

UDC 811.133.1'371

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2023.29.1.33>

**SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF THE CONSTITUENT ELEMENTS OF THE SECONDARY
PREDICATIVE COMPLEX $SN1 - SV (V - SN2 - X)$**

**СЕМАНТИЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ СКЛАДОВИХ ЕЛЕМЕНТІВ ВТОРИННОГО
ПРЕДИКАТИВНОГО КОМПЛЕКСУ $SN1 - SV (V - SN2 - X)$**

Zelena Iu.L.,

orcid.org/0000-0003-3897-863X

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Assistant at the Department of French and Spanish Philology

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

Determining the prerequisites for the emergence of predicative relations in linguistic constructions in order to establish the possibility of the existence of valence restrictions and the relationship between the semantic content of verbs is the task of this linguistic research. The aim of the study is to perform a complex analysis of attributive constructions in order to identify their productive predicative potential in modern French, based on the theory of valence, verbal semantics and secondary predication. The present article is dedicated to the semantic analysis of the constituent elements in sentences containing attributive complement which form the secondary predicative complex $SN1 - SV (V - SN2 - X)$. The structural and semantic characterisation of the types of attributive constructions is carried out in the context of two initial theories – the status of the referent and the actual division of the sentence. An independent study of the relationship between the manifestations of predication and the semantic and syntactic structure of the sentence is made by determining the valence

properties of attributive verbs. The differences between types of constructions with an attributive complement are described and illustrated, and it is established that there is a direct connection between the type of attributive sentences and the appearance of predicative relations. Given the types of interpretation of attributive sentences and, based on the results of contextual analysis, it became possible to prove that change of argumentative structure in verbal group gives a reason to treat attributive verb with elements SN2 (object complement), X (attributive complement) as a predicative focus of these sentences. As a result of this analysis, it was found that the distributional environment and the degree of homogeneity of verbs are pivotal in the formation of the secondary predicative complex from the semantic and syntactic point of view.

Key words: secondary predicate complex, category of attribution, category of predication, predicative core, argumentative focus, predicative focus, distributional environment, valency limitations.

Визначення передумов виникнення предикативних відношень у мовних конструкціях з метою встановлення можливості існування валентних обмежень та зв'язку між семантичним наповненням дієслів є завданням цієї лінгвістичної розвідки. Метою дослідження є комплексний аналіз атрибутивних конструкцій для виявлення їх продуктивного предикативного потенціалу в сучасній французькій мові на основі теорії валентності, дієслівної семантики та вторинної предикації. Цю статтю присвячено семантичному аналізу складових елементів у реченнях з атрибутивним додатком прямого та непрямого додатка, які утворюють вторинний предикативний комплекс SN1 – SV (V – SN2 – X). Структурно-семантичну характеристику типів атрибутивних конструкцій здійснено в контексті двох вихідних теорій – статусу референта та актуального членування речення. Проведено самостійне дослідження взаємозв'язку між проявами предикації та семантико-синтаксичною структурою речення шляхом визначення валентних властивостей атрибутивних дієслів, їх семантичного наповнення та синтаксичної сполучуваності. Описано та проілюстровано відмінності між типами конструкцій з атрибутивним додатком і семантико-синтаксичною структурою речення та встановлено, що існує прямий зв'язок між типом атрибутивного речення і проявом предикативних відношень. Враховуючи типи інтерпретації атрибутивних речень і спираючись на результати контекстуального аналізу, вдалося довести, що зміна аргументної структури дієслівної групи дає підстави розглядати атрибутивне дієслово з елементами SN2 (атрибутивний додаток додатка), X (атрибутивний додаток) як предикативний фокус цих речень. В результаті проведеного аналізу встановлено, що середовище дистрибуції та ступінь однорідності дієслів є визначальними у формуванні вторинного предикативного комплексу з семантико-синтаксичного погляду.

Ключові слова: вторинний предикативний комплекс, категорія атрибутивності, категорія предикації, предикативне ядро, аргументний фокус, предикативний фокус, дистрибутивне оточення, валентні обмеження.

