

Semipredicative attributive constructions as the index of structural semantic expansion of the sentence (on the data of the English language)

Rishat Zhurkenovich Saurbayev¹, Baglan Tasbulatovna Kulbayeva¹, Khabiba Sadyrovna Shagbanova²

¹Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute, Mira Street, 60, Pavlodar, 140000, Kazakhstan

²Tyumen State Oil and Gas University, Volodarsky Str., 38, Tyumen, 625000, Russian Federation

Abstract. In the article we view semipredicative attributive constructions, which represent the means of language efforts economy and indices of structural semantic expansion of the sentence in the modern language. The retrospective analysis was performed along with providing the characteristics of such a phenomenon as double predicate. The problem of expanded sentence hasn't received unanimous support among the researchers, staying the subject of scientific debates and discussions among syntaxists. The problem of categorization of structural & semantic expansion of the sentence and its qualitative and quantitative characteristics still remains unsolved. We tried to explain the nature of double predicate as the factor of structural & semantic sentence expansion. The paper is based on the facts of the modern English language.

[Saurbayev R.Z., Kulbayeva B.T., Shagbanova K.S. **Semipredicative attributive constructions as the index of structural semantic expansion of the sentence (on the data of the English language).** *Life Sci J* 2014;11(10s):186-190] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 30

Keywords: structural-semantic expansion, semi-predication, semi-predicative attributive constructions, transformation, semi-compound sentences, semi-composite sentences

Introduction

Syntactic language structure plays a specific role in the process of scientific generalization. Such generalizations include the process of literary language enriching and the development of various new structures as the factors, organizing the speech for its performance of special functions during the process of language communication. Thus the main feature of a syntactic system can be defined, which is based on the character of the types of the sentences, being made according to certain pattern. One of the most controversial problems of modern syntax is the nature of expanded sentence existence, which is viewed as the intermediate category between simple and composite sentences. Some domestic linguists still don't recognize the expanded sentence as a notional syntax category, while foreign linguist even do not consider it.

Expanded sentences are viewed as monosubject, but polypredicative syntactic constructions, which include 2 or more predicative lines. The difference is the degree of predicative lines independence: in composite sentence the predicative lines are expressed separately, they are fully-predicative, each of them has its own subject and predicate, expressed by personal forms of the verb; in expanded sentence the predicative lines are expressed together, one of the predicative lines is semi-predicative (secondary predicative, potentially predicative).

The peculiarity of the structures with semi-predication is the following: concerning their meaning content they are similar to sentence, they act as a

sentence, but they are not sentences, because they differ from subordinate clauses in their structural insufficiency and stronger dependence on the main clause. The sentence, which includes the secondary predication, is technically simple, because there is only one main predicate in its structure, but this simple sentence with secondary predicate is on the intermediate stage between the simple and composite sentence, on the sublevel on expanded sentence. The expanded sentence only creates the predicativity i.e. the ability to express several predicative relations by presence of a single structural core. In such sentence the secondary complementary predication is represented in "folded" mode. Thus the sentence has a secondary predication in its syntactic structure while staying a simple one concerning its external structure. In other words, during the combination of semantic relations on the logical-semantic level there is a semantic condensation on the syntactic level, the implicit sentence apex appears, which points out the presence of secondary predication.

The specific features of semi-predicative complexes are compactness, the intensesness of information delivery, the ability to report about the phenomenon of objective reality not with the help of composite sentence with bulky sequence of tenses, but using only a group of words. That's why they are interpreted in linguistics as the expressions with the improved semantic capacity. In addition the constructions with semi-predication do not only expand the plane of content of the utterance, but also indicate the additional information about various objects or facts of objective reality, which enable

more compressed, brighter expression of the event, which is the universal means of expressing and transmitting information.

The methods of research

Having based on some positions of the paradigmatic syntax of M.Y. Blokh, transformational analysis of N. Chomsky and also having used paradigmatic-semantic and contextual-functional approaches, we consider the following language phenomenon as a factor of structural-semantic expansion of the simple sentence.

One of the elements of structural-semantic expansion of simple sentence is a syntactic structure, which appear as a result of compression of separate units in the structure with semi-predication in the scope of a notional syntactic category of expanded sentence.

