

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2019.19.06>

UDC: 811.14'06



**Tetiana V. Liubchenko**  
Kyiv National Linguistic University,  
Kyiv, Ukraine

## PREDICATE AND OBJECTIVE SYNTAXEME IN THE SEMANTIC AND SYNTACTIC STRUCTURE OF A SENTENCE IN MODERN GREEK

### **Bibliographic Description:**

Liubchenko, T. V. (2019). Predicate and Objective Syntaxeme in the Semantic and Syntactic Structure of a Sentence in Modern Greek. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 19. P. 90–108. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2019.19.06>

### **Abstract**

*The relevance of the proposed study arose from the necessity to define the correlation between the morphologic and syntactic categories of the verb; disclose the functional characteristics of this part of speech that defines the structure of the sentence, the implementation of word formation intentions of the word and construction of the text as an integral unit of the communicative syntax. The article observes the major types of predicates, existing in Modern Greek. The author has coined the lexical content, morphological arrangement as well as the syntactic behavior of objective syntaxemes. At the semantic and syntactic level, the objective syntaxemes hold the position of right-sided strongly controlled member of the sentence. Prototype objective syntaxeme is the causative with a categorical seme expressing motivation of occurrence of the signs of substances. In Modern Greek, causative verbs are represented by the verbs of one lexeme; the verbs of different lexemes; the verbs created using word-formation instruments. Causatives represented by the verbs of one lexeme are interpreted by author as verbs with the variable valence. Verbs with the variable valence include those in which the morphological form itself creates the transitive and intransitive constructions without changing its voice affiliation Word-formation transformative of verbs with the variable valence is represented by the adjective-based and noun-derived verbs. This description enables the preparation of the functional grammar of Modern Greek, which is an urgent task of Modern hellinistic. In common language sense, the interpretation of the study results is important to identify the correlation between the semantic and syntactic structure of the sentence, to determine the semantic types of predicates and to classify the objective syntaxemes.*

**Keywords:** *structure of the sentence, communicative syntax, predicate, objective syntaxeme, functional grammar.*

### **1. Introduction.**

The long-term scientific studies of the linguists on the analysis of sentence as a unit of language system (V. Admoni, Y. Andersh, O. Bondarko, I. Vykhovanets, A. Zahnitko, G. Zolotova, G. Helbih, S. Katsnelson, T. Masytska, M. Stepanova, L. Tesnière) indicate the presence of controversial issues, including the prominent problem of determining the relations of the sentence components. In the sphere of problems of the sentence theory, the theory of valence, the inter-level category determined with the semantic of the verb and closely connected with syntactic and morphological levels of the language, is actual.

The verb that serves as predicate in a sentence connects objects, signs, location, time, actions, processes, occurring in the surrounding reality into one. "Syntagmatic field of the verb" (a range of subject-object, subject-object-recipient relations etc.) covers categorical values of transitive / intransitive property, active/passive, reciprocity, reflexive, the whole complex of the sentence structure that implements semantic potencies of the verb (Zahnitko, 1990: 10–11). At the semantic level, arguments (semanteme components) fill semantic slots of the verb-predicate, which on the syntactic level is an organizing member of sentences with actant that differ in their functions (Zahnitko, 1993: 9; Zahnitko, 1996: 8). Thus, the verb qualifies the role status and hierarchy of participants of the situation and programs a positional model of the sentence. The predicate certainly is the organizing center of an expression; however, the predicate itself determines the type of situation and a set of its arguments, and while in the proposition, its participants to some extent influence the type of predicate.

Hellenistic still has many unresolved issues relating to qualification of the sentence structure in different tiers, that demonstrate *the topicality* of the research. This necessitates an in-depth study of the Modern Greek verbs in order to determine the correlation between components of the sentence structures with objective reality. Multidimensional analysis of the verb is in line with the triple criterion of linguistic unit interpretation (Zolotova, 2001: 19), proposed in Modern linguistics, in which semantics, syntax and morphology are in seamless interaction. This description will enable the preparation of the functional grammar of Modern Greek, which is an urgent task of Modern hellenistic.

### **2. Aim and Objectives.**

*The aim of the article* is to detect the predicate and objective syntaxeme in the semantic and syntactic structure of a sentence in Modern Greek.

The interpretation of the results, based on Modern Greek material, is important to identify the correlation between the semantic and syntactic structures of the sentence, to determine the semantic types of predicates and to classify the objective syntaxemes in general. The illustrative material of the study consists of 5245 verbs selected with continuous sampling method from the Modern Greek dictionaries: Dictionary of Modern Greek (Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής γλώσσας), Modern Greek Dictionary; Dictionary of Modern Greek Demotic (Νέο ελληνικό λεξικό. Λεξικό της σύγχρονης ελληνικής δημοτικής γλώσσας).

### **3. Levels of a Sentence Structure.**

In Modern Ukrainian linguistics, sentences are analyzed on four levels: *proper semantic* (reflecting the logic (predicate-argument) structure and common to all languages); *semantic and syntactic* (reflecting the content of the expression, based on syntactic relations between parts of the sentence); *formal grammatical (proper syntactic)* (includes syntactic relations between parts of the sentence, and parts of the sentence distinguished on the basis of syntactic relations); *proper communicative* (reflecting the dual nature of the actual sentence division, helps a three-tiered language structure of the sentence to adapt itself to the

speech conditions, communicative orientation of the text, main purpose of the expression) (Vykhovanets, 1983: 7–8, 57, 125–130).

Each semantic and syntactic structure of the verb is correlated to a certain logical-semantic structure. Creating sentences, the speaker relies upon a positional semantic-syntactic model.

Lomtev mentioned that “Positional model of a sentence is a finished unity, it is reproduced in speech, not created, so the sentence is a unit of the language, not speech. The one, who knows words, their forms and morphemes, does not know the language yet. Units of language are not only words, their forms and morphemes, but also positional models of the sentence. The sentence is a unit of the language exactly because it is a ready positional model, positional structure” (Lomtev, 1958: 125).

Just as Katsnelson and Meshchaninov, Lednei mentions that the subject-predicate structure of a judgment, which combines different logical options of the propositional function has different formal means of the verbal expression (Lednei, 2003: 5–6).

Kibrik (2004) believes that material of a cognitive structure is a notion of the situation and participants. The researcher differentiates between the following types of situations with participants: 1) process (Processant); 2) action (Agence, Patience); 3) thought (Speaker, Content); 4) feeling (Experience center, Stimuli); 5) possessivity (Possessor, Owning); 6) localization (Localized, Place); 7) description (Essence, Descriptor); 8) existence (Existing); 9) identification (Identifier, Identified); 10) name (Identifier, Identified). The prototype basis of a situation in most languages is action with nuclear participants: Agence, Patience (p. 14–15).

When speech acts are studied from the viewpoint of generative semantics, three components of the sentence model are distinguished. The first component, “external situational”, is associated with the value correlated with the situation and information transmitted to the recipient. On the semantic-syntactic level, the situation is reflected by a proposition consisting of a predicate and its actants. The most important are actants of a predicate correlated with its valence. The second component is act and speech one, determined by pragmatic factors. Its essence is that the participants of communication known specifics of a situation in which an act of communication takes place. The difficulty in defining this component is that it is usually not expressed materially. The third component is communicative, associated with the recipient's strategy, his attitude to the message (Kibrik, 2004: 14–15).

Judgment as a propositional function is expressed on the syntactic level in parts of the sentence, and its subject-predicate structure – in the logical and grammatical structure of the sentence. This shows national and language specificity and life subjectively expressive speech colors of the sentence.

In Modern Greek researches, as a rule, block diagrams of sentences are given only on the formal grammatical level: Y-P, Y-P-A, Y-P-EA, Y-P-ΠΑ, Y-P-EA-A, Y-ΣΡ-K, where Y – υποκείμενο, P – ρήμα, A – άμεσο αντικείμενο, EA – έμμεσο αντικείμενο, ΠΑ – προτασιακό αντικείμενο, ΣΡ – συνδετικό ρήμα, K – κατηγορούμενο (Σαραφίδου, 2003: 37–43).

Analysis of the literature shows that Greek (especially domestic) Hellenistics lacks integrated researches of the functional-categorical apparatus of the verb in general. There is only one in-depth study of morphological categories of the verb: functional grammar by Kleris and Bambiniotis (Γραμματική της Νέας Ελληνικής. Δομολειτουργική – Επικοινωνιακή (II Το ρήμα της Νέας Ελληνικής. Η οργάνωση του μηνύματος), where the researchers single out predicates of action (ο πυρήνας που δηλώνει πράξη) denoting an action changing in time, and predicates of state (ο πυρήνας που δηλώνει κατάσταση)

denoting an unchanged state (Κλαίρης, 2005: 168–169). However, it should be noted that the semantic and syntactic-semantic tiers of the sentence in this paper are identified. This, in our opinion, is due to the fact that researchers rely solely on the theory by L. Tesnière, who presents one-tier model of the sentence without differentiating between the formal and semantic aspects (in contrast to the two-tier model (Silnickij, 2006)).