Problem definition. The study of attributive constructions, from the point of view of their predicative properties, is justified from logical, philosophical, general linguistic and traditional grammatical points of view, because the concepts of attributivity and predicativity are mutually complementary and have a deep context. However, in line with the changing theoretical approaches in the treatment of grammatical phenomena, the understanding of the role and place of the phenomenon of attributivity in French is also changing.

Nowadays, in modern linguistic circles, different terms take place: attributive complement, attribute, predicate complement, verbal predicate, predicate attribute, etc. The difficulty in understanding this grammatical phenomenon in French is due to its functioning at the junction of several grammatical processes: attributivity, co-referentiality and predication.

In our study we have focused our attention on the analysis of the mutual influence of the categories of attributivity and predication, namely the preconditions for the emergence of secondary predication relations due to the predicative potential of sentences with an attributive complement.

However, recent studies have also been talking about differentiating these two concepts in order to determine the role of semantic and syntactic factors, on the one hand, and the communicative intentions of the speaker, on the other hand.

In the linguistic research, predication has always been considered ambiguously, representing a complex set of linguistic phenomena, inseparably linked to the concept of modality, as the speaker, relying on the laws of logic, selects options of linguistic structures in order to better express his own opinion.

Analysis of recent research and publications.

In our study, we are based on the linguistic works of J.-I. Pollock [11], F. Higgins [4], C. Lambrecht [6], N. Rüwe [13] and recent studies of this issue by such modern foreign authors as M. Pierard [10], C. Blanche-Benvenist [1], M. Van Petengem [14], I. Roy [12] and others.

When considering predication as a centre which helps to realize the structural and semantic minimum of any statement, the questions of verbal predicates including the use of an attributive complement in its valency position, do not lose their relevance. Taking into consideration the complementary influence of predicative and attributive categories in a language, we deem it reasonable to continue analyzing factors of predicative relations in sentences, in particular, with an attributive complement (hereinafter: attributive sentences or attributive constructions).

Task definition. Taking into account the need to identify the preconditions for predicative relations in attributive constructions, in this research we aim at analyzing the modification of information structure and referent status in sentences containing an attributive complement, investigating their types of inter-

pretation, and coming to certain conclusions about the complementary influence of predicative and attributive categories in the language.

Achieving this goal in turn implies the following tasks:

1) refer to existing classifications of attributive sentence types in the linguistic approaches, based on their predicative potential;

2) conduct a comparative analysis of approaches and differences regarding the interpretation and classification of attributive sentences;

3) perform our own contextual analysis (based on electronic catalogues CONTAGRAM and FRANTEXT) of sentences that contain an attributive complement in order to analyze the constituent elements of the secondary predicative complex $SN1 - SV (V - SN2 - X)$ and clarify the role of $SN2$ and X elements when the informational structure and status of the verb V changes.

Presentation of the main content. In the structure of French attributive sentences of type $SN1 - SV (V - SN2 - X)$, where $SN1$ is the nominal subject syntagm, SV is the verb syntagm which contains: V – predicate verb, $SN2$ – object complement, X – attributive complement (AC), the actual combination of the two existing predicative relations, namely between the subject ($SN1$) and the verb syntagm $SV (V - SN2 - X)$, in general, and its elements $SN2$ and X in particular, allows us to speak of occurrence of the secondary predication in sentences with this structure.

Despite the apparent transparency of such constructions at first sight, contemporary researchers have much to add by looking at them from different perspectives. First of all, here are three approaches to analysing the schematic structure of sentences that contain AC (attributive complement), according to the transformational, syntagmatic and argumentative approaches:

(1) $SN1 - V - (SN2 - X) \rightarrow$ *Jean croyait (sa mère malade).*

(2) $SN1 - V - (SN2) - (X) \rightarrow$ *Jean croyait (sa mère) (malade).*

(3) $SN1 - (V - X) - SN2 \rightarrow$ *Jean (croyait malade) sa mère.*

Thus, in sentence (1), in the graphical representation $SN1 - V - (SN2 - X)$, the element $(SN2 - X)$ is treated as a complete complement of the verb. In sentence (2), with the representation $SN1 - V - (SN2) - (X)$, elements $(SN2)$ and (X) represent two separate complements of the verb, which in turn can also be analysed differently:

