

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

UNIVERSITY OF DANANG

BÙI THỊ NHÃ PHƯƠNG

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO
IRREGULAR SENTENCES
IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE**

Field Study : THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Code : 60.22.15

**M.A. THESIS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
(A SUMMARY)**

Danang 2011

The thesis has been completed at the College of Foreign Languages, University of Danang.

Supervisor: **Lê Tân Thi, Ph. D.**

Examiner 1: **Nguyễn Quang Ngoạn, Ph. D.**

Examiner 2: **Nguyễn Văn Long, Ph. D.**

The thesis was defended at the Examining Committee.

Time: January 8th, 2012

Venue: University of Danang

The original of thesis is accessible for the purpose of reference at the College of Foreign Languages Library, and the Information Resources Center, Danang University

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 RATIONALE

Language is a special gift of God to mankind. If there were no language, human civilization would have remained impossibility. It is thanks to language that we can communicate with other societies and mix up with them. However, we wonder whether the acquisition of grammar rules and regulations are necessary and sufficient to make communication successfully in daily life or not. In fact, we can meet many unusual structures occurring in a large number of writings. They can be seen in an advertisement. For example:

[1] *Departures from 22 North American gateways. Connections to over 70 European destinations. Making the world seem ever smaller.*

[25]

It is the fact that irregular sentences perform an important role in many great works of literature. Take a look at these following examples:

[2] It's a remarkable case-history. *Gallop ing paranoia. Delusions of jealousy and persecution. Megalomaniac hatred and desire for revenge. Curiously enough.*

[25]

[3] Today I woke up half a century old. I am not ready. *Too much yet to do. Too much everyday living. Too much left unsaid, unimagined.*

[25]

Besides, in teaching and learning languages, we also meet the difficulty in explaining some special sentences, which do not follow predictable grammatical patterns. The explanation nearly pays attention to authors' intention in terms of pragmatic and stylistic

devices rather than analyses structures of these sentences. Thus, we focus on investigating into syntactic and cohesive features of irregular sentences in English and Vietnamese.

1.2 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

1.2.1 Aims

The aim of this thesis is to investigate syntactic and cohesive features of irregular sentences, especially fragmentary sentences or the so-called elliptical sentences without change of speaker in English and Vietnamese. More importantly, it also finds out and explains the similarities and differences in the use of fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese to help learners improve their writing skills as well as in learning and practising irregular sentences.

1.2.2 Objectives

This paper is designed to aim at the following objectives:

- To investigate syntactic and cohesive features of fragmentary sentences expressed in English and Vietnamese.
- To find out the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese fragmentary sentences.
- To suggest some ideas for teaching, learning and understanding fragmentary sentences expressed in English and Vietnamese.

1.3 JUSTIFICATION FOR THE STUDY

As we mention above, how to using and understanding irregular sentences in daily life is the difficulty we can face. The topic – An Investigation into Irregular Sentences in English and Vietnamese – is just an attempt to consider problematical aspects of fragmentary sentences in terms of syntactic and cohesive features. When we carry out this study, we hope that we will more understand about ellipsis to analyze and write them well and logically.

1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

With limited time, space and our own ability, in this thesis we just investigate syntactic and cohesive features of fragmentary sentences, the so-called elliptical sentences without change of speaker, in English and Vietnamese. We also try our best to find out the similarities and differences of fragmentary sentences in terms of syntactic and cohesive features in English and Vietnamese and provide some practical suggestions for teaching, learning and understanding fragmentary sentences expressed in English and Vietnamese.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The paper attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What are syntactic and cohesive features of fragmentary sentences expressed in English and Vietnamese?
2. What are the similarities and differences of fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese in terms of syntactic and cohesive features?

1.6 ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The thesis consists of five main chapters.

Chapter 1 is the introduction of the study, which includes the rationale, justification, the scope of the study, the research questions, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2, the literature review, presents the previous study related to the paper, the theoretical background of the study in which it lays emphasis on identifying syntactic and semantic features of fragmentary sentences.