Certain aspects of analysis of the syntactic structure of the sentence are disclosed in articles, which methodological framework is based on transformational analysis (Giannakidou, 1997; Lascaratou, 1985). In theses of speeches at conferences Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou present analysis of sentences with pronouns duplicated using the method of direct components (Alexiadou, 1997; Anagnostopoulou, 1995; Anagnostopoulou, 1997; Theofanopoulou-Kontou, 1985; Αναγνωστοπούλου, 1992). The issue of types of alternations with morphological load, specifically, morphemes of the verb status are reflected in the work of D. Brian (Μπράιαν, 1992: 91).

Zombolou classifies predicates depending on the type characteristics of the verbal action: 1) Διαδικαστικά (procedural): Εκπλήρωσης (action-completion) – denoting action with a specific purpose that continues and ends when the purpose is achieved (χτίζω ένα σπίτι, ανοίγω το παράθυρο); Δράσης (action-action) – denoting action not limited in time (τρέχω, περπατώ); 2) Μη διαδικαστικά (non-procedural): Επιτέλεσης (action-resultative) – denoting non-continued action (βρίσκω, χάνω); Κατάστασης (action-state) – denoting being in a certain state (είμαι άρρωστη, ερωτευμένη) (Ζόμπολου, 1997: 235).

In Greek scientific literature, there is no finally defined term to interpret the concepts of “argument”, “actant”; it should also be emphasized that these terms are generally not recorded in reference works and encyclopedic literature (Μάντας, 2006; Παυλίδου, 2005). Based on the reference analysis, the term “μετέχων” (argument) is used to indicate “a person or object involved in the action or being in a certain state” (Κλαίρης, 2005: 383). A criterion for determining semantic roles of arguments in the functional grammar by Kleris and Bambiniotis is the degree of interference between the argument and the action. Theoretical difference between actants and arguments is not substantiated in the paper. The researchers established three kinds of arguments:

1) arguments that influence the predicate-core of the communication: cause, define, perform an action. These are such roles as an actor, cause, instrument;

2) arguments influenced by the action. These are such roles as object, creation, being, recipient;

3) arguments that neither influence the predicate nor are influenced by an action. These are roles such as neutral actant, place (Κλαίρης, 2005: 200).

The term “όρισμα” is used by some scientists to denote actant “semantically dependent on verbs” (Κλαίρης, 2005: 384; Σαραφίδου, 2003: 35), and by others – as a component of the logical structure of the sentence (Σετάτος, 1997: 204). The term “συμπλήρωμα” is interpreted as “denotation of all actants except subject” (Κλαίρης, 2005: 389; Σαραφίδου, 2003: 33; Χατζηβασιλείου, 1995: 122), although some researchers (C. Charalambakis, M. Setatos) treat all elements dependent on the semantics of the verb as actants, including the subject (Σετάτος, 1997: 204; Χαραλαμπάκης, 2001: 110). It should also be emphasized that some scientists (I. Malahardi) define compulsory (άμεσα συμπληρώματα) components of the sentence – actants, and optional – circumstantials (περιφερειακά συμπληρώματα) (Μαλαγαρδή, 1995: 373).

#### ***4. Predicate as a center of the positional model of a sentence.***

In Modern linguistics, we observe unequal interpretations of types of predicates and number of substantial syntaxemes. Classifications are based on different criteria:

1. Tesnière distinguishes actants and circonstants in the sentence structure. Actants represent three participants of a situation: “the first actant is the subject in traditional grammar – the one that performs the action”, “the second actant is the one that feels the effect of an action – the object”, “the third actant is the one, for / against which an action takes place – the indirect object”; the ratio between them may vary. The “first” and “second” actants, according to L. Tesnière, are equal structural disseminators of the verbal semantics, in contrast to the traditional concept, which includes the subject to primary parts of the sentence, and the object – to the secondary ones. Circonstants are adverbial modifiers (of time, place, and method) (Ten'er, 1988: 123–124).

2. According to Chafe, in the English language predicates are classified into four groups: predicates of state, process, action and process-action, and the absence of arguments – an ambient state and an ambient action. The seven arguments: agent, patient, experiencer, beneficiant, instrument, complement, and location are characterized by semantic relations to the type of the predicate (Chejf, 1975: 114–121).

3. Fillmore, the founder of case grammar, proposes to introduce the concept of depth cases in the analysis of the semantic and syntactic structure of a sentence (Fillmor, 1981a, 1981b). The term “case” is used by the researcher not in its traditional meaning, but to denote different semantic roles of structures dependent on the verb. At an in-depth level the sentence is represented with a modus and proposition consisting of a verb and nominal phrases connected with it, with basic case functions: agentive (A), instrumentalis (I), dative (D), factitive (F), locative (L), objective (O) (Fillmore, 1981a: 400). The continuation of the “case grammar” was a combination of semasiological and cognitive research in prototype semantics (Vezhbicka, 1985).

4. Arguments of the predicate in Bondarko's functional-grammatical theory are lexical-semantic categories that can be characterised by a certain set of semantic roles (agence, patience, recipient, etc.); subject and object are syntactic-semantic categories that are realized at the level of the content plan of a sentence (Teorija funkcionalnoj grammatiki, 1992: 12–14). Depending on the availability of the subject and object, predicates are qualified as subjective and objective. Actant-subject names a carrier of the state or is a source of action; actant-object names the object, to which the action (resulting in a change of the object or change of its attitude to the subject) is directed (Teorija funkcional'noj grammatiki, 1992: 104). Some researchers define the object as a part of sentence, indicating an object external to the subject (specific or abstract), or an event that is placed in the semantic structure of the predicate and is “the sphere of distribution of signs of the predicate, or causator or stimulant” (Sheljakin, 2001: 22).

5. Sylnytskyi defines syntactic attributes of the verb as its tendency to combine itself with syntactic surrounding of a certain positions. According to the researcher, the list of syntactic attributes includes: 1) combinability of the verb with a direct object; 2) property of the verb to be used without a direct object; 3) combinability of the verb with an indirect object; 4) combinability of the verb with an adverbial modifier; 5) combinability of the verb with a secondary predicate; 6) combinability of the verb with an additional compound; 7) combinability of the verb with a postposition. Paradigmatic features are determined by comparing the dictionary definitions of the verb (“physical characteristic”, “physiological characteristic”, “form”, “structure”, “spatial characteristic”, etc.). Syntagmatic semantic features are defined by a certain set of semantic actants of the sentence consisting of verb meanings: “operational” (causative-stipulating state, which reflects the effect of one actant (subject) on another (object), and “terminal” (result of the previous operational condition). According to Sylnytskyi, the main types of semantic actants of the sentence include: the object – the main carrier of the terminal state; the subject – the carrier of the operational

state; the conjunct – the auxiliary carrier of the terminal condition, which serves for orientation in space; the adjunct – the auxiliary actant to implement a terminal state (possessive adjunct, instrument, material, semiotic adjunct) (Sootnoshenie glagol'nyh priznakov razlichnyh urovnej, 1990: 39–43). Semantic classes of the verb are defined by the researcher with regard to simulated situations: 1) simple (implicit simple (non-projective implicit simple, projective implying simple); explicit simple (non-relational – relational simple, convergent – divergent simple, prospective – retrospective)); 2) complex (causative, semiotic, causative-semiotic) verbs; 3) projective – non-projective verbs (Sootnoshenie glagol'nyh priznakov razlichnyh urovnej, 1990: 272–391).

6. Depending on the width of arguments semantics, Kibardina distinguishes between the single-argument and multiargument verbs, respectively: single-subject (at the level of specific names) and multisubject (at the level of classes of names); single-object and multiobject (Kibardina, 1982: 33).

7. As determined by Kasevich, the verb-nucleus as a part of a syntactic structure serves as a nuclear syntaxeme; other syntaxemes, such as mandatory – actants, optional – circonstants, syntaxemes-definitions, connected with actants or circonstants, depend on the nucleus or are determined by each other (Kasevich, 1988: 105).

8. Apresjan's theory as to determination of the types of predicates was formed in stages. At the first stage, the researcher identified semantically homogeneous classes of verbs with the same syntactic behaviour (Apresjan, 1964; Apresjan, 1967); the second stage is connected with the development of Melchuk's model "Content-Text": types of the predicate government are established based on an analysis using a special semantic language with variables denoting participants of a situation. Government is effected at three levels: semantic, syntactic, lexical and morphological. At the third stage the researcher concluded that the type of government is established on the basis of the predicate inclusion in a fundamental classification of predicates and defined classes of predicates (action, activity, occupation, etc.) and fifty roles of actants (audience, date, value, etc.) (Apresjan, 2007; Apresjan, 2006; Jazykovaja kartina mira i sistemnaja leksikografija, 2006).

