Ewa Jędrzejko
University of Silesia in Katowice

The problematics of describing periphrastic predication Between word and image

Summary

The article discusses selected problems connected with description of complex predicates (*CPred*), i.a., the still controversial issue of criteria applied to differentiate and classify elements of this category, their status in lexical-grammatical system and their relationship with synthetic entities belonging to the class of *VERBUM*. What makes *CPreds* interesting is the fact that they have been encountered in various languages (e.g. *ispytywat''voschiščenije* (Russian) = *mieć // odczuć podziw // zachwyt* (Polish) *= to feel admiration (for)* (English); *polučať pomošč* (Russian) = *otrzymać // dostać pomoc* (Polish) = to receive help (from sb) (English); *zaviazywat' družbu* (Russian) = *nawiązać przyjaźń // zaprzyjaźnić się* (Polish) = *to strike up a friendship // to become friends* (English), etc.). This situation calls for a search for complex solutions, also with the aid of new linguistic theories. Especially the cognitivist thesis about the prototypical character of lexical-grammatical categories allows to classify *Cpreds* as a typologically diversified group of complex entities (characterised by varied degrees of fixedness) functioning within the class of *VERBUM* understood as a gradated and polycentric category. Such an approach allows for differentiation of several types (structural models) of *Cpreds*, i.e. entities representing a peripheral group of verbs and differing with respect to structure, lexical composition and degree of 'fixedness' of their meanings, and, as a result, with respect to their global content:

1) [V_{COP} + N_{KONKR} // *Nabstr* // *Adj* // *Adv*] (standard nominal predicates);
2) [V_{MOD}+ V_{INF}] + ... (modal predicates);
3) [V_{FAZ} +V // NA] + ... (phase-aspectual predicates);
4) [V_{GENER} + NA // NE // Nabstr] + ... (verbo-nominal analytisms);
5) [$V_{METAF //}$^{METAPRED} + Nabstr // NA // NE] + ... (periphrastic predicates as part of verbal phraseology).

Key words:

syntax, phraseology, idiomatic syntactic constructions; complex predicates (nominal, analytic, modal, phase-aspectual, periphrastic predicates); polycentric category, gradated category; verbalisers ($Verb_{synsemant}$ = synsemantic // auxiliary verbs), nominal predicators ($Nabstr_{pred}$), nominalisation

Streszczenie

Problematyka opisu peryfrastycznej predykacji. Między słowem a obrazem

W artykule rozważa się wybrane problemy opisu złożonych znaków predykacji (*complex predicates*, *CPred*) – m.in. ciągle kontrowersyjne problemy kryteriów ich wyróżniania i typologii, statusu w systemie leksykalno-gramatycznym oraz stosunku do pełnoznacznych jednostek (syntetycznych) z klasy *verbum*. *CPred* są interesujące również dlatego, że obserwowano je w wielu różnych językach (np. ros. *ispytywat'' voschiščenije,* pol. mieć // odczuwać podziw // zachwyt = zachwycać się, ang.

to feel admiration (for); ros. *polučiť pomošč (+ot kogo) = otrzymać // dostać pomoc (od kogo) = to receive help (from sb.)*; *zaviazywať družbu – zawrzeć, nawiązać przyjaźń = zaprzyjaźnić się*; ang. *to strike up a friendship,* etc.). Skłania to do ponownego poszukiwania kompleksowych rozwiązań, korzystając także z nowszych ofert lingwistyki. Szczególnie kognitywna teza o prototypowej naturze kategorii gramatyczno-leksykalnych pozwala traktować *Cpred* jako typologicznie zróżnicowaną sferę znaków złożonych (o różnym stopniu utrwalenia) z klasy *VERBUM,* ujmowanej jako kategoria gradacyjna i policentryczna. Można wtedy wskazywać kilka typów (modeli strukturalnych) *Cpred,* różniących się strukturą, składem leksykalnym, stopniem „związania" znaczeń składników, a w efekcie: treścią globalną takich wyrażeń (jednostek z peryferyjnej strefy czasowników):

1) [V_{COP} + N_{KONKR} // *Nabstr* // *Adj* // *Adv*]
2) [V_{MOD}+ V_{INF}] + ... (orzeczenia modalne)
3) [V_{FAZ} +V // NA] + ... (orzeczenia fazowe)
4) [V_{GENER} + NA // NE // Nabstr] + ... (orzeczenia analityczne właściwe)
5) [$V_{METAF //}$ ^{METAPRED} + Nabstr // NA // NE] + ... (orzeczenia peryfrastyczne jako część frazeologii werbalnej.