The sentences like *he lay sick*, *The sun rose red* are widely used in modern English. Similar sentences are also met in the other languages, e.g., in Russian: *on lezhil bolnoy*, *on pal mertvyi*.

The sentences of such type were described for the first time by A.A. Shakhmatov on the data of the Russian language [1].

Now there is no unanimity between linguists concerning the question, to which structural types the following sentences belong to [2-7]. The opinion that sentences of such type are simple sentences was generally acknowledged.

A.A. Shakhmatov, and then – the other domestic linguists, views them as double-predicative sentences, because, according to their common opinion, in addition to predicate they possess the other word, which is directly applying to the subject and is bound with it grammatically. The scholars call it the second predicate, expressed by noun. A group of scholars presumes, that the predicate in this case – *lay sick* – is a predicative attribute [1]. T.N. Kalinichenko also sticks to this opinion [5]. S.N. Tatarchenko singles out a full semantic independence of the elements as the main distinctive feature of double predicates [8].

In English linguistics the constructions like *It's hot*, *These look new*, *I found it excellent*, *They seem lonely* are called attributive-predicative ones, [8-12] or potentially predicative [13]. J. Geparaitė in her monograph view such constructions are subcategorical frames in a contrastive plane on the data of the English and Lithuanian languages [14].

In some researches the authors view the double predicated as a composite predicative complex, expressed by fully predicative and semi-predicative constructions, where one component is a matrix one, and the other is a complementary one,

characterizing the state or action of the main predicate [15-17].

So in the study of A.A. Alekseeva the problem of double predicate is studied and it is defined as a contaminated structure with two partially crossing propositions. This structure is represented by two predicates, where a matrix one is expressed by a notional verb, and the second predicate is oriented on the same subject (like the first one), which includes objective reality components along with material ones. The first predicate is a main one, and the second is a dependent on the first concerning the structural and semantic aspects [7].

The only controversy between linguists is in the definition of the type of such predicate. A.M. Peshkovsky, for example, viewed it as a special type of a composite predicated – the entity composite predicate [18].

R.A. Vafeev also follows the same views, studying these sentence types concerning their entity, topical and stylistic information [19].

A.I. Smirnitzkyi, studying such sentences as *The moon rose red*; *She went a young girl*; *she returned a grown up women*, singles out the predicate type, which they possess, as “process-qualificative predicate”. He notes that in this type of predicate the notional verb is also a link verb [20]. Having analyzed the similar sentence in Russian *On priekhal injenerom*, A.N. Gvozdev talks about the composite predicate, which combine the features of the simple composite predicate, but it is closer to composite, than to simple one [21]. N.F. Irtenyeva points out, that in the sentences like *She goes out radiant*, *conscious of being thoroughly up to date* the verb isn't semantically bound with the nominal part of the predicate, and it has the direct connection to the subject along with the verb, expressing predicate. N.F. Irtenyeva suggests that in such cases there is no need to talk about the composite predicate, and it would be more precise to call such predicate a crossed or double one [22]. B.A. Ilyish also expresses much interest concerning the problem of so-called double predicate. He notes that in the sentences types like *He came home tired*, *She married young*, *He died a bachelor* categorematic verbs *came*, *married*, *died* preserve their meaning, but the main content of the sentence is in the information, expressed by nouns and adjectives, being predicative parts. B.A. Ilyish thinks that the meaning of these sentences can be expressed in a different way, i.e. *He was tired when he came home*, *She was young when she married*, *He was a bachelor when he died*; the verb, being a predicate, also performs the functions of the link verb. According to B.A. Ilyish, such predicates form a special type of a mixed predicate, which was called by him a double one [23].

Some scholars, recognizing the existence of so-called double predicate in the language, admit the possibility of the use of comparative phraseological units in it as a predicative [24]. E.g.: *The cruelty of glass: as transparent as air, as divisive as steel* (J. Fowles). “Do you see this girl? She’s as lovely as a jewel. She’s my husband’s mistress” (J. Fowles).

