alexander the great} [\textit{of} oblique +’by’ oblique]
Version iii has two obliques, the others a subject-determiner + one oblique. In obliques it is the complement associated with the role of agent that takes ‘by, while other roles take the default preposition of. In the mixed constructions, pattern i is more usual than ii: there is a preference for the more active role to be aligned with the subject-determiner, and for the other to be aligned with an oblique, which will therefore take the preposition of.

- Note: there is no system of voice in NP. ‘...Conquest by Alexander...’, ‘...Persia by Alexander...’ are not passives.

2.4.5.2. Monovalent construction (having one complement):

subject-determiners compared with of phrases.

In bivalent constructions a subject-determiner can combine with an of phrase, but in monovalent ones the two kinds of complement tend to be in competition with each other:

- Genitive subject-determiner  
  i.a. Radha’s sister  
  ii.a. the accident’s result  
- of + non-genitive  
  b. the sister of Radha  
  b. the result of the accident

In the above examples one would prefer i.a. and ii.b., but not others. We have to review a number of factors favouring one or the other:

2.4.5.3. Semantic relation between the NP and the head noun:

Certain semantic relations are excluded from the subject-determiner construction but permitted in the of phrase one. The first involves a structure that excludes the genitive as ungrammatical, while with the others it is a matter of preferences.

- the hay stack’s painting  
  *the painting of the hay stack
- the cross’s sign  
  *the sign of the cross
- all battles’ battle  
  *the battle of all battles
- 2%’s rise  
  *the rise of 2%
- Roman coins’ collection  
  *the collection of Roman coins
- red wine’s glass  
  *the glass of red wine
- shrub’s two kinds  
  *the two kinds of shrub
- gold’s colour  
  *the colour of gold
*honour’s men the men of honour
*despair’s cry the cry of despair
*unemployment’s problem the problem of unemployment
*washed silk’s dress the dress of washed silk
*purple’s evil the evil of purple
*twelve years’ girl the girl of twelve years

There is also no genitive counterpart of the predicative construction
‘the stupid nitwit of a husband’ - *a husband’s stupid nitwit,
or of portative like
‘the youngest of the boys’ - *the boys’ youngest’.

2.4.5.4. Semantic character of the NP:
NPs denoting humans and animals occur with much greater frequency as subject-determiners. For example,

‘Mary’s green eyes’ and ‘cat’s paw’ are much preferred to
‘the green eyes of Mary and ‘the paw of the cat’.

There is also – less strong – preference for NPs denoting times and geographical entities to be subject-determiners, e.g. ‘October’s weather is preferred to the weather of October’, and ‘London’s pubs’ is preferred to ‘the pubs of London’. Least preferred as subject-determiners are NPs denoting other inanimates, e.g. ‘the roof of the house is preferred to the house’s roof’.

2.4.5.4.1. Syntactic character of the NP:
Pronouns are very strongly preferred as subject-determines, and rarely found as the complement of of: compare
‘her money’ and ‘your nose’ with the very unnatural
‘the money of her’ and ‘the nose of you’.
However, pronouns are not totally excluded from the of construction. We have examples like

‘The only portrait of her can be found in the National Gallery.’

Where ‘her’ as human topic is intended as relatively lower on the semantic hierarchy: ‘her only portrait’ could also be interpreted as creator or owner. There are also almost idiomatic phrases like ‘That will be the death/undoing/making of him’ Where again a low role seems to be intended.

Other things being equal, relatively short, head-final NPs will generally prefer subject-determiner position while relatively long NPs with post-head dependents will generally refer the oblique position:

i.a. the city’s usual rush-hour traffic
   b. the usual rush-hour traffic of the city

ii.a. a relatively young designer from Italy’s creations
   b. the creations of a relatively young designer from Italy

Version i.a. is preferred and ii.b too. This reflects the general linguistic tendency for heavy dependent to be positioned to the right of the head.

