

PHILOLOGY AND LINGUISTICS

Saurbayev R.Zh., Abildina Zh.B., Omarov N.R.,
Tekzhanov K.Kh.

SEMI-PREDICATIVE ATTRIBUTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS AS COMPONENT OF SEMANTICAL-STRUCTURAL COMPLICATION OF SENTENCE

Saurbayev R. Zh., Kazakhstan, Pavlodar State
Pedagogical Institute

Abildina Zh.B., Kazakhstan, Pavlodar State Pedagogical
Institute

Omarov N.R., Kazakhstan, Pavlodar State Pedagogical
Institute

Tekzhanov K.Kh., Kazakhstan, Pavlodar State
Pedagogical Institute

Abstract

The article considers the problem of syntax of complicated sentence in modern linguistics. The polypredicative and semi-predicative structures as component of semantic and structural complication is put forward in this research, one of the elements of this complication is polypredicative attributive constructions, which carry not only semantic weight, but stylistic and communicative one.

Keywords: polypredicative construction, semi-predicative construction, complicated sentence, semantic-structural complication.

Introductory. One of the elements of structural and semantic complications of the simple sentence is a syntactic structure, resulting in compression of complicated sentences, so-called poly-predicative defining structure.

Sentences such as *he lay sick*, *The sun rose red* is widely used in modern English. Such sentences like that are found in other

3d the International Conference on the Transformation of Education 2015

languages, for example, in Russian: *On lezhit bol'noy, On pal mertvym*. First sentences of this type have been described by A.A. Shakhmatov on the bases of the Russian language [1].

So far, among linguists there is no consensus as to which structural type this type of sentence belongs to [2;3;4]. Generally accepted opinion was that the sentence of this type belongs to simple sentences or to simple extended sentences [5].

A.A. Shakhmatov, and after him other Russian linguists consider them to be double-predicative sentences as to their general opinion, alongside with the predicate there is also a second word, which is directly related to the subject and is associated with it grammatically[1]. They called it the second predicate expressed by nominatives. Thus, a number of researchers believe that the predicate in this case - *lay sick* is a predicate definition [3], the same opinion is supported by T.N. Kalinichenko [6; 171]. S.N. Tatarchenko as the main distinguishing feature of double semantic predicates allocates full independence of its constituent elements [7; 40].

In English Linguistics constructions: *It's hot. These look new. I found it excellent. They seem lonely* are named attributive-predicative [8, 39-40]; [9, 109]; [10, 70-88]; [11,47-79], potentially predicative [12]. Yu. Giparayte in his monograph considers these constructions as sub-categorical frames in the light of comparative investigations on the bases of the English and Lithuanian languages [13].

In some studies, some linguists consider the double predicates as an integral complex predictive construction expressing a complex fully-predicative and semi-predicative design, where one is a matrix, and the other is further characterized as the state or action of the main predicate [14]; [15]; [16]. In a study of E.A. Alexeeva the problem of double-predicate sentence is defined as contaminated building with two partially overlapping propositions represented by two predicates, where the matrix is represented by a meaningful predicate verb, and the second focused on the same subject as the first, including both existential and material components. The first is the main verb and the second - as structurally dependent, so the semantic plans from the first [17; 7].

Many linguists differ only in the type definition of this predicate. A.M. Peshkovski, for example, saw it as a special kind of predicate - a real predicate [18; 249-254].

A similar opinion is shared by R.A. Waffev, considering these types of offers through the prism of real, relevant and stylistic information [19;15].