We deem that these syntactic structures belong to semi-predicative attributive constructions; they also can be divided into two types: attributive, semi-predicative constructions with a key element expressed by noun or adjective. As an example we can use such the following: *The party arrived safe and sound*. The key words are noun and adjective: *We parted the best of friends*.

The semi-predicative attributive constructions represent transforms. In the sentence *He died rich* there are two predicative lines, which are closely connected, and where one predicative line is a core, matrix one, and the other is complementary, semi-predicative, carrying the additional meaning of an attribute. Thus we can divided this sentence into two: *He died rich* и *He was rich*. It can be proved via the possibility of transformation of such sentence into the following one: *When he died, he was rich*; we can also view the next examples as transforms: *When the party arrived it was safe and sound > the party arrived safe and sound*. *When we parted we were the best friends > we parted the best friends*.

Having made the review of scientific literature, a conclusion can be made that “double-predicate sentences” are viewed as simple two-part sentences, for which a specific component connection is typical.

There is an attempt to re-view the interpretation of the sentences of such type, basing on the other classification of the sentences. This assumption was reflected in the thesis of A.M. Mukhin “The structure of the sentences and their models”, in which he paid much attention to defining the essence of the sentences like *He came home tired*. Sharing the opinion about the necessity of review of the theory of A.A. Shakhmatov about the composition of sentence, A.M. Mukhin writes: “... It will be more adequate to talk in such cases not about two-part sentences, but about three-part sentences: like two main parts of the two-part sentence group all secondary parts around themselves, making up different patterns of the sentence..., in this case the main parts of the sentence also group the secondary parts but making not two, but three predicative chains” [25].

Then, developing the problem of syntactic connections in the sentence structure, of kernel and non-kernel components and corresponding models of sentences, A.M. Mukhin makes a conclusion that with

these types of sentences we deal with three-part syntactic structure – between two kernel and one non-kernel component. The first component of the sentence is viewed as a kernel twice predicator, the second – as a kernel predicating, and the third – as non-kernel predecating component [25].

We should also admit the desire of some linguists to explain the nature of so-called double-predicate sentences with the help of transformational analysis. We can refer to the article of A.P. Shapkin, in which he calls such sentences “solidsubordinate”. He characterizes them as “derivatives of at least two elementary sentences as a result of crossing in the same word with the same grammatical status (being from the same grammatical class), the presence of which in the elementary sentences is an essential condition of derivation of such composite sentence. The added sentence is deformed via eliminating of common elements” [26].

For proving his opinion A.P. Shapkin gives the following example: *We saw the balloon – We saw the balloon high in the air. The balloon was high in the air*.

The same way sentences of such type were analyzed also in “A Theoretical English Grammar (Syntax)” [27]. Irtenyeva N.F., Barsova O.M., Blokh. M.Y., Shapkin A.P., where we can see the example: *We waited – We waited breathless. We were breathless*.

According to the opinion of these scholars, the product of crossing in the same component may be the following sentences: *The moon rose silvery over the dark forest. He sat silent over the letter* [27].

We think that it is impossible to view given sentences and these like them as semi-composite, because in the analyzed examples we cannot fully observe the subordinate connection. The proof can be a transformation of this unit into two independent predicative lines, which are bound between each other by coordination.

Consequently, we suggest that there are no good reasons to view the sentences of a studied type as semi-composite. We think that these constructions are one of the cases of semi-compound sentence i.e. the sentence with several predicates, which is also a result of applying several transformations to a set of successive primary sentences, representing the deep structure of this sentence. Such structures can be viewed as kinds of syncretism, i.e. the phenomenon, when one element of expression plane simultaneously signalizes two or more elements of the plane of content.

There is a set of examples of usage of the studied structures in modern English: *What kept me relatively calm was the knowledge that Lord Penross was returning today → Something kept me and it was*

relatively calm (J.W. Brown). The door to the nursery burst open, William rushed into the gallery → The door burst and it was wide open (J.W. Brown).

In these examples during the transformation of the constructions we have discovered the coordination as a connection type.

Analyzing these sentences, we can state that they are surface structures, descending from two different types of deep structures, viz.: NVi + NVIA.