9. According to Vykhovanets and Zahnitko, Ukrainian scientists, the verb-predicate has the proper semantic and syntactic-semantic statuses. A proper semantic predicate predicts the number of arguments and their role-based functions based on semes of agency, instrumentality, patiency. A semantic-syntactic predicate determines a set of actant syntaxemes with the relevant syntactic functions. In the Ukrainian language, Vykhovanets distinguishes predicates of action, predicates of process, predicates of state, predicates of quality, locative predicates, predicates of quantity and thirteen types of arguments (arguments having the meaning of an actor, recipient, experiencer, object, resultative, instrument, means, a carrier of physical condition, a carrier of comprehensive physical condition, identificative, componentive, compositive, locative). The concept of an action covers such attributes as "activity, causativity" and is directly linked to the existence of an object (Vykhovanets, 1992: 93–111). Nazarevych believes that the action of actional predicates is focused, depending on the will and intentions of a man or being; that a certain objective makes it act consciously or unconsciously (Nazarevych, 2008: 356). Predicates of process are characterised by an attribute of dynamics. In contrast to them, the verbs of state are characterised by typically "internal" attributes, properties that do not require expression of object relations. The verbs of state have an elementary semantic structure, as they denote processes within the scope of the subject. Predicates of quality denote a permanent attribute of an object. Locative predicates evidence the static nature of initial locativity. Predicates of quantity act to specify quantitative determinancy of objects (Vykhovanets, 1992: 93–111;

Vykhovanets, 1983: 40–42; Vykhovanets, 2002: 70; Vykhovanets, 1988: 90; Zahnitko, 1990: 16).

10. Bacevich believes that in onomasiological terms the verb in a sentence predicts its participants' actions, including dynamic signs. In some cases, a verbal lexeme “keeps in its memory the outlines of the previous situation”. The researcher qualifies these verbs as “retrospective”. Verbs modelling a future situation are defined as “prospective”. “Prospective predicates” model dynamic situations (action, process, event) and static situations (existence, quality, property, attitude, state, location, possessivity) (Bacevich, 1990: 49–53).

In our current research project specifics of implementing verb valence in the Modern Greek language was determined at the semantic and syntactic level. At the syntactic level, predicates of sentences with objective syntaxemes were analysed. This is due to the fact that the sentence as the basic syntactic unit fully reflects functional peculiarities of syntactic units (minimal syntactic unit, expression). Predicates in Modern Greek are classified as predicates of action and predicates of state, based on the assertion that “by their semantic parameters predicates are divided into two most generalized classes: predicates of action and predicates of state” (Vykhovanets, 1983: 34). Predicates of action are associated with an active object, actor; predicates of state – with a passive object, a carrier of state, to whom the corresponding state belongs or is attributed. Only constitutive (obligatory) components of the sentences in Modern Greek are established, as non-constitutive (optional) ones are not relevant in terms of informativeness; their elimination does not cause loss of the semantic status of the sentence.

### ***5. Object Syntaxeme as a Minimal Semantic and Syntactic Unit.***

Compatibility of a verb and a relevant actant is regulated by valence of the verb: a complex of syntagmatic semes that form the predicate structure of the sentence (Lander, 2010). The number of arguments is much more, which is motivated by a more complex frame of thought compared with its speech realization (Zahnitko, 1990: 14). In the Ukrainian language, left-sided valence of the verb at the semantic-syntactic level is represented by a subject (actor or carrier of a process or state) syntaxeme (minimal semantic and syntactic functional unit) (Vykhovanets, 1992: 58). Right-sided valence – by an object (subject to which an action or process is directed), recipient (person, to which an action is intended), instrumental (designation of specific specialised subjects), and locative syntaxeme (initial and end locative) (Vykhovanets, 1992: 58; Zahnitko, 1993: 63). Masytska specifies subtypes of the instrumental (“instrument of action” function and “means of action” function) and locative syntaxemes (dynamic locative syntaxemes (locative syntaxemes in the meaning of the starting point of movement; locative syntaxemes in the meaning of the end point of movement; locative syntaxemes indicating the path of movement and static locative syntaxemes) (Masytska, 1998: 41–42).

Object relations belong to the category of semantic concepts represented in any language (Jarceva, 1972: 15). According to Vykhovanets, “Semantic segmentation of objective syntaxemes just as other substantial syntaxemes is primarily due to the semantic nature of the predicate: the most central syntaxeme in the semantic-syntactic structure of the sentence, whose valence creates a simple sentence, which is elementary from the semantic and syntactic point of view” (Vykhovanets, 1992: 118). As defined by Arutjunova, semantic relations between the object and predicate are significantly influenced by the object that determines the type of an action, aimed at creating the object, its modification or destruction (Arutjunova, 1976: 126).

The objective syntaxeme in the sentence structure indicates the object to which the subject's action is aimed. Signs of an objective syntaxeme as an abstract minimal semantic-

syntactic unit include: 1) substantiality; 2) semantic simplicity; 3) valent bond with the predicate; 4) semantic differentiation depending on the type of the predicate; 5) morphological variation (case and preposition-case); 6) ability to appear in certain formal-syntactic and communicative positions of the sentence (Mezhov, 2005: 18). Unlike address, instrumental, locative syntaxemes, an objective syntaxeme is a part of the vast majority of elementary sentences, has the largest number of morphological variants and serves as a compulsory element of the sentence. The main differential features of objective syntaxemes are: 1) substantiality (object nature); 2) valent link with dynamic / static predicates; 3) right-sided valent position in relation to the predicate (in the language system); 4) passivity (Mezhov, 2005: 18).

According to the nature of the predicate, the objective syntaxemes are divided into semantic variants: object of action, object of process, object of state, object of qualitative attribute of relation, object of the locative predicate of action (classification by Vykhovanets) (Vykhovanets, 1992: 118); object of action (object of action, object of intellectual activity, object of speech activity, object of communication, targeting information to the recipient in transitive verbs; object provided with motion (object of motorics), object of help, gratitude in intransitive verbs); object of state (object of sense perception, object of intellectual status, object of emotional and evaluative attitude, object of positive-negative attitude, internal state and feeling, object of possession / non-possession, object of mental state, physiological processes, and sudden reactions as their expression, object of existence; object of locative predicate of action (object of relocation in space, object of motion); object of process; object of qualitative attribute of relation (classification by O. Lednei) (Lednei, 2003: 8–11); object of action (object of specific physical action, object of action-locativity, object of intellectual activity, object of speech activity, object of mental activity (perception)); object of process; object of state (object of emotional and mental state, object of intellectual status, object of state-relation, object of emotional and evaluative attitude, object of possession/non-possession (deprivation), object of resultative state); object of quality (object of proper qualitative attribute, object of quality-relationship (comparison); object of qualitative-modal relation); object of quantity-relation (comparison) (classification by O. Mezhov (Mezhov, 2005: 19–29)).

The choice of syntaxemes is largely affected by the communicative situation (Vykhovanets, 2004: 272). At the semantic level Zahnitko distinguishes between the following types of subject-predicate-object relations: 1) transformative relations: the subject changes the state or location of the object; 2) creative relations: the subject creates, reproduces or destroys the object; 3) address relations: the subject addresses the object; 4) factitive relations: the subject affects the will, feelings, mind of the object; 5) perceptual relations: the subject perceives the object through its sense organs; 6) cognitive relations: the subject knows the object as a result of mental activity; 7) emotional relations: the subject has a certain feeling to the object; 8) instrumental relations: the subject uses the object; 9) private relations: the subject needs the object (Zahnitko, 1990: 31–32).

It is determined that verbs with objective syntaxemes in Modern Greek form the following types of models:

- 1) predicate with the objective syntaxeme in the accusative case;
- 2) predicate with two syntaxemes;
- 3) predicate with variants of objective syntaxemes: a duplicated pronoun, a subordinate part.

The objective syntaxeme of a predicate expressed by a transitive verb is morphologically represented by:



- 1) noun: *Όλοι μέρα έτριβαν ελιές για να βγάλουν ένα δοχείο λάδι* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1369). Nouns that serve as objective syntaxemes are characterized according to categorical signs of opposition of being / non-being, person / non-person, singular / plural;
- 2) pronoun: *Τον κατασπάραξαν οι λύκοι* (Κριαράς, 1995: 686);
- 3) substantivated adjective: *Έπιασε την καλή* (Κριαράς, 1995: 646);
- 4) substantivated participle: *Είδ' ο τρελός το μεθυσμένο και φοβήθηκε* (Κριαράς, 1995: 851);
- 5) substantivated exclamation: *Άρχισε πάλι τα αχ και τα βαχ* (Κριαράς, 1995: 227);
- 6) substantivated verb: *Είπες ευχαριστώ στην κυρία;* (Κριαράς, 1995: 93);
- 7) subordinate part: *Ξέρω, ότι λέει ψέματα* (Κριαράς, 1995: 973).