2.4.5.4.2. Morphological character of the NP:

A small tendency has been noted for the regular plural ending to be avoided in subject-determiners: in speech,

‘the king’s horses’ and ‘the kings’ horses’ are not distinguishable, whereas
‘the horses of the king’ and ‘the horses of the kings’ are.

2.4.5.5. Subject-determiner genitive and oblique genitive, a comparison:

The oblique genitive construction is semantically less general than the subject-determiner construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject-determiner genitive</th>
<th>semantic meaning</th>
<th>oblique genitives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s green eyes</td>
<td>Radha has green eyes. [d has body part h]</td>
<td>Those green eyes of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s younger sister</td>
<td>Radha has a younger sister. [d has kin elation h]</td>
<td>That younger sister of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s husband</td>
<td>Radha has a husband. [d has married relation h]</td>
<td>That husband of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s boss</td>
<td>Radha has a boss. [d has superior h]</td>
<td>That boss of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s secretary</td>
<td>Radha has a secretary. [d has subordinate h]</td>
<td>That secretary of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s friend</td>
<td>Radha has a friend. [d has equal h]</td>
<td>That friend of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s team</td>
<td>Radha belongs to a team. [d is a member of h]</td>
<td>That team of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s debut</td>
<td>Radha performs her debut. [d is performer of h]</td>
<td>That debut of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s new house</td>
<td>Radha owns a new house. [d is owner of h]</td>
<td>That new house of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s honour</td>
<td>Radha is honourable [d has human property h]</td>
<td>*that honour of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s anger</td>
<td>Radha feels angry. [d has feeling h]</td>
<td>*that anger of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s letter</td>
<td>Radha receives a letter. [d is recipient of h]</td>
<td>*that letter of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radha’s obituary</td>
<td>Radha is the topic of an obituary. [d is human topic of h]</td>
<td>*that obituary of Radha’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cathedral’s spire</td>
<td>The cathedral has a spire. [d has inherent part h]</td>
<td>*that spire of the cathedral’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summer’s heat</td>
<td>The summer is hot. [d has non-human property h]</td>
<td>*that heat of the summer’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The oblique genitive therefore does not generally contrast with the non-genitive *of* phrase construction, since this is disfavoured by animate dependents and virtually excluded in the case of personal pronouns. There is no possibility of

*"those green eyes of her’ competing with
‘those green eyes of hers’.

We can note two cases where there is competition. Firstly, it has been established that relatively long and heavy post-head dependents can favour the *of* phrase construction over the subject determiner construction, this carries over to a competition between the oblique genitive and simple *of* phrases. We are more likely to have:

‘those green eyes of Radha’s’ (oblique genitive – not favoured)
‘those green eyes of Radha’ (of phrase – favoured usage)

‘those green eyes of the girl who lives next door’s’
‘those green eyes of the girl who lives next door’ (favoured usage)

Secondly, in the special case of the equal relationship the difference between the two constructions can indicate different perspectives. We gloss Radha’s friends’ as ‘d has equal h’, indicating that the relationship is viewed from Radha’s perspective, and ‘those friends of Radha’s’ is understood in the same way. In ‘those friends of Radha’, however, the perspective is that of the friends, so that an appropriate gloss would have the terms reversed, giving ‘h has equal d’.

2.4.5.6. Head and phrasal genitives:

We have a usage head and phrasal genitives. Genitive NPs are usually marked as such by the inflection of the head noun: it can be referred as head genitives. It is also possible for the marking to be located on the last word of a post-head dependent, and these can be called as phrasal genitives.
In the first example above, the head of the genitive NP is ‘King’ but the suffix ‘’s’ attaches to ‘England’, the last word of the phrase ‘the King of England’. The range of phrasal genitive constructions is greater in informal, especially spoken, style than in formal and written one.

[the Head of Department]’s speech

?[the Head of the newly formed Asian Studies Department]’s speech

The first example is acceptable in any style, but the second one is marginal and would generally be avoided in favour of other construction ‘the+N+PP’ (the speech by the Head of the newly formed Asian Studies Department).