3d the International Conference on the Transformation of Education 2015

Considering proposals such as *The moon rose red; She went a young girl; she returned a grown up women*, A.I. Smirnitsky indicates the type of predicate they term "process-qualificative predicate." He notes that in such a meaningful predicate verb is at the same time copulas [20;117-118]. By analyzing similar Russian proposal He came as an engineer, A.N. Gvozdev says about the complex predicate, which combines the features and simple, and the predicate, but closer to the composite than a simple [21; 73-74]. N.F. Irtenyeva indicates that in sentences like *She goes out radiant*, conscious of being thoroughly up to date verb is not semantically connected with the nominal part of the predicate, and the latter is directly related to the subject on a par with the verb predicate. As suggested by N.F. Irtenyeva, in such cases, there is no reason to talk about the predicate and predicate rather call this type crossed or double [22; 215-216]. Considerable interest in the problem of so-called dual predicate shows B.A. Ilyish. He notes that in sentences like *He came home tired, She married young, He died a bachelor* remarkable verbs came, married, died retain their value, but the main content of the sentence is contained in the information transmitted nouns and adjectives, performs the function of a predicate term. B.A. Ilyish believes that the value of these sentences can be transmitted by other means, namely: *He was tired when he came home, She was young when she married, He was a bachelor when he died*; verb as the predicate, also serves as a link-verb. According to B.A. Ilyish such predicates form a special type of mixed predicate called double [23].

Some researchers have recognized the existence of a so-called dual-language predicate, note the possibility of use as the predicate in its composition of comparative phraseological units [24]. For example: *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 believe that these syntactic structures are attributive semi-predicative structures; however, they can be divided into two types: Identification semi-predicative structure with a key component of a noun and attributive semi-predicative structure with a key component of an adjective. Let us illustrate this with examples from the position of the English language: *The party arrived safe and sound* keyword adjective and a keyword noun *We parted the best of friends*.

Defining semi-predicative structures are transforms. The sentence *He died rich* contains two predicative lines that are interconnected close relationship, where one line is predicative

3d the International Conference on the Transformation of Education 2015

nuclear, matrix, while the second is more, semi-predicative carrying additional value determination. Thus, we can expand the sentence into two lines predicative *He died rich*, and *He was rich*. This can be proved by the possibility of transformation of the sentence in the following *When he died, he was rich*. It should also be regarded as transforms the following examples: *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*.

From the review of the scientific sources shows that "double-predicative" is regarded as simple two-part sentences, which are characterized by specific communication components.

There have been attempts to revise the interpretation of the sentence of this type, based on a classification of the sentence. This is reflected in the study of A.M. Mukhina "The structure of the sentences and their model," in which a lot of attention is paid to clarify the nature of sentences like *He came home tired* [24]. Sharing the need to review the doctrine of A.A. Shakhmatov of a two-part and one-compound sentences, he writes: "... It would be more consistent to say in cases of this kind is not a two-part and three-part of sentences: even as a member of the two-part two main sentences are grouped around it seconded members to form with them one or the other part of supply and are key members grouped around it seconded members, forming with them, however, are no longer two, but three of "[1].

Further, the issue of developing a syntactic context in the structure of proposals on nuclear and non-nuclear components and related models proposals AM Mukhin comes to the conclusion that the proposals of this type we are dealing with a three-term syntactic construction - between nuclear and non-nuclear one component. The first component of the proposal is characterized as nuclear, preditsiruemy twice, the second - as nuclear predicated, and the third - as a non-nuclear component is predicated [25].

It should be noted the tendency of some linguists explain the nature of the so-called *dvuhskazuemyh* sentences using transformational analysis. You can also refer to an article by A.P. Shapkina who calls such sentences "together-slave." In this case, A.P. Shapkin characterizes them as "derivatives of at least two elementary propositions as a result of the intersection in the general word with the same grammatical status (belonging to the same grammatical class), whose presence in the elementary propositions is essential for the derivation of a complex sentence. Inclusion of the proposed deformed by striking out the common elements"[27; 12 - 13].

3d the International Conference on the Transformation of Education 2015

To confirm his statements 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.*

Similarly, considering sentences of this type in "Theoretical English Grammar" N.F. Irtenev, O.M. Panther, M.J. Bloch, A.P. Shapkina which provides the following example: *We waited - We waited breathless. We were breathless.* According to these researchers, the product of the intersection in the general remarks are the following sentences: *The moon rose silvery over the dark forest. He sat silent over the letter* [28].

We believe that it is impossible to consider the sentences presented, and the like as "compound –complicated sentences ", as in the analyzed examples, it is difficult to talk about the existence of subordination relation in the fullest sense of the word. Proof of this can result in the transformation of this unit into two independent predicative lines that are linked composition.