Chapter 3 is about the methods and procedures of the study. It will mention the aims, the objectives of the study, then the methodology, the design of the research, data collection, data analysis and description of the corpus.

Chapter 4: findings and discussion, is devoted to the analysis and comparison of syntactic and cohesive features of fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese.

Chapter 5 includes the conclusion and the implications, the limitations, and suggestions for further study.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 A REVIEW OF PRIOR STUDIES RELATED TO THE PROBLEM UNDER INVESTIGATION

In English, R. Quirk et al simply discussed the device of ellipsis and indicated their constructions. In 1972, they introduced shortly the term *ellipsis with the same speaker* [7, p.75]. Later, in 1985 they classified irregular sentences into sub-divisions and firstly introduced the term *elliptical sentences without change of speaker* which is defined as *fragmentary sentences* [9, p.849]. Simultaneously, they distinguished *fragmentary sentences* with *sentence fragments*. However, they only gave some examples but not bring out their specific structures.

In Vietnam, many researchers have been made into elliptical sentences so far.

Bui Duc Tinh [13, p.349] took interest in *Mệnh Đề Tĩnh Lược* in conversation. Nguyen Kim Than [17, p.610 - 613] indicated generally *Cấu Trúc Tĩnh Lược Chủ Ngữ*. In the book “Ngữ Pháp Tiếng Việt” Diệp Quang Ban mentioned the concept of *Câu tĩnh lược chủ ngữ* [11, p.280] and *Câu dưới bậc tương đương bổ ngữ* [11, p.285]. Tran Ngoc Them also defined irregular sentence as *Ngữ Trục Thuộc* in his book “Hệ Thống Liên Kết Văn Bản Tiếng Việt” [18, p.47].

Pham Van Tinh, in his book “Phép tĩnh lược và Ngữ Trục Thuộc Tĩnh Lược trong Tiếng Việt” [24, p.138], dealt with classification of fragmentary sentences but not gave specific structures. Le Tan Thi also had a research on *ngữ trục thuộc nối*, in which he only focused on fragmentary sentences started with linking words [21].

There some more authors also mentioned elliptical fragments in general such as Phan Mau Canh *Các Phát Ngôn Đơn Phần Tiếng Việt* [13, p.126], Nguyen Thuong Hung *Đối Chiếu Sự Tĩnh Lược Chủ Đề trong Câu Tiếng Anh và Tiếng Việt* [14, p.126-129] etc.

However, the elliptical sentences without change of speaker which defined as fragmentary sentences has not put into consideration so far. Our study, therefore, focus on investigating syntactic and cohesive features of subjectless fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese.

2.2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.2.1 Definition of Terms

2.2.1.1 Irregular Sentences

According to Quirk et al, the co-authors of the book “A comprehensive Grammar of the English Language” [p.838], irregular sentences are *some sentences do not conform to the regular patterns of clause structures or to the variations of those structures in the major syntactic classes*. Simultaneously, he mentioned several ways in which sentences are irregular. Firstly, *they contain forms not found in regular sentence structures*. Second, *they are marked as subordinate*. Finally, *they are fragmentary, lacking constituents that are normally obligatory; the ellipsis may be recoverable from the linguistic form of the sentence or it may be recoverable from the preceding context*. Quirk also divided irregular sentences into 14 types: sentences with optative subjunctive; irregular wh-questions;

subordinate clauses as irregular sentences; adverbials as directives; aphoristic sentences; subject-plus-complement constructions; block language; newspaper headlines; personal letters, cables, diaries; abbreviated sentences in instructional writing; abbreviated sentences in informal conversation; abbreviated sentences in broadcast commentaries; elliptical sentences in dialogue, elliptical sentences without change of speaker (fragmentary sentences).