1) according to the basics of classical transformational analysis, as recalled by K. Muller [9, p. 32],

referring to authors such as M. Rosenberg, M. Gross and J. Fokognier, transformation consists in the construction of the following steps: elimination of the verb *être* and relative pronoun *que*, transposition of the subject of the object clause into a complementary position (4), (4'):

(4) *Je croyais (que Marie était honnête) => (4') Je croyais (Marie) (honnête);*

2) according to more modern trends in linguistic thought, which disassociate themselves from transformation approaches with the techniques of simplification, reduction or transformation, attributive constructions with verbs like *croire* are characterized, according to the linguist C. Guimier, by "a discrepancy between the number of additions of verb subcategories and the number of arguments in the argumentative structure" [5, p. 125].

Nowadays, some researchers agree with this approach and consider the elements $SN2$ and X as two separate constituents of the verbal syntagm $SV (V - SN2 - X)$, which requires a more in-depth semantic analysis of the pair $(SN2 - X)$. In general, the debate among linguists often revolves around the question of whether the two units of construction $SN2$ and X each function as a syntactic complement of the verb, or, conversely, they can be considered as two constituents of one general complement associated with the subject, which is considered the predicative core of the whole sentence.

According to the goals and tasks we set at the beginning of this study, we think it is appropriate to begin by analyzing the classifications of attributive sentence types and their interpretations already existing in the foreign linguistic environment, by such researchers as J.-I. Pollock [11], F. Higgins [4] and K. Lambrecht [6]. This analysis will obviously allow us to further investigate the peculiarities of sentences with attributive complement and to establish which types of sentences reveal the presence of a marked informational structure, an argumentative focus proving the presence of secondary predication.

The first attempt to analyse and reflect on the differences in the functioning of sentences of type (5) and (6) in English and French, and to find arguments to explain them, was the work of the J.-I. Pollock, researcher of the Anglo-Saxon school [11, p. 132]:

(5) *Cet homme est un professeur.*

(6) *Cet homme est professeur.*

Among the first reasons, the linguist referred to the possibility of their different interpretations: predicative (5) and identifying (6). The first appears in a subjective and situational interpretation, while the second represents an objective characteristic of

a person or object and can manifest itself in different variants of nominative expression [11, c. 132] (5'):

(5') *Cet homme est mon cousin/le voisin de Paul/Jean/un linguiste qui a obtenu les plus hautes récompenses.*

J.-I. Pollock pointed out the importance and necessity of this distinction of the types of interpretations of attributive sentences. In his opinion, when sentences of type (6) are interpreted predicatively, they can, from the semantic point of view, also be paraphrased by sentences of type (7), which in turn become close in content to sentences of type (8):

(6) *Cet homme est un professeur.*

(7) *Cet homme enseigne.*

(8) *Cet homme est professeur.*

The second type of interpretation, namely the identifying one, can best be traced back to the following variants of the sentence (9a.-9d.):

(9a.) *Cet homme est mon cousin.*

(9b.) *Cet homme est le voisin de Paul.*

(9c.) *Cet homme est Jean.*

(9d.) *Cet homme est un linguiste qui a obtenu les plus hautes récompenses.*

Therefore, according to J.-I. Pollock, in this case we are not talking about a semantic difference between sentences, but rather about different interpretations of them at the level of the statement, because there are pragmatic interpretations, namely the use of descriptive properties with which the subject is characterised [11, p. 148].

The linguist F. Higgins was the next linguist to examine attributive sentences and propose their first classification, identifying four basic types (10–13) [4, p. 141]:

1) predicate-type sentences

(10) *Pierre Beaurivage est intelligent.*

2) specification-type sentences

(11) *Mon meilleur ami est Pierre Beaurivage.*

3) identifying-type sentences

(12) *Cet homme est Pierre Beaurivage.*

4) sentences with attributive equivalence

(13) *Pierre Beaurivage est mon meilleur ami.*

This typology was the first to take into account the nature of the relations between the subject-referent and the predicate. In particular, the presence or absence of an article and its type, was considered, according to the linguist, to be primarily related to the semantic differences that can be found in different contexts (use of the interrogative or negative form, passivisation, pronominalisation, etc.). For attributive sentences of the predicative type, their main semantic property has also been determined: the expression of the predicate function with respect to element *X* (the attributive complement).