### 6. Prototype Objective Syntaxeme in Modern Greek.

Objective syntaxemes in the accusative case are common in the Modern Greek language. It should be noted that the main function of the accusative without a preposition is the object one. The accusative case is defined as a prototype case of the object (η κατεξοχήν πτώση για τη δήλωση του συμπληρώματος). However, in Modern Greek the accusative case may also function as the nominal part of a composite predicate: *Σε καθιστώ υπεύθυνο για ο,τι συμβεί* or acquire adverbial meaning: *Πάω σπíti*. In Modern Greek, accusative is used with prepositions to denote different attributive relations: definitive accusative: *Ενα χαλί δέκα μέτρα φάρδος*, accusative of quantity: *Αγόρασε δέκα πήχες ύφασμα*, accusative of object: *Προσοχή τα χέρια σας*, accusative of content: *Το ποτήρι είναι γεμάτο νερό*.

The differentiation of the type of syntaxeme expressed by the accusative in Modern Greek represents the intersection of paradigmatic and syntagmatic semes of the noun and verb.

Predicates with objective syntaxemes account for a high percentage (82%) in the Modern Greek language; these are causatives denoting the cause of action or state of another subject. In Modern linguistics, causatives are defined as verbs with a categorial seme of causativity. These are verbs of the active action, which is the cause of a state, quality or feature of another person or subject (Kil'dibekova 1984: 9). Components of a “causative situation” are two micro-situations interconnected by a causative relationship (Tipologija kauzativnyh konstrukcij, 1969: 5).

Classifications of causatives are based on various parameters, specifically: morphological (morphological causatives, lexical or suppletive causatives, analytic causatives), semantic (factitive causation/permissive causation, distant causation / contact causation), syntax (causatives from intransitive verbs, causatives from transitive verbs) (Ufimceva, 1986: 5–19, 28–29). According to semantic features, there are proper causative verbs (factitive proper causative verbs – an agence-causator requires from a patience unconditional fulfillment of its will with the unconditionally subordinate caused object to implement the conditions set by the causator or with the unconditionally subordinate caused object to implement certain actions; permissive proper causative verbs, meaning causation for voluntary fulfillment of the agence's will: to the benefit of the causator-agence or the patience itself), and latent causatives – verbal lexemes, which mean causation of the physical change of something (Mozghunov, 1997: 144, 176). According to the componential composition, there are verbs with causation as the only semantic property; verbs with additional meaning of the methods of causation; verbs with characteristics of the caused action (Chudinov, 1981: 58–59; Chudinov, 1982: 63).

If we agree with the idea that by grammatical characteristics verbs are divided into the verbs of action and the verbs of state, the question arises as to the causes of the characteristics inherent to the verbs of state, namely: stay in a particular state, designation of relationships, features. It is believed that in most cases these properties are the result of a

certain action knowingly initiated by an actor. The seme expressing the motivation of the signs' occurrence of substances is interpreted in linguistics as causation. Thus, causative verbs are characterized by a complex semantic structure: a combination of the seme of action and seme of state (Kil'dibekova, 1984: 9). Y. Apresjan believes that causative verbs have one valence more compared to non-causative. Causative verbs are mostly transitive, but unlike non-causative verbs, semantically related to the subject and object of action, at an in-depth level they take actants in the functions of the subject of causation and the subject of caused state (Apresjan, 1974: 46). Gołąb, following Kuryłowicz, analysed the opposition causative / non-causative and defined causative as a transitive verb created by way of ablaut, suffixation, etc. from a non-transitive one with the same lexical root and a common abstract meaning. According to the researcher, the main function of "causativization" is regular transitivity of non-transitive verbs (Krinickajte, 1978: 30). Norman also points out that the grammatical nature of causation is represented by the opposition transitive/intransitive verb. Causative verbs always add a direct object unlike caused verbs (Norman, 1972: 120-121). There is an opinion that causative verbs are derived from non-causative, connected with them by content derivation (Holodovich, 1979: 91).

Setatos identifies in Modern Greek factitive causative verbs (μεταβιβαστικά) denoting the orientation of the verbal action to change of the object: *ποτίζω*, and proper causative verbs denoting the cause of a state: *βρομίζω*. A test for determination is a transformation: *κάνω να* – for the factitive verbs and *γίνομαι αίτιος να* – for the proper causative verbs (Σετάτος, 1997: 205).

Results of the analysis show that in Modern Greek language causative and non-causative verbs can be represented by:

1. Verbs of one lexeme ("syntagmatic opposition" (Tipologija kauzativnyh konstrukcij, 1969: 21), "syntactic causative" (Chudinov, 1984: 21), "symmetrical type of opposition" (Kil'dibekova, 1984: 17)): *Γυαλίζω τα έπιπλα / Γυαλίζει το πάτωμα* (Κριαράς, 1995: 320). *Με πονοστομάχιασε αυτό το φαγητό / Έφαγα τόσο γρήγορα το φαΐ που πονοστομάχιασα* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1136). *Σκληραίνει τη στάση της η αντιπολίτευση στη Βουλή / Με τις κακουχίες η ψυχή τους σκλήρυνε* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1238).

2. Verbs of different lexemes ("correlative-root opposition" (Tipologija kauzativnyh konstrukcij, 1969: 21)): *Ποτίζει κάθε μέρα τις γλάστρες* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1141) / *Πίνω γάλα* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1109). *Δεν τάισα ακόμη το μωρό* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1329) / *Τρώμε κρέας δυο φορές την εβδομάδα* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1378).

3. Verbs formed by word creation means ("correlative-affix opposition" (Tipologija kauzativnyh konstrukcij, 1969: 21)):

– suffix –άζω: *Ανεβάζω κάποιον στο δέντρο* (Κριαράς, 1995: 98) / *Ανεβαίνω στο βουνό* (Κριαράς, 1995: 99). *Κατεβάζω κάποιον από το δέντρο* (Κριαράς, 1995: 691) / *Κατεβαίνω τα σκαλιά* (Κριαράς, 1995: 691). *Με κούρασε αυτή η πορεία* (Κριαράς, 1995: 754) / *Κουράζομαι στα ταξίδια* (Κριαράς, 1995: 754);

– suffix –ίζω: *Μου θύμισε τα γεγονότα* (Κριαράς, 1995: 599) / *Θυμάμαι τη φυσιογνωμία του* (Κριαράς, 1995: 599). *Με κάθισε στο πλάι του* (Κριαράς, 1995: 628) / *Κάθομαι στην καρέκλα* (Κριαράς, 1995: 629). *Κοιμίζω το μωρό* (Κριαράς, 1995: 726) / *Κοιμάμαι βαθιά* (Κριαράς, 1995: 726). *Ο πρότανης όρκισε τους πτυχιούχους* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1014) / *Ορκίστηκε στο Ευαγγέλιο* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1014). *Με φοβίζει η εκτεταμένη χρήση της πυρηνικής ενεργείας* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1446) / *Μη φοβάσαι! Εγώ είμαι εδώ* (Κριαράς, 1995: 1916).

The peculiarity of the Modern Greek language is that semantic-word forming attributability is inherent also to the irregular verbs that are not used without affixes -μαι (so called reflexiva tantum).

Simple models formed by causative verbs have correlated complicated models, where syntactic means discover the meaning of causation: *ακονίζω το μαχαίρι – κάνω το μαχαίρι κοφτερό* (Κριαράς, 1995: 43). A certain group of causative verbs has correlative verbs in the passive voice (“reverse-postfix type”) (Kil'dibekova, 1984: 16). By semantic features, these verbs can be described as follows: a causative verb in active voice has the meaning: “to provide someone or something with a state, sign”: *Αποκουφαίνω (κάνω κάποιον εντελώς κουφό): Πάψε πια. Μας αποκούφανε με τις αγριοφωνάρες σου* (Κριαράς, 1995: 154). *Γενικεύω (κάνω κάτι από μερικό κοινό): Γενικεύω έναν κανόνα* (Κριαράς, 1995: 288). *Εδραιώνω (κάνω κάτι εδραίο, σταθερό): Εδραιώνω τη θέση μου* (Κριαράς, 1995: 414). *Ζαλίζω (προκαλώ σε κάποιον ζάλη): Τον ζάλισαν οι αναθυμιάσεις της βενζίνης* (Κριαράς, 1995: 553). *Ξαφνιάζω (τρομάζω κάποιον): Με ξαφνιάσες έτσι που με φώναζες* (Κριαράς, 1995: 961); a correlative verb in the passive voice has the meaning: “to be the bearer of a sign, to be in any state”: *Αποκουφάινομαι (χάνω την ακοή μου): Ήταν λίγο κουφός από πριν, αλλά τώρα αποκουφάνηκε* (Κριαράς, 1995: 154). *Γενικεύομαι (γίνομαι κοινός): Γενικεύτηκε η χρήση ηλεκτρονικών υπολογιστών* (Κριαράς, 1995: 288). *Εδραιώνομαι (γίνομαι σταθερός): Εδραιώθηκε η πεποίθηση του* (Κριαράς, 1995: 414). *Ζαλίζομαι (νιώθω ζάλη): Θα βγώ λίγο έξω γιατί ζαλίζομαι* (Κριαράς, 1995: 553). *Ξαφνιάζομαι (τρομάζω): Ξαφνιάστηκα που σε είδα στη γιορτή* (Κριαράς, 1995: 961).