2.2.1.2 Fragmentary Sentence

Also in their book, Quirk et al advanced the term *elliptical sentences without change of speaker* [9, p.838]. Then they acknowledged them as *fragmentary elliptical sentences may occur without change of speaker or writer* He gave examples illustrated as follows:

- a. Two strange figures approached. *Martians!*
- b. Janet felt uncomfortable. *Yes, very uncomfortable.*
- c. It has a very distinctive taste. *Crisp and fresh.*
- d. Designed in Sweden, this teak desk is a terrific buy. *Shown with our exceptionally priced desk chair.*

In the book “An Introduction to English Grammar” [3, p.184], Greenbaum mentioned *fragmentary sentences are sentences that are grammatically incomplete but can be completed from the verbal context*. For example:

- e. We’ve made a pact. *A new start. No more philandering.*

To sum up, base on theoretical background as Quirk et al and Greenbaum suggested, we take fragmentary sentences that lack of subject into consideration. Their subjects can be recoverable and are the same as ones occurring in preceding context.

2.2.1.3 Fragmentary Sentence and Sentence Fragment

When finding and analyzing examples, we find out that sentence fragments and fragmentary sentences have some

characteristics in common. Thus, sentence fragments should be distinguished with fragmentary sentences in order to specify the subject of our study.

According to Greenbaum [3, p.184] *a sentence fragment is a set of words that is punctuated as a sentence even though it is not grammatically and independent sentence.*

a. He gossiped about other people's relationships. *And even his own.*

Quirk et al suggest that *these fragmentary sentences are to be distinguished from the sentence fragments that are merely the result of a punctuation device to indicate a dramatic pause for emphasis.* He exemplified some example of sentence fragments as follows

b. He was drunk. *And penniless.*

c. We have all kinds of contemporary furniture. *For every room in the house.*

[9, p.838]

It is obvious that sentence fragments and fragmentary sentences have some similar characteristics. They are both not grammatically and independent sentences. They both also lack of constituents that are normally obligatory. However, sentence fragment is occasionally used to suggest an afterthought or a dramatic pause [3, p.185] while fragmentary sentence is not. As a result, the ability of their revision is not the same. Take a look at the possible revision of fragmentary sentences as follows:

d. Two strange figures approached. *They are Martians!*

e. Janet felt uncomfortable. *Yes, she felt very uncomfortable.*

f. It has a very distinctive taste. *It is Crisp and fresh.*

g. Designed in Sweden, this teak desk is a terrific buy. *It is shown with our exceptionally priced desk chair.*

The examples of sentence fragments cannot be revised as the same. They can be connected with the previous sentences easily.

h. He was drunk *and penniless.*

i. We have all kinds of contemporary furniture *for every room in the house.*

From these possible revisions above, we can sum up to the point that although fragmentary sentences may be recoverable from preceding context but they cannot be connected directly with the precede sentences as the same of sentence fragments' revisions.

2.2.2 Halliday's Theory of Cohesion

2.2.2.1 Halliday's Theory of Reiteration

According to Halliday's theory, reiteration is defined as a form of lexical cohesion. It is related to referring one lexical item back to another by means of having the same referent in the context of reference. Basing on the level of generality, Halliday divides the reiteration into three cases. Firstly, reiteration involves the repetition of a lexical item at one end of the scale. Secondly, reiteration is the use of a general word to refer back to a lexical item at the other end of the scale. Last but not least are a number of things in between – the use of synonym, near-synonym, or superordinate. In order to illustrating this point of view, Halliday gives the following examples:

The ascent (1)

The climb (2)

[a] I turn to the ascent of the park. The task (1) is perfectly easy.

The thing (2)

It (5)

He points out that *the ascent, the climb, the task, the thing, it* are cohesive elements related to the lexical item *the ascent* by means of (1) the same item repeated, (2) a synonym, (1) superordinate, (2) a general noun and (5) a personal reference item. Most general of all

is the reference item *it*, the form *it* comes closest to being an alternative realization of general noun plus reference item [5, p.279]. In conclusion, reiteration, therefore, includes not only the repetition of the same lexical item but also the occurrence of a related item. Any instance of reiteration may be (1) the same word, (2) a synonym or near-synonym, (1) a superordinate or (2) a general word.