There are also surface structures, in which basis there are the following deep structures:: NVi+NVIN. In this case of surface structure N is usually expressed by animate nouns. E.g., in English *He died a beggar. I lived coachman with Mrs. Reed...*

So Z.S. Harris also notices the cases of transformation of such type, being made with the help of conjunctions. As we can see from the aforementioned examples, such sentences are the result of asyndetic joining of two transforms. E.g., the sentence *He stood motionless* may be represented as a product of applying some transformations to deep structures NVi и NVIA. Among these transformations we can name conjunction, crossing in the same component and elimination.

Thus the structure *She stood motionless staring at him (I. Murdoch)* can be unfolded into compound sentences: *She stood and she was motionless.*

Each of the sentences, being part of the expanded-compound, can be folded to different types of deep structures.

Deep structures, which can be unfolded to studied surface structures, were generated by two different basic (kernel) structures, i.e. NV и NVIC.

We can't but agree with the opinion of Yu.V. Vlassova, that surface structures of the researched type are the result of compression of compound sentences [28].

Thus the elementary sentences, which are in the structure of this sentence, and descend from different types of double-core structures viz. NV и NVIC, are the sentences with a common subject, sentences, which possess the principle of simultaneity of two predicating qualities, which provide the possibility of combining them within one structure.

As a result of these conditions realization the structures of a special type are formed, in which the third component is an elliptical one, which include new additional information about subject and which is joint with a preceding component. Usually in such sentences the verb combines two functions: a function of a notional verb and a function of link verb. In this case the meaning of the predicative part is more valuable. Due to these circumstances there is a partial loss of notional verb semantics in a compressed structure. Thus in a structure *He died a bachelor* not

the thingness but the state definition defines the meaning of a predicative *a bachelor*. Maybe this fact was the reason for criticizing of the double predicate theory and rating this structure as a type of nominal composite predicate.

The appearance of compressed structures of such type in a modern language is the consequence of realization of the principle of language means economy, which stipulates the specific conditions of these structures usage. In the language there is also a tendency of elimination of maximal redundant information.

Taking the aforementioned into account we can make a conclusion, that the economy principle is the law of the language internal development, and condensed predicative constructions can be used as stylistic devices, which express the additivity of the action or state in a compressed form, thus adding dynamics and logic to the utterance.

Interpreting the cases of redundancy elimination in terms of transformational grammar, Z.S. Harris states, that only such components can be eliminated, which can be then restored from the wide context.

Tendency of language means economy can be clearly observed in the studies of elliptical sentences of O.I. Reunova, who, having studied the structures like *We sat silent*, has come to a conclusions, that information redundancy is eliminated in the in them by structure of the elliptical components *sat* and *silent* [29].

We have to a conclusion that double predicate is represented only by the part, which contains new, additional information, expressed by the semantics of the attribute, which modifies the first predicate, thus adding the additional predicativity and subjecting the compound sentence to structural compression.

Conclusion

In modern linguistics the distinction between extended simple sentence, composite sentence and expanded sentence as notional categories of syntax is still controversial, because there even now there are no clear criteria of defining the definition "expanded sentence" and the components of structural-semantic expansion. We have studied one of the components, which expand the structure of the sentence not only structurally, but also semantically. As we see from the examples, semi-predicative attributive constructions in English are mainly expressed via nouns, adjectives and adverbs. These constructions are used as the means of language structural compression in semi-predicative units, which expand simple sentences not only structurally, but also semantically.

Corresponding Author:

Dr.Saurbayev Rishat Zhurkenovich
Pavlodar State Pedagogical Institute
Mira Street, 60, Pavlodar, 140000, Kazakhstan