Słowa klucze:

składnia, frazeologia, idiomatyka składniowa; predykaty złożone (orzeczenia imienne, analityczne, modalne, fazowe, peryfrastyczne); kategoria policentryczna, kategoria gradacyjna; werbalizatory ($Verb_{synsemant}$ = czasowniki synsemantyczne // pomocnicze), predykatory imienne ($Nabstr_{pred}$), nominalizacja

The paper shall discuss selected theoretical problems connected with complex predicates, i.a. the still controversial issue of criteria applied to differentiate and classify elements of this category, their status in lexical-grammatical system and their relationship with synthetic entities belonging to the class of *verbum*. What makes such problems interesting is also their universal character, as they have been encountered and described from various angles in various languages.[1] The following examples represent complex predicates which belong to the group of idiomatic syntactic constructions: *ispytywať voschiščenije (dla Ngen)* (Russian) = *mieć // odczuć podziw // zachwyt (dla+Ngen)* (Polish) = *to feel admiration (for)*; *polučať pomošč (+ot Ngen)* (Russian) = *otrzymać // dostać pomoc (od Ngen)* (Polish) = *to receive help (from)*; *zaviazywať družbu* (Russian) = *to strike up a friendship, to become friends*; *opraviti kontrol* (Slovene) = *to conduct an inspection*; *dajati povod* (Slovene) = *to provide a reason*; *sozdavam zaklučok* (Bulgarian) = *to draw a conclusion*; *izrazuvam soglasnost* (Bulgarian) = *to give one's assent*; *činit natlak* (Czech) = *to exert pressure*; *dělat iluze* (Czech) = *to create delusions*; *přinášet problémy* (Czech) = *to cause trouble*; *effectuer un virement* (French) = *to make a (wire) transfer*; *faire des efforts* (French) = *to make an effort, to exert oneself*; *donner l'ordre* (French) = *to give an order*; *in Wut geraten* (German) = *to fly into a rage*; *Abhilfe schaffen* (German) = *to find a remedy*; *in Angst verstzen* (German) = *to frighten*; *Anklang finden* (German) = *to meet with sb's approval*; *tehda paatos* (Finnish) = *to make a decision;* and in English: *to pay a visit, to feel hunger.*

---

[1] Even such 'exotic' ones as the Malay language; see: Cattell (1984). Descriptions were created within the frameworks of various methodologies, but mainly structuralism, with elements of generativism. Phraseologised constructions, i.a. as forms utilised to express feelings, fall also within the scope of cognitivism, however, no systematic studies in this area have been conducted so far.

Various terms, frequently inclusive ones, are applied with reference to this type of structures existing at the intersection of lexicology, phraseology and syntax. Indirectly, this can be a sign of difficulties with their systematisation and typology. For instance, in Polish they are known as *complex // analytic // periphrastic predicates*, as well as *verbo-nominal analytisms* (abbr. VNA); see also below. Despite numerous studies conducted in Poland and abroad,[2] the question whether the VNA are language units or products of grammar, still remains open. This situation calls for a search for solutions in linguistic theories of the past and the present, with contemporary theories focusing i.a. on the concept of cognitive grammar.[3] Some cognitivist assumptions, e.g. the thesis about the prototypical character of lexical-grammatical categories (Taylor 2001; Tabakowska 2000) allow to classify *complex predicates* as a typologically diversified group of complex entities (i.e. constructions of varied degrees of fixedness) functioning within the extended class of VERBUM understood as a gradated and polycentric category (see also Jędrzejko 2002). From this standpoint, the category of VERBS would include, apart from 'prototypical' entities (synthetic full verbs capable of independently indicating actions, states and relationships occurring over time) also auxiliary verbs (auxiliary verbalisers) and various types of *complex predicates* they form. One of the subtypes included would be verbo-nominal constructions[4] such as the VNA, e.g. *zrobić ukłon <> ukłonić się* (*to give a bow, lit. „to make a bow" <> to bow*), *dokonać obliczeń <> obliczyć* (*to make calculations, lit. „to perform calculations" <> to calculate*), *prowadzić badania <> badać* (*to conduct research <> to research*), *wydać rozkaz <> rozkazać* (*to give an order <> to order*), etc. It is also worth noting that according to cognitivists the constructions are 'among the most reliable evidence that the structure of linguistic categories reflects the structure of extralinguistic reality' (Taylor, 2001). This is an important statement with regard to units functioning as periphrastic predicates. Undoubtedly, their complex structure, characterised by a global meaning frequently based on a conceptual metaphor, relies not only on semantic-grammatical connectivity of constituent lexemes but, first and foremost, on the established ways of conceptualising phenomena by a given community, which are encoded in its linguistic awareness, and to which the VNA, by means of metaphor, refer to. Their form and degree of stability as an element of the system is conditioned by socially established cognitive models, conceptual *schemas*, *frames* and cultural *scripts*,[5] which constitute a focus of 'post-structural' linguistics.

---

2   I discussed the most important of these in my monograph *Problemy predykacji peryfrastycznej,* Katowice 2002, where I also included extensive basic bibliography.

3   In generative descriptions the interest in complex units, i.a. *complex predicates*, was marginal, since according to that approach every construction could be reduced to a formula consisting of an 'orderly sequence' of slots to be filled by lexical units. Such formulas were also built for the VNA constructions, which did not, however, explain their semantic structure (for a more extensive discussion see Jędrzejko, 2002).