In both head and phrasal genitives the genitive marking is on the last word. It is not possible to have genitive marking on the head if there is a post-head dependent: we cannot have *[the Head’s of Department] speech’.

2.5. Telugu language:

Telugu is a verb-final language. It has postpositions, the genitive precedes the head noun, and the comparative marker follows the standard of comparison. The complementizer follows the embedded clause. Adjectives, participial adjectives, and relative clauses precede the head noun. Telugu is a nominative-accusative language, as are the other Dravidian languages. Telugu has the typical dative subject construction. Verbs carry pronominal suffixes as their ending. Telugu is a pro-drop language. The subject, direct object, indirect object, and Adverbial Phrase of the finite embedded and matrix sentence may be dropped.

2.5.1. Telugu postpositions:

A postposition is a type of adposition, a grammatical particle that expresses some sort of relationship between a noun phrase (its object) and another part of the sentence.
Postpositions are adpositions which follow their objects. The equivalent of the postposition in English is the preposition, which differs in that it precedes its object.

Postpositions in Telugu indicate the role of the nouns in relation to the verb in a sentence.

Ex. vaipu, vența, vadda, etc.

Postpositions in Telugu can function as case markers, ni/nu (accusative), ki/ku (dative), valla/valana (ablative) etc.

Some postpositions take case markers after them.
Ex. vaddaku, etc.

Some postpositions are bound to oblique stems of nouns and some are separate words.

Postpositions are added to the oblique stem of nouns and correspond in meaning of prepositions in English. (For our purpose, finding the functional equivalent for of, we need oblique forms null forms and postpositions).

According to Krishnamurthy (1985) postpositions can be classified as independent and dependent. In dependent type, postposition marker is added to the oblique form of the word, where as independent type can some times function as independent words.

Examples for dependent postpositions are:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni/nu</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki/ku</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōsaṃ</td>
<td>for the sake of, on account of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tō</td>
<td>with, along with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nuñci/niñdi from
a/na/ni in, on, at
a/na/ni than, compared to
guṇḍā/dvārā through

Examples for independent postpositions are:
lō in
lōpala inside
mīda on
kinda under
baita outside
daggira near, contiguous
venaka behind
mundu in front of, before
lā, lāgā like
prakāraṇi according to
tarvāta after
vāraku, dāka up to (place), until (time)
eduṭa opposite
madhyana between
pakkana by the side of
pāṭu for (of time)
vaipu in the direction of, towards

Grammar related to the postpositions of Telugu is also discussed in the following chapters, where ever it is require.

In the next chapter we will discuss the various syntactic and semantic distributions of the word of according to our purpose i.e. machine translation.
Appendix of the chapter:
I. Basic concepts of grammar (syntax):

I.1. Grammatical arrangement of words in a sentence can be called syntax. A sentence can be analysed on the basis of its constituents, syntactic categories of the constituents and grammatical function of the constituents in a given sentence.

I.1. Constituents:

The hierarchical composition of wholes from parts can be called constituent structure. The grammatical rules of a language say that sentence modification can be done without interrupting the constituent. Often a constituent will have other constituents in them, and those are made up from still shorter constituents.

Ex. ‘A boy read the book’.

Hierarchical composition of sentence

The sentence is divisible in the first instance into two parts. These parts of the sentence at the first level are called immediate constituents of the sentence.

‘a boy’ (the subject) and
‘read the book’ (the predicate).
The phrase ‘a boy’ is itself made up of smaller parts:

‘a’ and ‘boy’

And same with the ‘read the book’. Here, similarly, ‘read’ and ‘the book’ are the immediate constituents of ‘read the book’. The words are the ultimate constituents of the sentence.

The grammatical rules of a language say that modification can be done without interrupting the constituent.

Ex.

Apparently a boy read the book.
A boy apparently read the book.
A boy read the book, apparently.

But not

*An apparently boy read the book.
*A boy read apparently the book. Etc.

From the above examples star marked are interrupting the constituents, ‘a boy’, ‘read the book’. This point should be kept in mind to form a general rule for a language.