In more modern studies (I. Roy) [12] we can additionally find a division of this type of attributive sentences into three subclasses: describing (adjectival forms), characterizing (substantive forms without an article) and defining (substantive forms with an article) [13, p. 134]. However, in our opinion, this approach corresponds to the previously proposed theory of D. Davidson, according to which each predicate is a predetermined by some event or state [3, p. 83].

In later studies, linguists started referring to the distinction suggested by F. Higgins, but there were also those (N. Ruwe) [13] who criticised his approach and thought that both specification and equivalence sentences in general could be reduced to identifying sentences and then, in general, the analysis would deal with two main types of sentences – predicative and identifying types [13, p. 21].

In our opinion, this grouping of types is not entirely appropriate, since taking into account the difference between them is extremely important in the syntactic and semantic analysis of attributive sentences in terms of establishing predicative relations in them.

In its turn, interesting for analysis and comparison with other classifications is the typology of sentences of K. Lambrecht, a representative of the American school of linguistics, which is based on the theory of marked information structures and the concept of the information structure of a statement. It was this author who first pointed out that a necessary condition for expressing the information structure is the difference between the statement that already contains each sentence and the presupposition [6, p. 55]. In other words, for a sentence to be a carrier of a certain information structure, it must contain an element of the statement unknown to the interlocutor. K. Lambrecht calls this element the "focus of the sentence" and, depending on its syntactic load, distinguishes the following three types: predicative, argumentative and frastic. According to C. Lambrecht, depending on the different types of focus, different types of sentences can also be distinguished, the pragmatic organization (information structure) and communicative purposes of which differ significantly [6, p. 59]. Thus, sentences with predicative focus, or sentences of the type "topic" – "comment", are characterized by the fact that the predicate in them represents the focus of the statement. In terms of their communicative function, they aim to make a certain "comment" on the "topic" in the sentence.

It is also necessary to remind ourselves of C. Lambrecht's distinction between marked and unmarked sentences. The researcher notes that sentences with a canonical word order (predicate-com-

plement) represent an unlabelled pragmatic structure, while he defines sentences with an argumentative focus as those of an identifying type. This is because their communicative function is to present a referent that identifies the argument and denotes an overt presupposition. Different from the previous type of sentences in which the predicate is part of the presupposition, sentences with an argumentative focus are often a syntactic structure in which the latter coincides with the syntactic function of the subject. It is in such sentences that deviations from the direct word order are allowed and marked syntactic structures appear [6, p. 61]. Therefore, we have a confirmation that word order in a sentence is one of the main parameters to distinguish between different types of sentences, including attributive ones.

In this article, having carried out our own analysis of a number of typical sentences with an attributive complement construction, we can speak of certain differences in terminology. F. Higgins states that "the inversion of sentence members connected by a predicative link is not acceptable in predicate-type sentences, identifying-type sentences and in the sentences with attributive equivalence" [4, p. 123]. He adds that it is the sentences of the specification-type that contain a marked information structure that reveals the presence of an argumentative focus. When comparing these features with C. Lamrecht's typology, it becomes apparent that they correspond to the description of identifying-type sentences. In our study, however, we will stick to the typology of the first author, as it seems to us more reasonable in terms of the choice of appropriate terminology.

In particular, according to F. Higgins' definition, specification-type sentences aim to "specify a certain meaning of a fundamentally defined variable" [4, p. 128]. A representative of the modern Belgian school of linguistics, M. Van Petengem partly agrees with him, suggesting, however, the following clarification: "The specification sentence in French, in general, is an inversion of the subject and the predicate" [14, c. 102]. On the basis of this statement, she also identifies favourable conditions for the emergence of the attributive syntagma, in particular it refers to the anteposition to the subject (14):

(14) *La seule matière possible pour l'exécution du monument est le ciment.*

As we can see from example (14), we get once again a confirmation that in specification-

type sentences, the proper subject provides new information in the sentence and is its focus of the utterance. In our study, we can choose exactly this type of attributive sentences and determine the fact of accepting the inversion of elements *SN2* (complement) and *X* (attributive complement) in specification-type sentences as one of the grounds for the occurrence of secondary predication in them.