This is the essence of decausative transformation, in which subject-object relationships of the active verb are broken and a new kind of the situation with the subject-bearer of sign is formed. By losing components of action, the verbs acquire semantics of state; this discloses the dialectical unity of action and state. Decrease in the degree of action (actionality) causes a proportional increase in the degree of state. Of special importance in this respect are causative and non-causative verbs represented by one lexeme, which we define as verbs with the variable valence (VVV). The transformation ‘causative – non-causative verb’ in VVVs occurs without morphological changes of state.

### **7. Verbs with the Variable Valence as a Special Type of Causative Alternation.**

According to our definition, verbs with the variable valence comprise verbs with dual functioning: both transitive and intransitive (cf. approach by Zaika, where the variable valence implies change of the verb’s valence following change of its morphological forms (Zaika, 2006: 53)). In our opinion, changes associated with modification in grammatical forms belong to the phenomena of lexical derivation). According to Petryk (2001), ergative (intransitive) meaning in the verbal lexeme is formed due to the valent shift and reframing of the hierarchy of participants that reflects “correlations between natural, cognitively selected and structured language situation and its verbal embodiment” (p. 8). As exemplified by verbs of the English language, the researcher distinguishes between ergative verbs using the following criteria: 1) object of transitive structure and subject of intransitive structure, expressed by the same lexeme; 2) in both of these syntactic positions the actant has the status of patience; 3) the transitive meaning of the verb is formally and semantically transitive, and intransitive meaning – formally and semantically intransitive (Petryk, 2001: 8). Letuchij interprets these verbs as “labile” and believes that in systems with numerous labile verbs, lability serves as a causative marker (Letuchij, 2004).

We believe that the variable valence of the verb enables to substitute the seme of action with the seme of state and vice versa without morphological changes: *ασκημαίνω: κάνω κάποιον άσχημο: Το χτένισμα αυτό την ασκημαίνει / γίνομαι άσχημος, χάνω την ομορφιά μου: Άσκήμωνε τώρα που μεγάλωσε* (Κριαράς, 1995: 192). Verbs with the variable valence are common in Modern Greek. Klymenko points to the ability to “a large number of Greek verbs in the active voice to have both transitive and intransitive meaning depending on the context, i.e. beyond the form of one word, which provides the relative ease of transition of many

verbal semes from the category of syntactically expressed in the category of latent at the level of word formation and represented only through semantics of the noun” [Klymenko, 2001: 70].

Setatos defines the following types of “diathesis transformations” in Modern Greek, which occur without any change of state:

– transitive verbs as intransitive: *ανοίγω την πόρτα* (active diathesis) – *ανοίγει η πόρτα* (medium diathesis);

– intransitive verbs as transitive: *αρρώστησε* (passive diathesis) – *μ’αρρώστησε με τη φλυαριά του* (active diathesis=μ’έκανε ν’αρρωστήσω);

– verbs of active diathesis as self-reflexive: *κτίζουν σπίτι (ως εργάτες)* – *κτίζουν σπίτι (ως ιδιοκτήτες)*;

– verbs of active diathesis as reciprocal reflexive: *πού θα τους ανταμώσουν;* – *πού θα ανταμώσουν;*

– verbs of active diathesis as verbs of passive diathesis: *(η ζέστη/ο μάγειρας) λιώνει το βούτυρο* – *το βούτυρο λιώνει;*

– verbs of passive diathesis as verbs of active diathesis: *τρίζει το πάτωμα απο τα βήματα* – *τρίζει τα δόντια του;*

– verbs of reflexive diathesis as verbs of passive diathesis: *ξυρίζομαι (ο ίδιος)* – *ξυρίζομαι (από τον κουρέα)* (Σετάτος, 1997: 206).

In Modern Greek linguistics, the views on the problem classification of these verbs vary. Kleris and Bambiniotis interpret them as ergative and causative constructions [Κλαίρης, 2005: 283]. According to the researchers, verbs of the 1<sup>st</sup> group are ergative (εργαστικά ρήματα) (Charalambakis defines them as εργατικά [Χαραλαμπάκης, 2001: 116]; Theofanopoulou-Kondou – as causative structures (μεταβιβαστικές δομές) or causative pairs (μεταβιβαστικές εναλλαγές), which have the meaning of change of state (αλλαγή της κατάστασης) [Θεοφανοπούλου-Κοντού, 2003: 237]), functioning mainly as transitive: *κάποιος ανοίγει κάτι* – *κάτι ανοίγει*.

Constructions with the ergative Modern Greek verbs used in transitive meaning have two actants: the actor (subject) and the object. In intransitive use of the verb, the object performs the syntactic function of the subject, which approximates these constructions to ergative languages. If the ergative verb is used as intransitive, it is impossible to indicate the doer, while in verbs that have passive voice it can be expressed only with the aid of *ποιητικό αίτιο*: *Ο Γιάννης άνοιξε την πόρτα/η πόρτα άνοιξε / (νεβίρνο) η πόρτα άνοιξε από τον Γιάννη / η πόρτα ανοίχτηκε από τον Γιάννη (ποιητικό αίτιο)* (Κλαίρης, 2005: 285). With ergative verbs, it is only possible to indicate the cause, i.e. the actor which is a non-being: *Το χτύπημα άνοιξε την πόρτα/η πόρτα άνοιξε από το χτύπημα* (Κλαίρης, 2005: 286). However, as is known, ergative languages have two cases: nominative and ergative. The nominative case functions as the subject of an intransitive verb and object of a transitive one; the ergative case – as the subject of a transitive verb. Transitive verbs in ergative constructions are always active (Klimov, 1973; Hrakovskij, 1974; Bendini, 1985). There is no such special case in the Modern Greek language, so the term “ergative” is questionable. Verbs of the 2<sup>nd</sup> group are causative ones (μεταβιβαστικά ρήματα) with mainly intransitive usage: *κάποιος θυμώνει* – *κάτι θυμώνει κάποιον* denoting action with an actant undergoing a certain influence. Transitive verbs of this group are used with actants denoting causes of action or doer implementing an action: *Γέρασε πριν της ώρας του από τις σκοτούρες / οι σκοτούρες τον γέρασαν πριν της ώρας του* (Κλαίρης, 2005: 287). Ciupy believes that sentences with ergative verbs: *Η πόρτα άνοιξε* resemble structures of reflexive diathesis (Δομές μέσης διάθεσης): *Αυτό το πρόβλημα λύνεται εύκολα*. The similarity of these sentences is that the object can

operate as a subject. However, according to the researcher, these sentences are not identical; it is confirmed by several criteria determining the construction as ergative, specifically:

1) the argument of sentences with an ergative verb is only patience; arguments of the sentences with reflexive verbs on the in-depth level are both agence and patience. This can be tested by adding a phrase “από μόνο του” – himself, herself, itself. While a sentence with an ergative verb allows for the use of this phrase: *Η πόρτα άνοιξε από μόνη της*, a sentence with a reflexive verb becomes incorrect if this phrase is added: *Το βιβλίο διαβάζεται* (impossible: *από μόνο του*);

2) constructions with ergative verbs convey the meaning of the completed action, while constructions with verbs of reflexive diathesis imply incompleteness, even in the past tense: *Το πουκάμισο σιδερωνόταν εύκολα*; 3) constructions of the reflexive diathesis allow transformation with the verb *μπορώ*: *Το φόρεμα μπορεί να πλυθεί εύκολα* [Σιούπη, 1996; Σιούπη, 1997; Σιούπη, 1999]. Therefore, the researcher defines constructions of reflexive diathesis as non-ergative (ανεργαστικά) [Σιούπη, 1999: 447].