Consequently, there is little evidence of this type of offer, complications subordinates. In our opinion, these designs are one of the cases of complications-penned suggestions, proposals have multiple predicates, which, in turn, is the result of applying multiple transformations to a number of consecutive primary offerings representing the deep structure of the proposal. Such structures can be viewed as a kind of syncretism, when one element of expression at the same time signals of two or more elements of the plan content.

Here are some examples of use in modern English language structures studied type: *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 the examples in the transformation of the data structure, we found that they are linked composition.

The analysis of these sentences suggests that they are surface structures, dating back to the two different types of deep structures, namely: NVi + NVIA.

There are also surface structures, which are based on the following underlying structure: NVi + NVIN. Wherein N is expressed in the surface structure, usually animate nouns. For example, in English: *He died a beggar. I lived coachman with Mrs. Reed...*

So, Z.S.Harris notes only those cases transformations of this type, which are carried out with the help of conjunctions. As can be seen from the above examples, these sentences are the result of

3d the International Conference on the Transformation of Education 2015

joining two asyndetic transforms. For example, the sentence *He stood motionless* can be represented as a product of the application to the deep structures and NVi NVIA series of transformational operations, such as the inclusive stack, crossing in the general component and elimination.

Thus, the structure *She stood motionless staring at him. (I. Murdoch)* may be deployed in a compound sentence *She stood and she was motionless.*

Each of the sentences included in the complications-essay goes to various types of deep structures.

Deep structures, which date back to the studied surface structures, are generated by two different bases (nuclear) structures NV and NVIC.

One cannot but agree with Y.V. Vlasova that the surface structure of the type studied - is the result of compression of compound sentences.

Thus, the elementary propositions that make up the sentence back to the different types of dual structures, namely NV and NVIC, characterized one-subjected unit because the sentences with composition are the sentences with one common subject; have the principle of simultaneity of two predicating signs

As a result of these conditions, a special type of structure, in which the third component are elliptical, containing new, additional information about the subject and presents the articulation with the previous component. In such sentences, usually a verb combines two functions: function notional verb and verb ligament function. In this case, more important is the value of the predictive member. Under these circumstances there is a loss of the notional verb semantics in a compressed structure. Thus, in the structure *He died a bachelor* in the value of predictive member of a bachelor in terms of content appears not objectivity and designation status. Perhaps this fact gave rise to criticism of the theory of double predicate, and attribution of this structure to the type of compound nominal predicate. The emergence of a modern language compressed structures of this kind is a consequence of the implementation of the principle of economy of language means, which causes the specific features of the use of these structures. In language there is a tendency to eliminate redundant information as possible.

R.A. Vaffev considers compressive verb forms, not only as a form of savings linguistic resources, but also as a means of stylization speech [19].

In our opinion, the second predicate is the only part, which contains new, additional information, the semantics definition,

3d the International Conference on the Transformation of Education 2015

modifying the first predicate, while making additional predicativity and subjecting a compound sentence structure compression. This allows providing fullness of thoughts expressed in the sentence structures studied.

Conclusion. As can be seen from the examples, defining structures are often expressed by forms of transferred nouns, adjectives and adverbs that distinguish the studied language. Universal design themselves are the same, which are designed to act as a means of compression of language structures in semi-predicative units, complicating both structurally and semantically simple sentences.