I.1.a. Syntactic categories:

We can categorize constituents as lexical (noun, verb, and also phrasal nouns phrasal verbs etc) and phrasal (VP, NP, AdjP, etc) categories – one of the main difference between these two categories is that, traditionally, dictionaries have lexical entries.
I.1.b. Grammatical functions:

Every constituent will have a role in the constructions. This role could be called as a function (subject, object, etc). Here a syntactic category can have more than one grammatical function.

In the sentence ‘A boy read the book’, ‘A boy’ and ‘the book’ belong to the same category, NPs (because both have a noun as the major element); but they have different functions, subject, object respectively.

Constituents can have the same grammatical function but belong to different syntactic categories.
For example, in sentences ‘His guilt was obvious’ and ‘That he was guilty was obvious’ ‘His guilt’ and ‘That he was guilty’ both have same function, subject (they stand in the same relation to the predicate), but the categories are different, NP and a clause.

I.2. Head and dependents:

A phrasal category can be divided as head and dependents. The head, normally obligatory and plays the primary role in determining the distribution of the phrase.

1.2.a. Head:

‘his guilt’ and ‘that he was guilty’ can function as subject but they differ in other aspects of their distribution –

‘The news that he was guilty was devastating’, but not

*The news his guilt was devastating

We need a preposition to correct the above sentence:

‘The news of his guilt was devastating’

This difference is attributable to the fact that the head of the former is a noun while the head of the latter is a verb (i.e. according to the head the grammar changes).

1.2.b. Dependent:

Dependents often optional and they are syntactically subordinate elements. In any given construction the kind of dependent permitted depends on the head:

Ex.

‘too’ (in a sense of ‘excessively’)
‘too carefully’, ‘too careful’
Here, ‘too’ is functioning as dependent to an adjective or adverb, but not to a noun or verb:

*their too extravagance, *you shouldn’t too worry

Dependent is a very general function, and we can subdivide this function according to their more specific relation to the head, like complements, modifiers, and determiners.

i. the photographs of their dog that they had brought with them [complement]
ii. the photographs of their dog that they had brought with them [modifier]
iii. the photographs of their dog that they had brought with them [determiner]

I.2.c. non-head:

Although the functions of head and dependent apply to a very wide range of constructions, we must also allow for non-headed constructions.

i. She bought [a hamburger, some chips and a glass of milk]. [coordination – the underlined NPs are of equal syntactic status]
   ii. A storm damaged – or so I’m told – the roof of their house. [supplementation – instead of being integrated into the constituent structure of the sentence as a dependent or coordinate, it is loosely attached, set off from the rest in speech by separate intonational phrasing and in writing by punctuation.]

Preposition in non-expandable clause:

If declarative content clauses do not permit the subordinator ‘that’ then they are non-expandable. Almost all words that license complements of this kind are prepositions, though there are also prepositions that take expandable content clauses, like heads of other categories.
i. We left [before the meeting ended]. (non-expandable)
ii. I’ll come with you [provided (that) it doesn’t rain]. (expandable)
iii. I [know (that) you’ve done your best]. (expandable)

In ‘i’ ‘before’ is preposition because it is not possible to insert ‘that’ in it. With ‘provided’ the word ‘that’ is permitted, as it is with the verb ‘know’ in ‘iii’ and here we therefore need further evidence ‘that’ is a preposition.

**Phrasal verb:** A phrase which consists of a verb in combination with a preposition or adverb or both, the meaning of which is different from the meaning of its separate parts. Ex. look after, work out make up for.

**Idioms:** A group of words in a fixed order that have a particular meaning that is different from the meanings of each word understood on its own. Ex. To “have bitten off more than you can chew” is an idiom that means you have tried to do something which is too difficult for you.

**Phrase:** A group of words which is part rather than the whole of a sentence.

**Case:** Any of the various types to which a noun can belong, according to the work it does in a sentence, usually shown by a special word ending: the accusative/dative case.