According to another opinion, verbs with the variable valence are united into two groups:

1) indirectly intransitive and transitive (causative) verbs (ρήματα μέσα αμετάβατα – μεταβατικά (μεταβιβαστικά)). It is believed that these verbs can be used both in transitive and intransitive meaning: *Η αδερφή μου άναψε τη φωτιά. Η φωτιά άναψε*. The main peculiarity of this group of verbs is that the construction ‘Subject – Predicate – Object’ can change, namely the object of transitive verbs can function as the subject of the relevant non-transitive verbs without changing the state of the verb. Verbs included in this category enable to describe an action from the perspective of its causator (agence (δράστης), cause (αιτία), instrument (όργανο)) and the perspective of the one influenced by it. The selected perspective determines the transitive or intransitive functioning of the verb associated with the speaker’s intention: if the meaning of causator is accentuated, a construction with a transitive verb is used; if the result is important – with an intransitive one: *Η βροχή είχε σβήσει τη φωτιά/η φωτιά είχε σβήσει*. In terms of semantic-syntactic characteristics, this group includes verbs denoting:

– active doer – subject of the transitive verb and object of the verbal action of the intransitive verb, thematic groups: change of location (*γυρνάω, κυλάω, στρίβω, ανεβαίνω, κατεβαίνω*), change of state (*αλλάζω, ανοίγω, αδειάζω, βουλιάζω, βρωμίζω, γλυκαίνω, δροσίζω, κλείνω, λυγίζω, μαδώ, λιώνω, παγώνω, ραγίζω, τεντώνω*), change of color (*ασπρίζω, μαυρίζω, κιτρινίζω*);

– active doer – subject of the transitive verb and object of state of the intransitive verb, thematic group: mental state (*αγρειεύω, αηδιάζω, αγανακτώ, διασκεδάζω, θυμώνω, ησυχάζω, τρομάζω, σκυθρωπιάζω*);

– causative verbs with object-non-being of the intransitive verb (*θηλιάζω, βυζαίνω, βοσκώ*).

2) verbs with dual functioning (ρήματα με διπλή λειτουργία). These verbs are used both in transitive and intransitive meaning: *Ο Γιάννης φούσκωσε το μπαλόνι. Ο Γιάννης φούσκωσε και ξαναφούσκωσε* (Διατμηματικό, 1998: 37, 40–41). Verbs of this group are used in a metaphorical sense in one of two cases.

There is an opinion that the change of valence and diathesis is a stylistic means, i.e. a pun.

A functional analysis of 493 verbs with the variable valence, selected by continuous sampling from the dictionaries of the Modern Greek language allows dividing them into the following groups: VVV in the active voice: VVV in the active voice with mainly transitive functioning, VVV in the active voice with mainly intransitive or implicitly transitive

functioning; VVV in the passive voice; VVV in the active and passive voice: VVV in the active and passive voices with the variable valence in the active voice with mainly transitive functioning, VVV in the active and passive voices with the variable valence in the active voice with mainly intransitive functioning.

Word-formation transformative of VVVs is represented by the adjective-based and noun-derived verbs. Adjective-based verbs allow for varying substitution of the right-sided position with an actant expressed by a being or an actant expressed by a non-being: *Τη μαύρισε ο ήλιος. Μαύρισαν τον τοίχο της πολυκατοικίας γράφοντας συνθήματα / Κάτι μαυρίζει πέρα στο δρόμο* (Κριαράς, 1995: 844). In the Modern Greek language, there is a morphologized and semantic stage of transformations: the adjective becomes a verb, which in certain context selectively acquires either the semantics of state, or the semantics of action. Changing the correlation of semantic and syntactic actants is accompanied by a “systemic shift” [Apresjan, 2006: 17] in the meaning of the lexeme and is fixed lexicographically.

### 8. Conclusions.

The research materials have shown that during the generation of speech as one of the types of cognitive activity, the specific data of the speaker's experience (notions of things, objects, people, etc.) affect the pre-speech stages of division of the initial plan, categorization, propositioning and construction of a superficial structure with stable valence models (Bergelson, 1981). The verb encodes “procedural knowledge about the world and ways of being, and interactions of objects in time and space” (Kubryakova, 1997: 249), correlates a certain form of the speech sign with the existing structure of consciousness at the stages of “internal cognitive and psychological planning” (Selivanova, 2000: 42).

Valence of the verb plays an important role in the formal semantic organization of phrases and sentences. Nature of the verb determines the structure of a sentence, semantic and syntactic specifics of nouns that will accompany the verb and their relationship (Chejč, 1975: 115), so the verbal nomination is a complex ratio of one, who calls, to a subject, object of an action, process, and state. Interrelations of primary and secondary functions of case forms, modifications of subject-object framework of the sentence are connected with specialization of the verb as predicate and pertain to the proposition-oriented predicate-verbal categories.

The objective syntaxeme implements the valence predetermined by the semantics of the predicate at the semantic and syntactic and formal grammatical levels of the sentence. Modification of subject-object relations determined through the change of valence of the verb causes significant changes of the structure of the sentence and is manifested through the verb's ability to form transitive/intransitive reflexive forms, etc., which present the appropriate type of a syntactic model of the verb and act as components of the semantic structure of the verb.

### References

- Apresjan, Ju. D. (1974). *Leksicheskaia semantika. Sinonimicheskie sredstva jazyka*. [Lexical semantics. Synonymous means of language]. M.: Nauka.
- Apresjan, Ju. D. (1964). O silnom i slabom upravlenii (opyt kolichestvennogo analiza). [About weak and strong government (quantitative analysis experiment)]. *Voprosy jazykoznanija*, 3. P. 32–49.
- Apresjan, Ju. D. (2006). Tipy sootvetstvija semanticheskikh i sintaksicheskikh aktantov. [Types of semantic and syntactic actants correspondence]. *Problemy tipologii i obshhej lingvistiki: materialy mezhdunar. nauch. konf., posvjashhennoj 100-letiju so dnja rozhdenija prof. A. A. Holodovicha*. P. 15–28.
- Apresjan, Ju. D. (2007). Trehurovnevaja teorija upravlenija: leksikograficheskij aspekt. [Three-level theory of government: lexicographic aspects]. *Tipologija jazyka i teorija grammatiki: materialy mezhdunar.*

konf., posvjashhennoj 100-letiju so dnja rozhdenija S. D. Kacnelsona. Retrieved from: [http://www.iling.spb.ru/grammatikon/mater/dsk2007/tez2007\\_apresjan.pdf](http://www.iling.spb.ru/grammatikon/mater/dsk2007/tez2007_apresjan.pdf).

Apresjan, Ju. D. (1967). *Jeksperimental'noe issledovanie semantiki russkogo glagola*. [An experimental investigation of verbs semantics in Russian]. M. : Nauka.

Arutjunova, N. D. (1976). *Predlozhenie i ego smysl (logiko-semanticheskie problemy)*. [The sentence and its sense (logico-semantics problems)]. M. : Nauka.

Bacevich, F. S. (1990). Prospekciya russkogo slova (funkcionalno-onomasiologicheskij aspekt). [A prospection of word in Russian (functional and onomasiological aspects)]. *Russkoe jazykoznanie*, 21. P. 49–55.

Bergelson, M. B. Kibrik, A. E. (1981). Pragmatischekij princip "prioriteta" i ego otrazhenie v grammatike jazyk. [The pragmatic principal of priority and its reflection in grammar]. *Izvestija AN SSSR. Ser.: Literatura i jazyk*, 40(4). P. 343–355.

Vezhbicka, A. (1985). Delo o poverhnostnom padezhe. [The case for surface case]. *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike*, 15. P. 303–341.

Vykhovanets, I. R. (1992). *Narysy z funkcionalnogo syntaksysu ukrainskoi movy*. [Essay on the functional syntax of the Ukrainian language]. K. : Nauk. Dumka.

Vykhovanets, I. R., Horodenska, K. H., Rusanivskiy, V. M. (1983). *Semantiko-syntaksychna struktura rechennia*. [Semantico-syntactic structure of the sentence]. K. : Nauk. Dumka.

Vykhovanets, I. R., Horodenska, K. H. (2004). *Teoretychna morfolohiia ukrainskoi movy: akademichna hramatyka ukrainskoi movy*. [Theoretical morphology of the Ukrainian language]. K. : Univer. vyd-vo "Pulsary".

Vykhovanets, I. R. (2002). Typy syntaksychnykh odynyt. [Types of syntactic units]. *Movni i kontseptualni kartyny svitu*, 6. P. 70–76.

Vykhovanets, I. R. (1988). *Chastyny movy v semantiko-hramatychnomu aspekti*. [Semantico-grammatical analysis of the parts of speech]. K. : Nauk. Dumka.

Esperen, O. (1958). *Filosofija grammatiki*. [The philosophy of grammar]. M. : Izd-vo inostranoj lit.

Zahnitko, A. P. (1993). *Systema i struktura morfolohichnykh katehorii suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy (problemy teorii)*. [System and structure of morphological categories in the Ukrainian language]. K. : ISDO.

Zahnitko, A. P. (1990). *Struktura ta iierarkhiia valentnykh znachen diieslova*. [Structure and hierarchy of verb valency meaning]. K. : NMK VO.

Zahnitko, A. P. (1996). *Ukrainskyi syntaksys (naukovo-teoretychnyi i navchalno-praktychnyi kompleks)*. [Ukrainian syntax]. K. : IZMN.