2.2.2.2 Halliday's Theory of Substitution

As for Halliday, substitution is one type of grammatical cohesion which is related the replacement of one item by another. It is also a sort of counter which is used in place of the repetition of a particular item. As a general rule, the substitution item has the same structure function as that for which it substitutes. He gives some illustrated example as follows:

- a. My axe is too blunt. I must get a shaper one.
- b. You think Joan already knows? – I think everybody does.

From the example above, the author indicates that *one* and *does* are both substitutes: *one* substitutes for *axe* and *does* for *knows*.

In terms of classification of substitution, Halliday divides the types of substitution basing on the grammatical function of the substitute item. This means that there are three types of substitution which are inclusive of nominal, verbal and clausal substitution.

2.2.2.3 Halliday's Theory of Collocation

According to Halliday collocation is a form of lexical cohesion. The lexical items are cohered to each other by means of their co-occurrence systematically. Halliday give the illustrated example as follows:

[a] Why does this little *boy* point wriggle all the time? *Girls* don't wriggle.

From the example above, the author points out that *boy* and *girl* are hardly synonyms, nor is there any possibility of their having

the same referent, they are mutually exclusive categories. Halliday affirms that there is obviously a systematic relationship between a pair of words such as *boy* and *girl*. The cohesive effect of such pairs depends on their tendency to share the same lexical environment, to occur in collocation with one another. To sum up, from Halliday's point of view, collocation is a term for cohesion set up by virtue of the co-occurrence of the lexical items which are related with each other by mean of a certain meaning relation or simply because of their sharing the similar context.

2.2.3 Tran Ngoc Them's Theory of Cohesion

2.2.3.1 Tran Ngoc Them's Theory of Reiteration

Tran Ngoc Them defines reiteration as a type of cohesive devices which involves the repetition of elements that had before [18, p.88]. He classifies reiteration into lexical reiteration, grammatical reiteration and phonetic reiteration. Lexical reiteration, according to him, is the case in which the lexical item in the latter occurrence is repeated as the same first occurrence. For examples:

a. *Tiếng hát* của các em lan trên các cánh đồng bay theo gió. *Tiếng hát* trong như những giọt sương trên bờ cỏ.

b. Đêm nay thể nào hai người cũng sẽ cãi nhau, và Vượng sẽ đập vỡ một cái gì đấy, còn Lành thì *khóc*. *Khóc* rất sẽ.

He also supposes that lexical reiteration can be categorized based on different criteria. With regards to the length of the lexical item and the repeated item, reiteration can be divided into word repetition and phrase repetition. As far as the phrase repetition is concerned, partial repetition and complete repetition are two subdivisions. Based on the part of speech of the lexical item and repeated item, lexical reiteration can be categorized into the repetition preserving part of speech and the repetition converting part of speech. In respects of the function of the lexical item and repeated item, there

are two types of lexical reiteration: the repetition preserving the function of the lexical item and the repetition converting the function of the lexical item.

Besides, grammatical reiteration is rather complex. The grammatical reiteration, from Tran Ngoc Them's points of view, is a type of cohesive device in which the structure of the first occurrence is repeated in the latter [18, p.93]. He also supposes that grammatical reiteration consists of two levels: structural repetition and morphological repetition. Structural repetition involves the repetition of the first structure in general but not the main structure. Structural repetition itself can be complete, different, odd or missing. He exemplified the structural repetition as follows:

c. Nếu không có nhân dân thì không đủ lực lượng. Nếu không có chính phủ thì không ai dẫn đường.

2.2.3.2 Tran Ngoc Them's Theory of Substitution

According to Tran Ngoc Them, substitution can be defined as a cohesive device in which the substitute used have the same meaning or share the same referent with the presupposition [18, p.114]. For examples:

a. Một cái mũ len nếu chị *sinh* con gái. Chiếc mũ sẽ đỡ tươi nếu chị *để* con trai.

b. *Phụ nữ* lại cần phải học. Đây là lúc *chị em* phải cố gắng để kịp nam giới.