4   Taylor (2001) states plainly: 'Constructions (...) should be considered as prototypical categories which may be expanded to a lesser or greater degree.' (ibid., p. 269; translation mine)

5   All italicised terms in this sentence belong to the metalanguage of cognitive grammars. Definitions and explanations (although not always precise ones) can be found in numerous studies representing

It is noteworthy, with reference to the discussion about the status of the VNA in language, that according to Hopper & Thompson (1985) neither the characteristics of a linguistic sign nor its location within a given lexical-grammatical category are permanent and categoriality is, in turn, a matter of degree. Categorial features of language signs may change depending on the context in which they appear.[6] This thesis, although not a new one (cf. textual homonyms such as: *the child's dress₁ was on the chair: it took five minutes to dress₂ the child*; *a baking₁ oven was in the corner of the room: I was baking₂ a cake in an oven*), can apply very well to periphrastic predicates and elements of their structure. Their peculiarity consists in the fact that the verbal element, considered an element of the lexicon, is a (prototypical) full verb, but if used in a function of an auxiliary (V_{Cop}) it is subject to 'decategorisation' (a term taken from Taylor, 2001). By describing an activity as an auxiliary it loses its basic referential meaning and its ability to predicate independently (cf. *x fell₁ in a hole: x fell₂ in love*). Thus, in constructions of the latter type it becomes a 'less prototypical' element of the class of VERBUM, although it formally retains its representative features. However, such a non-predicative (non-referential, auxiliary, or metapredicative) function of a verb and its contextual meanings, differing from its basic lexical meaning, are revealed *only* in the expression plane and *only* in periphrastic constructions. They can also change depending on the meaning of the nominal component of a periphrasis, as in the following Polish examples: *nieść₁ – carry sb/sth* (N_{KONKR}) usually using one's hands, but: *nieść₂+NA // Nabstr: nieść pomoc // radę // zgubę // śmierć // radość = bring (lit. „carry") help // advice // loss // death // joy*. Other Polish examples include: *odnieść₁ = to put sth back in its place* (*odnieść książkę do biblioteki = to return a book to the library*), but in the VNA constructions *odnieść₂ zwycięstwo = to gain victory, odnieść₃ rany = to be injured*; *żywić₁ (kogo, czym) = to feed, to provide nutrition,* but in the VNA constructions *żywić₂ nadzieję // szacunek // niechęć* = to feel a feeling specified by Nabstr (*to hold hope // dislike*); *płonąć₁ = to burn* (literally only about fire), but in the VNA constructions *płonąć₂ gniewem, nienawiścią = to burn with anger, hatred; miotać₁ (co // czym) = to throw (sth),* but in the VNA constructions *miotać obelgi, oszczerstwa = to hurl insults, libels; (przy)wiązać₁ = to fasten together the ends of a piece of fabric, rope*, but in the VNA constructions *wiązać nadzieję (z czym) = to hope for sth, przywiązywać wagę = to attach importance to sth*, etc. Such examples could be multiplied. Dictionaries do not usually provide definitions of such 'associated meanings' acquired by a verb in the AWN structures: not only are they sometimes difficult to define, but in the absence

---

this approach – e.g. Tabakowska 2001, pp. 193, 250ff ; see also Fife 1994, Langacker 1995, Taylor 2001, pp. 127–130.

[6] However, in this theory the term *sign* is understood in a different way and refers to the *parole* plane (the only plane taken into consideration). Still a distinctive feature of a verb consists in having a grammaticalised tense category – it cannot be otherwise. On the other hand, looking for a conceptual (semantic) foundation of grammatical categories Langacker (1987) defines them in terms of *contouring, profiling relationships in specific cognitive domains*. For instance, verbs are 'linguistic units profiling a temporal relationship', while verbal nouns profile 'a number of temporally adjacent relationships'. Such abstracts as *love, envy, idea* have a comparatively homogenous structure of 'uncontoured substance' expanded by each particular name (see Taylor 2001: 261–162). The NE should probably also be viewed in this manner.

of such structures they simply do not exist![7] Hence, dictionaries list only several most frequent verbo-nominal idioms. So far, in lexical descriptions not much attention has been paid to the semantics of verbalisers either, apart from providing their general functional characteristics, which classifies them as *auxiliary*[8] elements for verbal categories (i.e. ones that indicate time, person, aspect, etc.). For these reasons, it is an interesting research task, especially with regard to bilingual dictionaries, to specify the inventory of the most frequent secondary operator verbs and their meanings in periphrastic constructions.[9] A manner of perceiving some predicated states in terms of other states (conceptual metaphor) to a significant degree determines the choice of a verbaliser and the global image conveyed by the VNA constructions.

Let us consider this interdependency using an example of the already obliterated relationship between the basic and the abstract meaning of the Polish verb *wejść* (to enter), which can function in the VNA structure: *wejść w porozumienie // w konflikt // w kontakt* (lit. enter into an agreement // conflict // contact) < '*wejść w coś // do czegoś* (enter into // inside some physical space). A metaphor can also be found at the basis of the Polish VNA *znaleźć śmierć // satysfakcję* (to find death // satisfaction) < *znaleźć coś*, i.e. to find something – accidentally or as a result of intentional action, which is denoted by *szukać* (*czegoś*) (to seek /sth/), hence the possible paraphrase into the VNA *szukać śmierci // satysfakcji* (to seek death // satisfaction). The meaning of 'passivity' conveyed by such Polish verbs as *ulegać, podlegać* (to yield, to submit oneself) < *leżeć // być pod czym* (to lie // be beneath sth), *poddawać* (*się*) *komu // czemu* (surrender/become subject to sb/sth) metaphorically profiles the content predicated by the VNA: *ulec złudzeniu, przemocy, zniszczeniu* (to indulge in an illusion, to surrender to violence, to undergo destruction); *podlegać wpływom* (to yield to influences), *poddać naciskom* (to

---

subject sth to pressure). These secondary meanings projected onto a different sphere of activities are also revealed by etymology: (*pod*)*dać się* (to surrender) < *dać [siebie] pod (coś)* (to place [oneself] beneath (sth))*; leżeć pod czym* (to lie beneath sth) – there is an image strongly established in the cultural script: 'TO BE BENEATH (Polish: *BYĆ POD IS WORSE*' > *podległość* (subordination)*, uległość* (submission)*, poddany // poddaństwo* (subject // subjection) — all of these examples connote passivity, inertia, helplessness. This meaning profiles the image conveyed by the VNA: *ulegać namowom* (to yield to persuasion)*, ulegać prośbie* (to comply with a request)*, poddać się presji* (to give in/subject to pressure) connote resultativity: 'to do what one has been persuaded, asked, etc. to do'.