Zaika, N. M. (2006). Faktory, vlijajushhie na variativnost' valentnosti glagola v baskskom jazyke. [Factors that influence the verb lability in basque]. *Problemy tipologii i obshhej lingvistiki: materialy mezhdunar. nauch. konf., posvjashhennoj 100-letiju so dnja rozhdenija prof. A. A. Holodovicha*. P. 53–56.

Zolotova, G. A. (2001). K probleme sootnoshenija semantiki, morfologii i sintaksisa. [Some problems of semantics, morphology and syntax correlation]. *Teoreticheskie problemy funkcionalnoj grammatiki: materialy Vseros. nauch. konf.* P. 19–20.

Kasevich, V. B. (1988). *Semantika. Sintaksis. Morfologija*. [Semantics. Syntax. Morphology]. M. : Nauka.

Kibardina, S. M. (1982). Kategorii subekta i obekta i teorija valentnosti (na materiale nemeckogo jazyka). [The categories of subject and object and valency theory]. *Kategorija subekta i obekta v jazykah razlichnykh tipov*. P. 23–45.

Kibrik, A. E. (2004). Kognitivnoe raznoobrazie predikatno-argumentnyh struktur i jazykovye strategii ih unifikacii. [Cognitive peculiarities of predicate-argument structure and strategies of their unification]. *Sintaksicheskie otnoshenija i struktura argumentov: materialy Vtorogo mezhdunar. simpoziuma po jazykam Evropy, Severnoj i Centralnoj Azii*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/uhlcs/LENCA/LENCA-2/information/datei/04-kibrik-russ.pdf>.

Kibrik, A. E. (1979). Podlezhashhee i problema universalnoj modeli jazyka. [Subject and the problems of universal model of language]. *Izvestija AN SSSR. Ser.: Literatura i jazyk*, 38(4). P. 309–317.

Kildibekova, T. A. (1984). Funkcionalno-semanticheskaja kategorija kauzativnosti v russkom jazyke. [Functional-semantic category of causativity in Russian]. *Issledovanija po semantike*, 10. P. 8–19.

Klymenko, N. F. (2001). Syntaksychnyi potentsial chastyn movy ta yikhonii vplyv na realizatsiiu slovotvirnykh katehorialnykh znachen (na materiali suchasnoi ukrainskoi ta novohretskoi movy). [Syntactic

potential of the parts of speech and their influence on word formation categorical meaning]. *Linhvistychni studii*, 7. P. 167–172.

Klimov, G. A. (1973). *Ocherk obshhej teorii jergativnosti*. [An essay on the ergativity theory]. M. : Nauka.

Krinickajte, S. A. (1978). Problema perehodnosti v issledovanijah po indoevropskim jazykam. [Transitivity in the researches based on indo-european languages]. *Problemy vnutrennej i vneshnej lingvistiki*. M. : Nauka.

Kubryakova, E. S. (1997). *Chasti rechi s kognitivnoj točki zrenija*. [Parts of speech from cognitive linguistics point of view]. M. : RAN, In-t jazykoznanija.

Lednei, O. F. (2003). *Obiektni syntaksemy v strukturi prostoho rechennia*. [Objective syntaxeme in the structure of simple sentence]. Odesa.

Letuchij, A. (2004). Labilnost glagolov: svjaz s semantikoj i aktantnoj strukturoj (na materiale germanskih, slavjanskih, arabskogo, tjurkskih i drugih jazykov). [Lability of verbs: interaction of semantics and actant structure]. *Sintaksicheskie otnoshenija i struktura argumentov : materialy Vtorogo mezhdunar. simpoziuma po jazykam Evropy, Severnoj i Central'noj Azii*. Kazan'. Retrieved from : <http://www.ksu.ru/conf/LENCA-2/183.rtf>

Lomtev, T. P. (1958). *Osnovy sintaksisa sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*. [The basics of Russian syntax]. M. : Uchpedgiz.

Masytska, T. Ye. (1998). *Hramatychna struktura diieslivnoi valentnosti*. [Grammatical structure of verb valency]. Lutsk : RVV "VDU" im. Lesi Ukrainky.

Mezhov, O. H. (2005). Semantychna dyferentsiatsiia obiektnoi syntaksemy. [Semantic differentiation of objective syntaxeme]. *Ukrainska mova*, 1. P. 17–32.

Mozghunov, V. V. (1997). *Perekhidnist yak typ valentnosti diieslova (na materialy ukrainskoi movy)*. [Transitivity as a type of verb valency]. Donetsk.

Nazarevych, H. Ya. (2008). Subiektna syntaksema u rechenniakh z aktsionalnymy predykatamy. [Subjective syntaxeme in sentences with action predicates]. *Problemy semantyky, prahmatyky ta kohnityvnoi linhvistyky*, 14. P. 354–360.

Norman, B. Ju. (1972). *Perehodnost, zalog, vozvratnost*. [Transitivity, voice, reflexivity]. Minsk : Izd-vo Belorus. un-ta.

Petryk, T.V. (2001). *Syntagmatyka ta paradyghmatyka erghatyvnykh dijesliv u suchasnij anghlijskij movi*. [Syntagmatics and paradigmatics of ergative verbs in English]. L.

Selivanova, E. A. (2000). *Kognitivnaja onomasiologija*. [Cognitive onomasiology]. K. : Fitocentr.

Silnickij, G. G. (2006). Dvuhurovnevaja model predlozhenija Ten'era-Holodovicha i sovremennaja sintaksicheskaja teorija. [Two-level model of sentence in researches of Tesniere-Kholodovich and Modern syntactic theory]. *Problemy tipologii i obshhej lingvistiki: materialy mezhdunar. nauch. konf., posvjashhennoj 100-letiju so dnja rozhdenija prof. A. A. Holodovicha*. P. 136–142.

*Sootnoshenie glagol'nyh priznakov razlichnyh urovnej* (1990). [Correlation of verb features of different levels]. pod red. G. G. Sil'nickogo, S. N. Andreeva, P. A. Kuzmina. Minsk : Navuka i tjehnika.

Tener, L. (1988). *Osnovy strukturnogo sintaksisa*. [Elements of structural syntax]. M. : Progress.

*Teorija funkcionalnoj grammatiki. Subektnost. Obektnost. Kommunikativnaja perspektiva vyskazyvanija* (1992). [Functional grammar theory. Subjectivity. Objectivity. Communicative perspective of utterance]. pod red. A.V.Bondarko. SPb. : Nauka.

*Tipologija kauzativnyh konstrukcij. Morfologicheskij kauzativ*. (1969). [The typology of causative constructions. Morphological causative]. L. : Nauka.

Ufimceva, A. A. (1986). *Leksicheskoe znachenie: princip semasiologicheskogo opisanija leksiki*. [Lexical meaning: semasiological principle of lexicon interpretation]. M. : Nauka.

Fillmor, Ch. (1981a.). Delo o padezhe. [The case for case]. *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike*, 10: Lingvisticheskaja semantika. P. 369–495.

Fillmor, Ch. (1981b). Delo o padezhe. [The case for case]. *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike*, 10: Lingvisticheskaja semantika. P. 496–530.

Holodovich, A. A. (1979). *Problemy grammaticheskoi teorii*. [Problems of grammatical theory]. L. : Nauka.



Hrakovskij, V. S. (1974). Passivnye konstrukcii. [Passive constructions]. *Tipologija passivnyh konstrukcij. Diatezy i zalogi*. P. 5–46.

Chejf, U. L. (1975). *Znachenie i struktura jazyka*. [Meaning and the structure of language]. M. : Progress.

Chudinov, A. P. (1984). O derivacii glagolov s kausativnym znacheniem. [On derivation of verbs with causative meaning]. *Issledovanija po semantike*, 10. P. 20–25.

Chudinov, A. P. (1982). O nekotoryh zakonomernostjah sovmeshhenija kausativnogo i nekausativnogo znachenij v predelah odnoj leksemy. [On some peculiarities of combination of causative and non-causative meaning within one lexeme]. *Issledovanija po semantike*, 8. P. 64–66.

Chudinov, A. P. (1981). O semantike kausativnyh glagolov. [About semantics of causative verbs]. *Issledovanija po semantike*, 7. P. 58–60.

Sheljakin, M. A. (2001). O ponjatii i funkcionalno-semanticheskoj tipologii dopolnenija obekta v russkom jazyke. [On notion and functional-semantic typology of object in Russian]. *Teoreticheskie problemy funkcional'noj grammatiki : materialy vseros. nauch. konf.* P. 22–24.

*Jazykovaja kartina mira i sistemnaja leksikografija* (2006). [Linguistic picture of the world and systematic lexicography]. pod.red V. Ju. Apresjan, Ju. D. Apresjan, E. Je. Babaeva i dr. M. : Jazyki slavjanskih kultur.