As noted by him, substitution is also an effective way to avoid the repetition of the lexical items and make the text more diversity in lexical use. Thus, the substitution can be recognized easily by considering whether the pair of cohesive lexical items can replace each other or not. From this assumption, the definition of substitution, to some extent, is similar to Halliday's definition of reiteration.

2.2.3.3 Tran Ngoc Them's Theory of Collocation

As suggested in his book "*Cohesion in English*" published in 1992, Halliday uses a term *collocation* to refer to a form of cohesion which is achieved through association of lexical items that regularly co-occur [5, p.284]. In the language of Vietnamese, Tran Ngoc Them in his book "*Hệ Thống Liên Kết Văn Bản Tiếng Việt*" published in 1985, advances a term *phép liên tưởng* [18, p.121]. He defines it as a type of cohesion that takes place through the fact that a pair of lexical items is related to each other by sharing a certain semantic relation. This type of cohesive device is exemplified as follows:

a. *Mặt biển* mở rộng dần và đã nổi lên lại. *Sóng* gợn man mác, cái màu trắng buồn tẻ bao quanh càng man mác hơn.

Obviously, the two linguistics terms have much in common however it is not the case that there is no difference between the two terms at all. This opens up the possibility of identifying the *collocation* with *phép liên tưởng* [10, p.28]. As for Tran Ngoc Them, collocation can be categorized according to the characteristics of the pair of lexical items and the relation between them. There are two types of collocation group: identical or unrelated. The identical group consists of superordinate, chains of collocational cohesion, and quantitative cohesion whereas the unrelated group contains locatable, functional, specific and causal.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

3.1 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This investigation makes use of contrastive analysis in qualitative and quantitative approaches. Besides, descriptive and contrastive method helps us to set up the differences and similarities in linguistic features between English and Vietnamese fragmentary

sentences. English is chosen as the first language and Vietnamese serves as the second language.

3.2 RESEARCH PROCEDURE

The following steps will be included:

- Collecting and examining 120 English and 120 Vietnamese fragmentary sentences.
- Investigating the linguistic features of fragmentary sentences.
- Finding and discussing result of analysis above, compare the similarities and differences between the two languages.
- Suggesting some implications for teaching and learning language as well as comprehend and analyze fragmentary sentences.
- Suggesting further research.

3.3 DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION AND SAMPLE

In order to do survey of the population and samples of the thesis, the study is focused on 120 samples in English and the same number of samples in Vietnamese. Most of the samples are taken from English and Vietnamese short stories and novels. They are all in written form.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

3.4.1 Data Collection

The relating data in this study is mainly taken from short stories and novels. The criteria for choosing the data are that they must be in written form and function as fragmentary sentences.

The English samples come from novels such as *Love Story* by Eric S., *Just Cause* by Katzenbach J., *Invisible Man* by Ralph E., *Small Vices* by Parker R.B., ect. Many samples are also chosen for English short stories such as *An Hour in Paradise* by Leegan J., *The Best American Short Stories* by Keillor G. and Kenison K., ect.

The Vietnamese samples are picked out mainly from interesting short stories by writers such as Nguyễn Hồng, Nguyễn

Minh Châu, Nguyễn Thị Thu Huệ, Hoàng Anh Tú, Phan Hồn Nhiên, ect. Some of samples are taken from the novel *Cơ Hội Của Chúa* by Nguyễn Việt Hà.

3.4.2 Data Analysis

Data collected will be mainly analyzed on the basic of the following points:

- Syntactic features: we examine which patterns of structure are frequently used in fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese.
- Cohesive features: we examine cohesive features used in fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese.

The findings of the similarities and differences of some features of fragmentary sentences will be discussed basing on the descriptive and contrastive analysis.

3.5 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

The work of comparing and contrasting fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese is mainly based on the analysis of the collected data in the two languages. Therefore, the process of reading, choosing and analyzing the samples must be done carefully to ensure a satisfying reliability of results.