Verb polysemy, including abstract meanings (which I regard as semantic 'parameters' of Nabstr in the VNA) develops in the course of usage. However, 'decategorisation' of a verb in the VNA results also from complex mental processes in which metaphor plays a crucial role. By definition, neither structural nor generative approach takes such factors into account. And it is mainly metaphor and certain cultural scripts connected with it that provide a foundation for both content and form of most periphrastic predicates, semantically richer and more figurative than 'simple' verbs which are, or might be, their equivalents. It is also due to the fact that the integrated meaning of the VNA is not only a simple sum of meanings of its constituent elements, according to the rule 'more words equals more content', but results as well from a peculiar perintegration of meanings brought by all these elements. A periphrastically expressed conceptual image comes into being as a result of metaphorical overlapping of images from various cognitive domains reflected by the respective images. Thus, without accounting for all these factors a description of the VNA according to generative principles is incomplete, although it points out a general grammatical mechanism of the VNA, i.e. their internal and external syntax. However, the point is that, at least theoretically, each full verb may become a metaphorical metapredicate of Nabstr. On the other hand, each noun can have a predicative function and be 'reverbalised' with the help of a verb. Formal principles of syntax, even if they account for the selection and subcategorisation rules, are almost always exposed to the danger of 'overgeneration'. This refers especially to the rules of the VNA generation if it is not supported by cognitive and cultural interpretation. Only researching data assembled in large corpora allows, empirically, choosing 'candidates' to include in the grammatical lexicon of verbalisers (and the lexicon of nouns as well, because of the 'support' verbs they select[10]).

---

[10]   Cf. also an interesting study by Grażyna Vetulani (2000). Her description and the proposed syntactic dictionary highlight the problem of periphrastic predication from a reverse point of view. The author's viewpoint focuses on an abstract noun with regard to its predicative function and ability to select both arguments and 'support' verbs. She states: 'While specifying the meaning of the predicate the selection of an accompanying verb is especially characteristic' (ibid., p. 79, translation mine). It is also a good vantage point for noun typology. For instance, Polish verbs connected with functions or honours combine with the verbs *pełnić, objąć, piastować, przyjąć (godność, stanowisko, tytuł)* (to take, to hold, to accept (office)), while names of diseases 'select' such nouns as *mieć, dostać, złapać, przechodzić (grypę, anginę)* (to contract, to come down with (flu, pharyngitis)).

It should be noted in this place that the very concept of analyticity in lexicon and grammar is (as well may be) understood in a variety of ways, either in narrow or in a wide sense. Thus, the same applies to denotation of such terms as *analytism // complex predicate // analytic predicate // periphrastic predicate*, *periphrastic // analytic predicates*, p*eriphrastic // predicative constructions* (Anusiewicz 1978, Buttler 1967b, 1968; Bogusławski 1978, Topolińska 1979, 1984; Otfinowski 1982; Jędrzejko 1982, Mindak 1983, Grzegorczykowa 1984, Dyszak 1992, Żmigrodzki 2000, Loewe 2000), *analytical verbs* (Jędrzejko 1997), shortly: *analytisms*, or in a more descriptive way: *constructions with a lexical auxiliary // support verb* (Buttlerowa 1988, Vetulani 2000), and finally, may also be understood as a certain functionally determined subtype of phraseology, the so-called *phrases* (Polish: *zwroty*) according to the terminology of S. Skorupka et al. (1982). Terminology is one of the reasons for 'discord' with regard to analytical // periphrastic predication and a source of difficulties with defining borders within the field. A multitude of terms can be encountered in studies written in various languages. In Polish there are *konstrukcje opisowe z czasownikiem funkcyjnym* or *werbalne formy rozłożone//rozciągliwe*, and in other languages the following terms are utilised: *Funktionsverbgefüge* and *Streckformen* (Engelen 1968, Hartenstein 1994; Polenz 1963), *phrases á verbe support* (Giry-Schneider (1978), *ustojčivyje glagol'no-imennyje slovosočetanija* (Bosilkov 1979), *frazovyje rečenija s opisateľnym glagolom // opisatelnyje oboroty* (Kopylenko 1978; Deribas 1983); *analitični predikativni izrazi* (Hajrov 1990); *dekomponovane predykaty* (Radovanović 1977); general terms such as *complex predicates* (Ross 1968; Jackendoff 1974) and *composite predicates* (Cattel 1984), or simply *collocations* (Comrie, Thompson 1985).