Jarceva, V. N. (1972). O sintaksicheskoj roli prjamogo dopolnenija v jazykah raznyh tipov. [On syntactic function of direct object in different types of languages]. *Chleny predlozhenija v jazykah raznyh tipov*. P. 4–19.

Alexiadou, A., Anagnostopoulou, E. (1997) Clitics in Restrictive Relatives: an antisymmetric account. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 17<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη. P. 304–317.

Anagnostopoulou, E. (1995). Direct object clitic doubling in Modern Greek: the prominence condition. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 15<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη Α.Ε. P. 328–339.

Anagnostopoulou, E. (1996). Experiencer-object predicates in Greek. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 16<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη Α.Ε. P. 254–265.

Bendini, P. (1985) The ergative subject. *Glossologia*, 4. P. 31–38.

Giannakidou, A., Merchant, J. (1996). On the interpretation of null indefinite objects in Greek. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 17<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη : Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη Α.Ε. P. 290–303.

Holton, D., Mackridge P., Φιλίππική-Warburton Eι. (1998). *Γραμματική της Ελληνικής Γλώσσας*. [Grammar of Modern Greek]. Αθήνα: Πατάκη.

Lander, Y., Plungian, V. (2010). Case, valency and transitivity. *Studies in language companion series 77, Language*, 86. P. 728–731.

Lascaratou, Ch., Phillippaki-Warburton, I. (1985). Lexical versus transformational passives in Modern Greek. *Glossologia, 2–3 (1983–1984)*. P. 99–109.

Mackridge, P. (2000). *Η Νεοελληνική γλώσσα*. [Modern Greek]. Αθήνα : Πατάκη.

Theofanopoulou-Kontou, D. (1985). Patient vs non patient orientation of the action and the voice distinction in Modern Greek. *Glossologia, 2–3 (1983–1984)*. P. 75–90.

Αναγνωστοπούλου, Ε. (1992). Εξαρτήσεις του Α-τονούμενου και κλιτικά στα νέα ελληνικά: ο παράγοντας της εξωπροτασιακής σύνθεσης. [A-dependencies and clitics in Modern Greek: the D-Linking factor]. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 13<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη : Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη. P. 275–293.

*Διατμηματικό πρόγραμμα διδασκαλίας της νέας ελληνικής ως ξένης γλώσσας. 2 Θέματα Νεοελληνικής σύνταξης. Θεωρία – ασκήσεις*. (1998). [The program of teaching Greek as a foreign language]. επιμέλεια έκδοσης Δ.Θεοφανοπούλου-Κοντού, Γ.Κατσιμάλη. Αθήνα: Εθνικό και καποδιστριακό πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών.

Ζόμπολου, Κ. (1997). «Αναζητώντας το δράστη ...». Αποθετικά ενάντι μέσο-παθητικής. Μια άλλη προσέγγιση των ρηματικών φωνών της Νεσ. [Searching for agent]. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά*

της 17<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη. P. 229–241.

Θεοφανοπούλου-Κοντού Δ. (2003). Τα ρήματα κίνησης της Νέας Ελληνικής και η μεταβιβαστική τους χρήση. [Causative function of motion verbs]. *Σύγχρονες τάσεις στην ελληνική γλωσσολογία*. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Πατάκη. P. 236–255.

Κλαίρης, Χ. (2005). *Γραμματική της Νέας Ελληνικής. Δομολειτουργική – Επικοινωνιακή*. [Modern Greek Grammar]. Αθήνα: Ελληνικά γράμματα.

Κριαράς, Εμμ. (1995). *Νέο ελληνικό λεξικό της σύγχρονης δημοτικής γλώσσας. Γραπτής και προφορικής*. [New dictionary of Modern Greek]. Αθήνα: Εκδοτική Αθηνών.

Μαλαγαρδή, Ι. (1995). Σθένος και έλεγχος σε προτάσεις με «να-συμπληρώματα» και «για να-συμπληρωματικές προτάσεις» σημασιολογικές και πραγματολογικές επισημάνσεις. [Valency and distribution in complex sentences with subordinate clauses]. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 15<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*, 11–14 Μαΐου 1994. – Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη. P. 372–383.

Μάντας, Α. Γ. (2006). *Το αλφαβητάρι του φιλόλογου*. [The alphabet of Linguist]. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Αρμός.

Μπαμπινιώτης, Γ. Δ. (1998). *Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας με σχόλια για τη σωστή χρήση των λέξεων*. [The dictionary of Modern Greek]. Αθήνα: Κέντρο λεξικολογίας.

Μπράϊαν, Δ. Τ. (1992). Η μορφοσύntax του νεοελληνικού ρηματικού συνόλου σαν μορφολογία όχι σύνταξη. [The Morphosyntax of verb as morphology and not syntax]. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 12<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη. P. 34–43.

Παυλίδου, Θ. (2005). *Επίπεδα Γλωσσικής ανάλυσης*. [Levels of language analyses]. Θεσσαλονίκη: Επίκεντρο.

Σαραφίδου, Τ. (2003). *Θέματα σύνταξης και λόγος της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας*. [Problems of syntax and discourse in Modern Greek]. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Αθ.Σταμούλης.

Σετάτος, Μ. (1997). Οι διαθέσεις στην κοινή νεοελληνική. [Diathesis in Modern Greek]. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 17<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη. P. 202–215.

Σετάτος, Μ. (1985). Παρατηρήσεις στις πτώσεις της νέας ελληνικής. [Case in Modern Greek]. *Γλωσσολογία*, 2–3 (1983–1984). P. 69–74.

Σιούπη, Α. (1996). Δομές μέσης διάθεσης στα νέα ελληνικά και στα γερμανικά. [Middle voice structures in Modern Greek and German]. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 16<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη. P. 172–182.

Σιούπη, Α. (1997). Η παραγωγή των δομών μέσης διάθεσης. [Formation of middle-voice structures]. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 17<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη. P. 216–228.

Σιούπη, Α. (1999). Τα κατηγορήματα των δομών μέσης διάθεσης: εργαστικά ή ανεργαστικά. [Unergative and ergative predicates in middle voice]. *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα. Πρακτικά της 19<sup>ης</sup> ετήσιας συνάντησης του τομέα γλωσσολογίας της φιλοσοφικής σχολής του Αριστοτέλειου Πανεπιστημίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός οίκος αδελφών Κυριακίδη, 447–460.

Χατζηβασιλείου, Γ. Κ. (1995). *Συνοπτική νεοελληνική γραμματική και σύνταξη*. [Short Modern Greek Grammar and Syntax]. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Γρηγόρη.

Χαραλαμπάκης, Χ. (2001). *Νεοελληνικός λόγος. Μελέτες για τη γλώσσα και λογοτεχνία και το ύφος*. [Language, Literature and Stylistics Studies]. Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Νεφέλη.

**Acknowledgments:** The research is financially supported by the A. G. Leventis Foundation.

### **Bibliographic Description:**

Любченко, Т. В. (2019). Предикат і об'єктна синтаксема в семантико-синтаксичній структурі речення сучасної новогрецької мови. *Науковий часопис*

Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов, 19. Р. 90–108. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2019.19.06>

#### **Анотація**

Актуальність пропонованого дослідження зумовлена необхідністю вивчення взаємозв'язку між морфологічними і синтаксичними категоріями дієслова; розкриття функціональних характеристик цієї частини мови, що визначає структуру речення, реалізацію словотвірних інтенцій слова і побудову цілісного тексту як одиниці комунікативного синтаксису. В статті розглянуто семантико-синтаксичну структуру речення новогрецької мови, встановлено типи предикатів новогрецької мови, з'ясовано лексичне наповнення, морфологічне оформлення та синтаксичну поведінку об'єктних синтаксем. На семантико-синтаксичному рівні об'єктна синтаксема перебуває в позиції правобічного сильнокерованого члена речення. Прототипною об'єктною синтаксемою є каузатив із категоріальною семою, що виражає мотивацію появи ознак субстанцій. У новогрецькій мові каузативні дієслова репрезентовано: дієсловами однієї лексеми; дієсловами різних лексем; дієсловами, утвореними за допомогою словотвірних засобів. Каузативи, представлені дієсловами однієї лексеми, тлумачимо як дієслова з варіативною валентністю. До дієслів із варіативною валентністю віднесено дієслова, у яких та сама морфологічна форма будує перехідні та неперехідні конструкції, не змінюючи своєї станової належності. Словотвірний трансформатив дієслів із варіативною валентністю представлено відад'єктивними та відсубстантивними дієсловами. Такий опис уможливіє підготовку функціональної граматики новогрецької мови, що є актуальним завданням сучасної елліністики. У загальномовознавчому аспекті інтерпретація отриманих результатів дослідження важлива для виявлення відношень між семантичною й синтаксичною структурами речення, визначення семантичних типів предикатів та класифікації об'єктних синтаксем.

**Ключові слова:** структура речення, комунікативний синтаксис, предикат, об'єкт, функціональна граMATика.