Reliability and validity are two most important criteria to guarantee the quality of the data collection procedures. Most of the findings in the study result from the analysis of evidence, statistics, and frequencies. Therefore, the objectivity of study is assured.

Besides, all the samples are selected from well-known English and Vietnamese short stories and novels so they are reliable. The data are then classified based on the theoretical background mentioned in chapter 2, which can guarantee the reliability and validity of the research.

In conclusion, all the facts presented above make the study reliable and valid.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

4.1 SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF FRAGMENTARY SENTENCES IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.1.1 Syntactic Features of Fragmentary Sentences in English

4.1.1.1 Verbal Fragmentary Sentences (VFSs)

4.1.1.2 Nominal Fragmentary Sentences (NFSs)

Table 4.2 The Occurrence of Modifiers of Nominal Fragmentary Sentences in English.

The Modifications of NFS in English	Postmodifiers	Non – finite Clause	-ed Participle Clause	-
			-ing Participle Clause	-
			To Infinitive Clause	+
		Relative Clause	+	
		Prepositional Phrase	+	
		Noun Phrase in Apposition	-	
		Adverb (Phrase)	+	
		Adjective (Phrase)	-	
	Head			
	Premodifiers	Noun	+	
Participle		+		
Epithet		+		
Demonstrative		-		
Numeral		Quantifier	+	
		Ordinal	-	
		Cardinal	+	
Possessive		+		
Article	+			

In addition, syntactically, we find that the functions of NFSs in English are mainly direct object or subject complement.

4.1.1.3 Adjectival Fragmentary Sentences (AFS)

4.1.2 Syntactic Features of Fragmentary Sentences in Vietnamese

4.1.2.1 Verbal Fragmentary Sentences

4.1.2.2 Nominal Fragmentary Sentences

Table 4.5: The Occurrence of Modifiers of Nominal Fragmentary Sentences in Vietnamese

The Modifications of NFS in Vietnamese	Postmodifiers	Numeral	Ordinal	-
		Relative Clause		+
		Prepositional Phrase		+
		Noun		+
		Possessive		+
		Epithet		+
	Head			
	Premodifiers	Demonstrative		+
		Numeral	Cardinal	+
			Quantifier	-
Article			+	

As far as syntactic features are concerned, the functions of NFSs in Vietnamese are mainly direct object, adverbial and subject complement.

4.1.2.1 Adjectival Fragmentary Sentences

4.2 COHESIVE FEATURES OF FRAGMENTARY SENTENCES IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.2.1 Cohesive Features of Fragmentary Sentences in English

4.2.1.1 Cohesive Features of Verbal Fragmentary Sentences in English

4.2.1.2 Cohesive Features of Nominal Fragmentary Sentences in English

4.2.1.3 Cohesive Features of Adjectival Fragmentary Sentences in English

4.2.2 Cohesive Features of Fragmentary Sentences in Vietnamese

4.2.2.1 Cohesive Features of Verbal Fragmentary Sentences in Vietnamese

4.2.2.2 Cohesive Features of Nominal Fragmentary Sentences in Vietnamese

4.2.2.3 Cohesive Features of Adjectival Fragmentary Sentences in Vietnamese

4.3 SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES OF FRAGMENTARY SENTENCES IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.3.1 In Terms of Syntactic Features

As far as the structure of the fragmentary sentences are concerned, there are some similarities and differences in the frequency as well as occurrence of types of fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese.

As the table 4.9 shows, we can see that the verbal forms serve as fragmentary sentences occur with the highest frequency in the both English and Vietnamese and the nominal fragmentary sentences are the same. That is to say there are far more common in the use of VFSs and NFS than in AFSs. The striking difference is that Vietnamese has higher frequency of AFSs use.