References

- [1]. Shakhmatov AA The syntax of the Russian language. - M., "URSS", 2001. - 624 p.
- [2]. Tabachenko L.V. 2011. The role of saturated and effectiveness in the development of inside-predicate prefixing // Southern Federal University. Philology. № 2. – pp: 114-120.
- [3]. Bliznichenko M.V. 1954. Predicative definition, its expression and function in modern English: PhD thesis - Moscow, pp: 26.
- [4]. Pavlyukovets M.A. 2011. Syncretism on morphological and syntactic levels of the English language as a manifestation of the speech economy: the functional aspect: PhD thesis - Rostov-on-Don, pp: 30.
- [5]. Kobrina N.A. 2006. English Grammar: Morphology. Syntax. Moscow, pp: 456.
- [6]. Kalinichenko T.N. 2011. Predicative definition in design with a meaningful verb in modern French language // Bulletin of KNU Grammar and lexicology. - Vol. №848. – pp: 169 - 174.
- [7]. Tatarchenko S.N. 1998. On the nature of a temporary delimitation feature dual predicate in modern English // Bulletin of Tomsk State Pedagogical University. Humanities. - №6. – pp: 39 - 41.
- [8]. Huddleston D. A. 2009. Syntactic Study Based on an Analysis of Scientific Texts. – Cambridge, pp: 343.
- [9]. Truswell R. 2004. Attributive Adjectives and The Nominals They Modify. Dissertation for the Degree MPh. Univ. of Oxford. pp: 109.
- [10]. Uličný O. 2009. On Semipredicative Constructions Seen from the Standpoint of Double-Base Transformations

3d the International Conference on the Transformation of Education 2015

- and Complex Condensation. Information: Linguistics. Volume 10, # 82. pp: 70–88.
- [11]. Fried M. 2008. Constructions and Constructs: Mapping a Shift between Predication and Attribution. *Construction and Language Change*. Mouton de Gruyter, pp: 47 – 79.
- [12]. B.M. Blokh 2006. *Theoretical Grammar of English*, Moscow, pp: 446.
- [13]. Gepraite J. 2010. *The Non-verbal Type of Small Clauses in English and Lithuanian*. Oxford Scholars Publishing. Oxford, pp: 239.
- [14]. Saurbayev R.Zh., Tekzhanov K.Kh. (2013) Substitute Construction as an Indicator of Structurally-Semantic Expansion of Sentence (as Exemplified by English, Russian and Tatar Languages) *Life Science*. 10 (10s). pp: 30-35.
- [15]. Saurbayev R.Zh., Tekzhanov K.Kh., Ergaliyev K.S, Amrenov A.D. & N.R. Omarov(2013) To the Problem of Delimitation of the Expanded Sentence as an Independent Syntactic Category in Modern Linguistics) *Life Science*. 10 (12s). pp: 464-474.
- [16]. Tekzhanov K.Kh., Ergaliyev K.S, & A.D. Amrenov (2013) On the Issue Structure-Semantic and Predicative Features of Semi-Composite Sentences and Their Functions in the Bounds of Paradigmatic Syntax. *Life Science Journal*; 10 (4), pp: 1042-1050.
- [17]. Alekseev E. A. 2005. *The second verb in French*: PhD thesis, Voronezh, pp: 48.
- [18]. Peshkovski A.M. 1956. *Russian syntax in a scientific light*. – Moscow, pp: 511.
- [19]. Wafeev R.A, and R.J. Saurbaev 1999. *Complicated sentences as an independent unit of syntax (based on the present-day. English and Tatar Languages.) // The study of different types and genres of the text*. Intercollege. - Surgut, pp: 57-66.
- [20]. Smiritsky A.I. 1957 *Syntax of the English Language*. Moscow, pp:
- [21]. Gvozdev A.N. 1968. *The modern Russian literary language*. - Part II – Moscow.
- [22]. Irtenyeva N.F. 1975. *Informative division of the sentence. // Theoretical problems of syntax of modern Indo-European languages*. - Leningrad, pp: 29 - 32.
- [23]. Ilyish B. 1971. *The Structure of Modern English*. “Prosveschenye” Moscow, pp: 365.

**3d the International Conference on the
Transformation of Education 2015**

- [24]. Zinina Y.M. 2011. Link verbs as words incomplete nomination in the English language: Dissertation for the Degree MPh. - Moscow, pp: 257.
- [25]. Mukhin A.M. 1968. Sentence structure and model. - Leningrad, pp: 205.
- [26]. Shapkin A.P. 1967. One category of formal content asymmetry in the language (in the English language) // Studies in the syntax of modern English. - №285. - S. 17 - 24.
- [27]. Irtenyeva N.F., Barsova O.M., Blokh. M.Y., Shapkin A.P. A Theoretical English Grammar (Syntax). Moscow, pp: 143.