What is more, each of these terms is well justified:

– by the structure of the signs (the VNA create constructions consisting of VERBUM and NOMEN);
– by their semiotic and semantic-syntactic function (the AVN are non-continuous signs of events; being logical operators of predicate exponents they functions as predicates, they determine valency schemas and imply specific roles of nominal arguments);
– by their structure and way of expressing the predicated content (in the analytical, non-continuous and descriptive way, i.e. periphrastically), while the sign as a whole has a non-ambiguous 'single' reference, analogically to synthetic units;
– they highlight the specific nature and function of the verbal element (which is auxiliary, i.e. *synsemantic*, *functional, operatorial*, *supportive*, *descriptive*) with refer-ence to the main carrier of predication – as its metapredicate, which also introduces verbal categories (and thus is a *verbaliser*); simultaneously, they also characterise the nominal component by underlining its tight semantic connection with nominalisa-tion processes (*names* of activities, events, states, nominalised *predicate*, *predicator* (NA//NE//Nabstr), *main carrier of predication // nominal predicator*), and the ability to select a *support* verb;
– they all highlight formal discontinuity ('modularity') of the VNA combined with their functional autonomy and global character of 'fractionalised' meaning (*analyt-ism, periphrasis, discontinuous entity, complex // phraseological // periphrastic predicate*);

– they highlight semantic and functional analogies of these constructions as predicative *complexes* with a full synthetic verb (the VNA show nearly identical dispositions as regards meaning and grammar-syntax), which does not, however, entail complete semantic and communicative equivalence.

For the reasons listed above, all the terms have been preserved, although they do not always cover the same ground. Describing various models of complex predication will allow looking at them in a more specific way and pinpointing the constructions that are the focus of our attention. In a narrow sense, the separate nature of predicative verbo-nominal periphrastics is easier to notice against the background of other types of *complex predicates* regarded as systemic ways of realising the 'deep' predicate (a prelinguistic content-concept unit, an element of the P-A structure). It is possible to point out, schematically, both in Polish and in other languages, several types of complex predicates[11] differing with respect to structure, lexical composition and degree of 'fixedness' of their meanings:

1) $[V_{COP} + N_{KONKR}$ // Nabstr // Adj // Adv]

Standard nominal predicates, i.e. constructions with a basic auxiliary verb such as *być // mieć, sta(wa)ć się, zostać* (to be // to have // to become). These semantically // referentially empty verbs are considered the most 'transparent' *copulae* which show the broadest lexical and grammatical connectivity with the nominal predicate, e.g. *jest dyrektorem, staje się // został artystą, był mądry, staje się mądrzejszy* (is a director, is becoming // became an artist, was wise, is becoming wiser). The opposition *staje się > jest // był > stał się // został* (is becoming > is // was // became) signalises the course of action in time; a phase and/or aspect.[12]

2) $[V_{MOD} + V_{INF}] + ...$

The so-called modal predicates, i.e. complex constructions with basic modal verbs *móc // musieć, należy* (can // must, ought to), etc., which require an infinitive form of the main predicate. This type is of no particular interest in the context of the present study, but it does represent a widely understood phenomenon of complex predication (just as types 1 and 3) due to the 'synsemanticity' and metapredicative character of V_{MOD}, e.g. *musiał wracać, mógł wyjść, trzeba się śpieszyć, powinno się przewidzieć* (he had to come back, he could leave, one should hurry up, one should foresee). However, the nominalised shape of event modalisers, i.e. $Nabstr^{MOD} = possibility$, *necessity*, *need*, etc. creates both nominal predicates with conventional existential-aspectual or phase-aspectual meaning: *jest // istnieje // była // powstała konieczność + Nabstr* (there is // there arose // arose a necessity) > *należy + Inf // musi + $V_{infinit}$; była potrzeba + Nabstr*

---

[11]   It must be noted that according to the purely formal approach the function of predicate is played by every verb in the finite form regardless of the degree of its semantic completeness. Then the problem of complex predicates (and thus also periphrastic ones) simply does not exist.

[12]   If we view verb *auxiliarity* and the terms *complex predication // nominal predicate* in a broader perspective, other predicative constructions (B-E types) shall also be included in this group, regardless of their internal diversity. This is one of the reasons for terminological problems and difficulties with drawing boundaries of periphrastic predication.

(there was a need) > *trzeba // ktoś musi // powinien* + *Inf* (it is necessary // sb must // should), *powstała // pojawiła się możliwość* + *Nabstr* (a possibility came into being // appeared) > *można // ktoś będzie mógł* + *Inf* () and periphrastic predicates: *zrodziła się możliwość // konieczność* (there arose [a] possibility // necessity).

3) [V$_{FAZ}$ +V//NA] +.....

The phase-aspectual kompleks predicates. These are constructions with basic phase verbs: *zacząć, trwać, przestać* (to begin, to last, to stop) which imply an event predicate in alternative forms: either verbal or nominal one. For example, (*kwiaty*) *zaczęły kwitnąć* = (*kwiaty*) *rozkwit(a)ły* ((flowers) began to blossom = (flowers) were blossoming/blossomed), but non-personally only *zaczęło się kwitnienie // nastała pora kwitnienia* (the blossoming began // the blossoming time came); cf. also *zaczęła się // powstała awantura* > *trwała* > *skończyła się awantura* (a quarrel began // emerged > lasted > finished); *kończyło się* > *nastał koniec awantury* (it was ending > the end of the quarrel came); *zaczęli rozpaczać i narzekać* > *nastała rozpacz i narzekanie* (they began to despair and complain > despair and complaining began). Typical phase complex predicates are also synonymous to predicative periphrases, usually the subjectless phrases with verbs of movement, which specify the phase of an event according to the principles of the genetic conceptual metaphor: [*TEMPORAL MOVEMENT* > *SPATIAL MOVEMENT*]: *nadeszła klęska, minęła młodość, nastąpiła radość* (defeat came, youth passed, joy followed), etc.[13]

4) [V$_{GENER}$ + NA//NE//Nabstr] +....