With regards to the structures, from the table 4.2, 4.5, 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12 show, we can see that there are many similarities and differences in the occurrence of structural types of English and Vietnamese fragmentary sentences. As for the occurrence of VFSs, we can see that English VFSs is structured nearly the same as Vietnamese. However, it should be noted that, there is no appearance of the structural type *V + C* in English and the *V + O + A* Vietnamese in contrast. The table 4.2 and 4.5 indicate that the occurrence of NFSs is showing differently in English and Vietnamese. It is interesting to note that the both English and Vietnamese NFSs have the great diversity in the use of modifiers. Nevertheless, their position is not the same; the premodifiers in English NFSs can be inclusive of *article, possessive, numeral, demonstrative, epithet and noun*. The premodifiers of Vietnamese NFSs, in contrast, includes *article, numeral and demonstrative*. When taking these elements into the consideration, we can see that there is no occurrence of *ordinal number* modifying the head noun in both NFSs and the *demonstrative* appears in English but not in Vietnamese. Table 4.12 shows that English AFSs are slightly different from Vietnamese, the structural type of *the only adjective* appears in Vietnamese but not in English whereas the structural type *adjective plus prepositional phrase* appears in English but not in Vietnamese.

As far as syntactic features are concerned, the similarities and differences of fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese are noted by means of their different functions. In our study, we just take the functions of NFSs into consideration because of diversified roles of noun phrase in sentences. As to NFSs in English and Vietnamese, refer to the table 4.11, we can see that both NFSs can occur as *direct object* and *subject complement*. However, there is a slight difference

in their syntactic function. The Vietnamese NFSs can function as *adverbial* but English NFSs cannot.

Table 4.9 The Frequency of Fragmentary Sentences in English and Vietnamese

Types	English		Vietnamese	
Verbal Fragmentary Sentences	63	53%	65	54%
Nominal Fragmentary Sentences	47	39%	36	31%
Adjectival Fragmentary Sentences	10	8%	19	15%
Total	120	100%	120	100%

Table 4.10 The Occurrence of Structural Types of Verbal Fragmentary Sentences in English and Vietnamese

Types of Structure	English	Vietnamese
V	+	+
V + O	+	+
V + A	+	+
V + C	–	+
V + O + O	+	+
V + O + A	+	–
V + O + C	+	+

Table 4.11 The Syntactic Similarities and Differences of Nominal Fragmentary Sentences in English and Vietnamese

Function	English	Vietnamese
Direct Object	+	+
Subject Complement	+	+
Adverbial	–	+

Table 4.12 The Occurrence of Structural Types of Adjectival Fragmentary Sentences in English and Vietnamese

Types of Structure	English	Vietnamese
The Only Adjective	–	+
Intensifier Plus Adjective	+	+
Adjective Plus Prepositional Phrase	+	–

4.3.2 In Terms of Cohesive Features

When analyzing the fragmentary sentences with respect to the cohesion, we find that there are similarities and differences in the occurrence as well as frequency use of the cohesive devices between English and Vietnamese fragmentary sentences. As the table 4.13 indicates, the forms of reiteration are also mainly used in both English and Vietnamese VFSs and AFSs. As far as cohesive features are concerned, NFSs has the most diversity in common use of cohesive devices. Of all cohesive devices occurring in NFSs, the collocation has the highest frequency which is referred in table 4.14. Also in the table 4.14, we can see that the substitution occurs in English with higher frequency in compared with Vietnamese. The table 4.15 shows that there are some similarities and differences in the occurrence of each type of cohesive device used in English and Vietnamese NFSs. It is clear that all specific kinds of reiteration and collocation occur in English similarly to Vietnamese NFSs. The striking difference is that some kinds of substitution which occur in English NFSs almost do not appear in Vietnamese and vice versa such as the appearance of *synonym and near-synonym, substitution of pronoun* in English but not in Vietnamese or the appearance of *enumeration* in Vietnamese but not in English.