Among the corpus of examples we analyzed, taken from CONTAGRAM and FRANTEXT electronic databases, we found that out of the total list of attributive verbs with direct and indirect complement AC, relatively few of them allow the inversion of these elements. The percentage of verbs that allow both the direct ordering of *SN2* and *X* elements in the attributive construction and the inversion of these components was 45% of the number of verbs analysed. Interestingly, two different subclasses can be distinguished among them: verbs expressing judgement and evaluation (*juger, trouver, estimer, considérer, croire, penser, regarder comme, tenir pour, traiter en*) and causative verbs (*laisser, rendre, faire, garder*). It's important to note that classical grammarians emphasize that only a limited number of verbs allow the introduction of indirect complement AC into a sentence.

Conclusions. In our study, we adhere to the opinion of those linguists who argue that when forming the second part (*V-SN2-X*) of the secondary predicative complex *SN1-SV(V-SN2-X)* it's should be first of all taking into account the distributional environment and the degree of homogeneity of verbs. Also, when we tried to eliminate the element *X* from the secondary predicative complex, we found that this leads to discontinuity and uncertainty in the sentence, since, given the actant node. This gave us grounds to assert that the elimination of one of the constituent elements from this complex, at the semantic level, tantamount to the elimination of attributive predication from the sentence as a whole, which proves the fact of its presence in such constructions.

Therefore, the prospect of further research into constructions with an attributive complement in the context of secondary predication appears to be justified. First of all, this is due to the fact that many aspects remain to be established in systematically determining both the status and the exhaustive list of verbs that can be used within a verbal syntagm in sentences with an attributive complement, considering above all their valency limitations.

REFERENCES:

1. Blanche-Benveniste C. Préliminaires à une étude de l'apposition dans la langue parlée. *Langue française. Nouvelles recherches sur l'apposition*. 2000. № 125. C. 60–71.
2. Boone A. Les complétives et la modalisation. Paris : DE GRUYTER, 1996. 255 c.

3. Davidson D. The Logic form of Action Sentences. *Rescher. The Logic of Decision and Action*. University of Pittsburgh Press., 1967. С. 81–95.
4. Higgins F.R. The pseudo-cleft Construction in English. New York : Garland, 1979. 300 с.
5. Guimier C. La thématization dans les langues. *Langage et société. Actes du colloque de Caen*. № 9.1999. С. 120–134.
6. Lambrecht K. Prédication seconde et structure informationnelle: la relative de perception comme construction représentative. *Langue française. La prédication seconde*. № 127. 2000. С. 49–67.
7. Lamiroy B., Melis L. Les copules ressemblent-elles aux auxiliaires? Amsterdam : Benjamins, 2003. 217 с.
8. Martin F. Les prédicats statifs. Étude sémantique et pragmatique. Bruxelles : Duculot, 2008. 336 с.
9. Muller C. Classes de verbes français transitifs à extension attributive : les opérateurs supplétifs. *Langage et référence. Mélanges offerts à Kerstin Jonasson à l'occasion de ses soixante ans*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. 2001. С. 419–429.
10. Pierrard M. Paramètres pour l'interprétation et le classement des constructions à attribut de l'objet. *Langage et référence. Mélanges offerts à Kerstin Jonasson à l'occasion de ses soixante ans*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. 2001. С. 497–507.
11. Pollock J-Y. Sur quelques propriétés des phrases copulatives en français. *Langue française*. № 58. 1983. С. 89–125.
12. Roy I. Typologie des prédicats non-verbaux dans les phrases copulatives et théorie de la prédication. *Prédicats, prédication et structures prédicatives*. Paris : Cellule de Recherche Linguistique. 2009. С. 131–146.
13. Ruwet N. Grammaire des insultes et autres études. Paris : Seuil, 1982. 349 с.
14. Van Peteghem M. Les phrases copulatives dans les langues romanes. Wilhelmsfeld : Gottfried egert verlag., 1991. 207 с.