The most common type of the VNA with basic 'generic' verbs (e.g. *robić* (to do), *czuć* (to feel), *mieć* (to have), *doświadczać* (to experience), and also: *wyrażać* (to express), *okazywać* (to show), *jawić się // objawiać się* (to appear // to manifest itself), etc.).[14] Such verbs in a way 'reveal' the generic sem of a given class of nominal predicates qualified as ACTION, STATE, FEELING, FEATURE possessed, etc. Synsemantic verbalisers of this kind carry a certain portion of content general for the whole category and also verbal properties (tense, person, aspect, etc.), giving names the grammatical contour (profile) of VERBUM ('verb-likeness' + 'actionality' // experiencing // causality // symptomality, etc.). The lexical meaning is then carried by the name of an event (full NA // NE // Nabstr). In this case it might be more justifiable to use the term *analytic construction // verbo-nominal analytism* (in a narrow

---

[13] In the dictionary of the VNA similar structures were characterised as *phase*, *non-personal*, as the phrase *nastała cisza* cannot be conjugated (* *ja nastaję...*) and the grammatical (formal) subject is not a typical 'active' subject of the metapredicate *nastać, przyjść* (*to follow, to come*), furthermore, it is frequently not implied by the name of an event: *cisza, zima nastała* (*silence, winter followed*); *nastały porządki* ([*new*] *order came*), *zaszły zmiany* (*changes occurred*). Sometimes there can also be observed a certain kind of regular correlations with a subject verbal clause: *nastała rozpacz: ktoś rozpacza* (*despair followed: sb has been despairing*) – specifically: *ktoś zaczął rozpaczać* (*sb began to despair*). On the other hand, cf.: *nastał nowy kierownik* (*a new manager took over*).

[14] However, the group // inventory of 'generic' verbs would have to be further specified in the course of detailed study; as for today it remains a mere theoretical postulate.

sense), because the *verbaliser* does not introduce any additional meanings and the whole is practically synonymous to a full verb: *czuć wstyd = wstydzić się* (*to feel shame = to be ashamed*), *odczuwać zakłopotanie = być zakłopotanym* (*to feel embarrassment = to be embarrassed*); *odczuwać zaniepokojenie = niepokoić się // być zaniepokojonym* (to feel restlessness = to be restless), *doznać cierpienia = cierpieć* (to feel suffering = to suffer); *robić pranie = prać* (to do the washing up = to wash up), etc. Cf. also *robić zamieszanie, robić wrażenie* (to cause confusion, to make an impression), when the meaning of NA is 'disconnected' from the content of its basic verb *zamieszać, (wy) razić* (to confuse, to impress).

5) [$V_{METAF}//^{METAPRED}$ + Nabstr//NA//NE] +....

Regarded as periphrastic predicates in the strict sense of the term, these constructions employ secondary synsemantic verbs, these primarily full, 'concrete' verbs are used in these constructions metaphorically not only in a verbalising function (as in 1-4), but also in a metapredicative one (as in 2-4). But most frequently they are used idiomatically (as in 6), for example: *mieć // brać // wziąć udział* (to take part, lit. to have/take part), *uprawiać wspinaczkę // plotkarstwo* (to go climbing // to engage in gossip; lit. to practise climbing/gossiping), *pławić się w rozkoszy* (to savour delight; lit. to swim in delight); *rzucić klątwę* (to cast a curse), *wpaść w szał* (to fly into a rage; lit. to fall into rage), *wylać gniew* (to vent anger; lit. to pour anger), *tryskać radością* (to be frantic with joy; lit. to gush with joy), *rzucić pomysł* (to suggest an idea; lit. to throw an idea). However, they are motivated by conceptual metaphors and this is what differentiates them from all the other predicative constructions. The verbal element provides both the grammatical information about the 'verbalisation' of the content (in every type of complex predication) but also information about non-grammaticalised features of an activity, such as phase, pace, manner, and duration. However, first and foremost, unlike in the remaining types of such constructions, it modifies the 'conceptual profile' of the nominal predicate. It becomes the semantic parameter Nabstr, and as such it has a metapredicative character. The figurative sense of the verb ($V_{METAF}//^{METAPRED}$) introduces a variety of conceptual phemic additions. Such additional content, profiling the nominally predicated content, is based on the system of knowledge and cognitive experience, in certain established cultural scripts, etc. Thus, a periphrastic verbaliser enriches the linguistic image of a concept. This element combines grammatical sems with overall generic and associative-metaphorical (cognitive) ones, but these sems are formally separated from the 'purely' lexical meaning indicated by the nominal element (Nabstr). In this sense periphrases resemble analytisms (as type 4), but they are richer because of their descriptive, i.e. *periphrastic*, character (cf. *odczuwać rozpacz : pogrążyć się w rozpaczy* (to feel despair : to sink into despair, lit. to be indulged into despair); *czuć przerażenie : wpaść w przerażenie* (to feel fright : to get a fright, lit. to fall into fright); *mieć konsekwencje : zrodzić konsekwencje* (have consequences: entail consequences, lit. to give birth to consequences). Their conceptual nature and stylistic markedness make them more attractive and are conducive to phraseologisation of the constructions, which consequently brings them close to type 6 constructions.