Table 4.13 The Occurrence of Cohesive Devices of Verbal and Adjectival Fragmentary Sentences in English and Vietnamese

Types of Cohesive Device	English		Vietnamese	
	VFSs	AFSs	VFSs	AFSs
Lexical Reiteration	+	+	+	+
Grammatical Reiteration	+	-	+	-

Table 4.14 The Frequency of Cohesive Devices Occurring in Nominal Fragmentary Sentences in English and Vietnamese

Types of Cohesive Device	English		Vietnamese	
Reiteration	13	29%	14	39%
Substitution	13	29%	7	19%
Collocation	21	42%	15	42%
Total	47	100%	36	100%

Table 4.15: The Occurrence of Cohesive Devices of Nominal Fragmentary Sentences in English and Vietnamese

Types of Cohesive Device		English	Vietnamese
Reiteration	Lexical Reiteration	+	+
	Grammatical Reiteration	+	+
Substitution	Near Synonym or Synonym	+	-
	Superordinate	+	+
	General Item	-	-
	Enumeration	-	+
	Substitution of Pronoun	+	-
	Substitution by Appositive	+	+
Collocation	Superordinate	+	+
	Chains of Collocation Cohesion	+	+
	Quantitative Collocation	+	+

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSIONS – IMPLICATION – LIMITATION - RECOMMENDATION

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The research is carried out for the purpose of making explicit the characteristics of fragmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese. The description of the structure of fragmentary sentences plays a significant part in identifying and differentiating them in the chains of sentences in the text. From a syntactic point of view, the formation of a fragmentary sentence is similar to a verb, a noun or an adjective phrase. This relates to the fact that the fragmentary sentences themselves serve as many function in relation with sentences they depend on. It can be a predicative when its appearance as a verb phrases, an object when be shown as a noun phrase or a complement when its form as an adjective phrase. The occurrence of fragmentary sentences not only makes the text themselves more enrich in the lexical and grammatical use but also brings more background information for the related sentences.

As far as the cohesive features are concerned, it is interesting to note that the use of cohesive devices in fragmentary sentences in company with other presupposed sentences is the complex combination. That is to say there is possibility of the occurrence of more than two types of cohesion in a same case. The normally cohesive devices used are reiteration, substitution and collocation.

5.2 IMPLCATION FOR THE LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

As we stated in the first chapter, the fragmentary sentences used to be thought of not following the grammatical rules so the language learner can face difficulties in identifying and understanding their full meaning. Therefore, this study is carried out

with the aim of helping the learners understand the fragmentary sentences. As a result, the learners can interpret these kinds of sentences into their native language appropriately. There is no doubt that the fallacy of the fragmentary sentences is fade away if the learners of English and Vietnamese give a matter of a complete thought.

5.3 LIMITATION OF THE STUDY

As we stated in the first chapter, the fragmentary sentences used to be thought of not following the grammatical rules so the language learner can face difficulties in identifying and understanding their full meaning. Therefore, thanks to the similarities and differences of frangmentary sentences in English and Vietnamese that we found out, we can help learner understand and can identify fragmentary sentences easily when practising language skills.

For examples, when reading, learners can answer these questions:

1. Is this sentence is a fragmentary sentence or a sentence fragment?
2. What kind of fragmentary sentences is it?
3. What is its subject?
4. What is its function in relation with other sentence?
5. How can it cohere with other sentences?

By answering these questions, learner can understand clearly the fragmentary sentences they meet and translate them into their naitive language appropriately.

In practising writing skill, the irregular sentences should be avoided so far in school. However, in some cases, they are usually used for special purposes, such as for decorations, for advertising and so on. Thus, base on our results, learner can know how to write

elliptical sentences correctly. Besides, the cohesive features of this study can help teacher correct learners' writing mistakes successfully.

5.4 SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

From the syntactic point of view, we just concern in syntactic and cohesive feature at all, thus, other linguistic features of fragmentary sentences such as semantic and pragmatic features should be take into consideration to fulfill the complete picture for the matter. In addition, there is variety of the sample resources that has not been collected. For example, how to identifying fragmentary sentences in daily conversations or in prose is a matter for debate.

With respect to cohesive features, as discussed in chapter 4, one of the significant functions of the general noun is the embodiment the interpersonal meaning - a particular attitude on the part of speaker. It is the truth that the analyzing the interpersonal meaning in company with the use of lexical items in cohesion function is an interesting subject so far.