References

1. Shakhmatov, A.A., 1941. Syntax of Russian language. Leningrad, pp: 620.
2. Torchina, L.J., 1962. Concerning the question of double predicate in modern English, PhD Thesis, Moscow, pp: 23.
3. Tabachenko, L.V., 2011. Suffixal positional verb in the history of Russian language: poly-aspect analysis: PhD thesis, Rostov State University Rostov-on-Don, pp: 48.
4. Pavlyukovets, M.A., 2011. Syncretism on the morphological and syntactic levels of English as the expression of language economy: functional aspect, PhD Thesis, Rostov-on-Don, Rostov State University, pp: 30.
5. Kalinichenko, T.N., 2011. The predicative attribute in the construction with notional verb in modern French. ChNU issue. Grammar and lexicology series, 848: 169-174.
6. Bliznichenko, M.V., 2011. Predicative attribute, its expression and functions in modern English, PhD Thesis, Moscow State University, Moscow, pp: 26.
7. Alekseeva, A.A., 2005. The second predicate in French: PhD Thesis, Voronezh State University, Voronezh, pp: 48.
8. Tatarchenko, S.N., 1998. About the character of temporary limitation of a sign of double predicate in the modern English language. TSPU bulletin. Liberal sciences series, 6: 39-41.
9. Huddleston, R., 2007. A Short Overview on English Syntax. The Univ. of Queensland.
10. Truswell, R. 2004. Attributive Adjectives and The Nominals They Modify. Dissertation for the Degree MPH. Univ. of Oxford, pp: 109.
11. Uličný, O., 2009. On Semipredicative Constructions Seen from the Standpoint of Double-Base Transformations and Complex Condensation. Information: Linguistics, 82(10): 70-88.
12. Fried, M., 2008. Constructions and Constructs: Mapping a Shift between Predication and Attribution. Construction and Language Change. Mouton de Gruyter: 47-79.
13. Blokh, M.Y., 2004. Theoretical Course of English Grammar. Moscow: "Vyshaya Shkola".
14. Giparaite, J., 2010. The Non-verbal Type of Small Clauses in English and Lithuanian. Oxford: Oxford Scholars Publishing, pp: 239.
15. Saurbayev, R.Zh. and K. M. Tekzhanov, 2013. Substitute Construction as an indicator of structurally-semantic expansion of sentence (as exemplified by English, Russian and Tatar languages). Life Science Journal, 10(10s): 30-35.
16. Saurbayev, R.Zh., 2013. The Tagseme as a Component of Structural Semantic Sentence Complexification. Middle East Journal of Scientific Research, 16(3): 432-436. IDOSI Publication.
17. Saurbayev, R.Zh., K.M. Tekzhanov, A.D. Amrenov and K.S. Ergaliey, 2013. On the Issue of Structure-Semantic and Predicative Features of Semi-Composite Sentences and Their Functions in the Bounds of Paradigmatic Syntax. Life Science Journal, 10(4): 1042-1050.
18. Peshkovsky, A.M. 1956. Russian syntax in scientific overview. Moscow, pp: 511.
19. Vafeev, R.A., 1983. The word order as a means of expressing entity, topical and stylistic information in Russian and Kirghiz languages, PhD Thesis, Alma-Ata, pp: 26.
20. Smirnitzyki, A.I. 1959. Syntax of the English language. M.: Progress Publishers, pp: 440.
21. Gvozdev, A.N. 1968. Modern Russian literary language, P. II. Moscow.
22. Irtenyeva, N.F., 1965. Grammar of the English language. Moscow: "Vysshaya Shkola", pp: 156.
23. Ilyish, B., 1971. The Structure of Modern English. Moscow: "Prosveschenye", pp: 365.
24. Zinina, Ju.M., 2011. Link verbs as the words of partial nomination (on the basis of English), PhD Thesis, Moscow State Pedagogical University, Moscow, pp: 25.
25. Mukhin, A.M., 1968. The structure of the sentences and their models. Leningrad: Nauka, pp: 277.
26. Shapkin, A.P., 1967. About one category of formal-content asymmetry in the language (on the basis of English language). Studies of syntax of modern English, 285: 17-24.
27. Irtenyeva, N.F., O.M. Barsova, M.Y. Blokh. and A.P. Shapkin, 1966. A Theoretical English Grammar (Syntax). Moscow, pp: 143.
28. Vlassova, Ju.N., 1970. Concerning the problem of compression on the level of composite sentence. Interacademic scientific conference on Romano-Germanic linguistics. Pyatigorsk: 21-23.
29. Reunova, O.I., 1967. Elliptical sentences in modern English, PhD Thesis, Rostov State University, Rostov-on-Don, pp: 48.

6/12/2014