6) [V^METAFOR + N + ◊ +◊ +]_IDIOM

These are so-called phraseological predicates, i.e. 'typical' idioms functioning as verbs. However, their structure, unlike the structure of type 5 predicates, cannot be described by means of a general formula. Such discontinuous phraseological units are characterised by low variance; they do not come in series, as is the case with those belonging to type 5. Lexical composition and meaning of phraseological predicates is rather constant, yet unforeseeable. However, they contain a verb, which determines the grammatical function of the whole expression and may be the head of a sentence. Their global meaning is not a simple sum of meanings of their components, neither does it directly derive from them, cf. *powstrzymać łzy* (to hold // blink back tears, lit. to hold back tears)*; pleść co ślina na język przyniesie // pleść androny // koszałki-opałki // duby smalone // jak Piekarski na mękach* (to talk off the top of one's head, to talk nonsense; lit. to plait what saliva brings // rubbish, to engage in gibble-gabble)*; zadzierać nosa* (to turn up one's nose, to put on airs; lit. to move nose upwards)*; prawić słodkie słówka* (to coax // cajole with flattery; lit. to preach sweet words). However, many of these can be synonymised with full synthetic verbs or a type 4 or 5 periphrasis (VNA). Thus, the boundary between phraseological predicates and 'typical' periphrastic analytisms (which frequently are phraseolgised as well) is rather hazy. Cf. the following synonymous sequences: *powstrzymać łzy // powstrzymać płacz = nie płakać* (to hold // blink back tears = to refrain from crying) and the inchoative *wybuchnąć płaczem = rozpłakać się* (to burst into tears; lit. to explode with cry = to start crying), while it is incorrect to say *wybuchnąć łzami* (to burst into crying, lit. to explode with tears); cf. also *pleść jak potłuczony: pleść głupstwa* (to talk nonsense; lit. to plait as a beaten one/ to plait stupidities : to engage in gibble-gabble) or the phrase *zadzierać nosa* (to turn up one's nose) as a synonymous to the predicate *być zarozumiałym* (to be vain). Type 1 phraseological expressions, compared to other types of complex predication, can have more components, and none of them is the major carrier of predicated content.

Such a typology of complex signs of predication shows the fuzziness // liquidity and internal diversity (polycentricity) of the category of *complex predicates*. It provides a clear view of their heterogeneity, as well as similarities and differences among particular (sub)types of the class. One similarity consists in the fact that all predicative constructions obligatorily include a verb, but the verbs vary with respect to the degree and character of their synsemanticity. As verbalisers they introduce grammatically relevant 'indications of verbal character' (tense, person, etc.), which the semantically central component does not formally possess. On the other hand, one of the differences consists in the manner in which forms and senses carried by all components 'combine', and in the varying degrees of integrity with respect to their content, which decides about the value of such predicates. The least integrated are types 1, 2 and 3, while type 5 (periphrastic predicates) is more integrated, and type 6 – the most integrated. It allows to specify the scope and mutual relationships of the terms *complex – analytical – periphrastic – phraseological predicates*, which are practically inclusive. However, in the light of tradition it does not have to imply that the already existing terminology referring to periphrastic structures (in the narrow meaning) ought to be abandoned. In the present classification they are most accurately represented by type 5.

Because of their identical syntactic function, all types of *complex predicates* can be considered as a widely understood category of predicative periphrastics, which has its share in creating verbal lexicon. According to this approach, the category of VERBUM would have a polycentric character.[15] Complex predicates would then include all characteristic features of predication: if they refer to specific actions (processes, states, etc.) they signal a grammatical category of time (i.e. *profile courses* of time) and construct senses (i.e. indicate their argument structure and valency positions). This condition is fulfilled by every predicate sign, both formally simple and complex ones (with an 'auxiliary' verb). Furthermore, the above typology shows the unclear character of the term analyticity (in a broad sense), but is helpful in outlining the central sphere of analytical-periphrastic predicates. We assume that the central sphere of analytical predication (in a narrow sense) is represented by type 4, extended by type 5 because of its metaphorical character and semantic 'surplus' which imaginatively profiles the nominally predicated content. However, in a broader sense, on the basis of a 'strong' formal criterion (i.e. the presence of nominalisation) it also includes some constructions representing the remaining types, if they contain a Nabstr: especially 1 and 3, and certain (compound) phraseological predicates of type 6 (which are the closest to type 5). In general, the sphere of verbo-nominal periphrastics can be outlined 'across' the remaining types of complex predication, constituting a layer where boundaries between particular types are fuzzy.[16]

Differences are also visible on the formal plane: there are structural differences between representatives of each type and they differ with regard to the principles of selection and subcategorisation of their components. I have assumed that the processes of analytisation (decomposition) and paraphrasing of a predicate are tightly connected with nominalisation (see also Jędrzejko 1993, 1998). Therefore, one of the major defining features of VNE consists in the fact that the predicative (central carrier of predication) <u>must</u> have the form of Nabstr//NA//NE, while in other types of complex predication this feature is not obligatory, and in the case of modal predicates – prohibited.

Modelling as a procedure adopted in structural typology of complex predication signs reveals also specific features distinguishing the class of periphrastic predicates as understood in the narrow sense (type 5).

1) Only these include a verb capable of coding independent predication, which in their case is selected by Nabstr (major carrier of the predicate) and combined with it according to widely understood principles of metaphorisation. It is only in such constructions that primarily full verbs become 'secondary functionaries' as they become subject to contextual decategorisation. They lose their primary

---

[15] It is believed that the affiliation to a polycentric category determines the similarity to one of a number of prototypical representations (Taylor 2001: 142) – here it would consist in the similarity between one of the typical models of A-E complex predication; polycentricity is also a feature of type 5 constructions, i.e. periphrastic predications (in the narrow sense) – this problem shall be discussed further down.

[16] Assuming the criterion of synonymy between $V^{AUTOSEM}$ and VNE considered as predicate variants in synthetic and analytic realizations, it might also be assumed that the centre of analytic predicates includes type 4 constructions, and the type 5 periphrastics might be considered as a sphere of (multidirectional) metaphorical extensions of such 'basic' VNE.

(actual) sense and ability to designate events; they acquire a metaphorical, more abstract sense, by referring to another kind of experience. It gives them the status of a 'semantic parameter' that modifies the cognitive profile and temporal character of a nominally indicated event. Among various synonymous terms referring to VNE this aspect is highlighted by the following: *descriptive, periphrastic structure, constructions with a descriptive // support // extended verb*, etc.

2) Only in periphrastic structures is the nominal predicate e x c l u s i v e l y an abstract noun (Nabstr // NA // NE); however, it is not an eventive argument and cannot be replaced by a different structurisation of this component (e.g. an infinitive or a complementary clause), which is usually possible in constructions with full verbs entailing an eventive argument (e.g. *nakazał wyjazd <> nakazał żeby(m) wyjechał // nakazał wyjechać*; *myśl(ał) o wyjeździe // myśl(ał), że wyjdzie// żeby wyjechać* (he ordered the departure <> he ordered that I depart // he was considering departure // he thought that he would depart) – but not: *brać udział // *brać to co... // *brać to że...* (to take part // *to take this, that... // *to take this, what...).

3) Only expressions which belong to this subclass may be subject to phraseologisation // lexicalisation, as confirmed both in contemporary and historical Polish. Many (but not all) VNA 'moved to the lexical level' as established non-continuous units that can be 're-used'. As for all of the remaining forms of complex predication (apart from type 6), they do not undergo such processes but are created 'regularly', i.e. according to the typological principle shaping the syntax of synsemantic verbs and their formal 'government and binding'. In such sense types 1–4 are products of grammar and synthetic lexicon. It does not alter the fact that they may, simultaneously, constitute non-prototypical examples of the lexical-grammatical category of verb as a structural variant of predication that does not have a single word equivalent.

4) Only periphrastic predicates create productive patterns (schemas with the same support verb combined with Nabstrs representing various lexical meanings) which allow to generate longer or shorter sequences of new VNE with other Nabstrs e.g. *dać radę* (to give advice) > *dać przykład, pomoc, opiekę, wsparcie, zapewnienie* (to give an example, help, care, support, ressurance) etc.; *prowadzić badania* (to conduct research) > *prowadzić poszukiwania, obserwacje, prace, zbiórkę* (to conduct search, observations, works, an assembly). The general model provides a basis for various modifications of the same concept with the help of various conceptual metaphors, lexical-semantic associations and cultural scripts. In this manner (sub)categories of polycentric or radial periphrastics come into being, constituting various 'periphrastic families' within the group of such expressions, e.g. *WSTYD* (SHAME): *zapłonąć wstydem* (to burn with shame) > *wstyd pali, wygasł* (lit.: shame burns, died); *najeść się wstydu > dławić się wstydem* (lit.: to feed on shame > to choke with shame); *zmyć wstyd > zmyć hańbę* (lit.: to wash off shame > to wash off disgrace); *okryć się wstydem > wstyd opadł* (lit.: to cover oneself with shame > shame has fallen away), etc. Some of these, if they are preserved and/or lexicalised, acquire a systemic status, thus enriching the lexicon of *non-continuous entities* which belong to the class of phraseological *expressions*.

For these reasons, the category of signs of periphrastic predication understood in a narrower sense as a specific microsystem, differs from the remaining types of predicative

constructions and can be considered an open class of verbal *composites* within the boundaries of the polycentric category of VERB. Both structure and function of the periphrastic // analytic verbs resemble the type of non-continuous *verbo--nominal composite*, i.e. the so-called endocentric composites. Their analytic form, in juxtaposition to the synthetic form (i.e. a full verb) is semantically richer than the latter, because periphrastic verbalisers not only introduce a 'temporal profile' but also provide additional 'descriptive' content, specifying a conceptual image of the activity predicated in this manner.

As for verbo-nominal *analytisms*, in a strict sense they occur only among type 4 structures as the VNA proper. In their case the generic verbaliser does not actually bring any new content modifying the value of the nominal predicate, although it allows defining the functional perspective of the message from a different angle. Predicate decomposition // analytisation of the verbally predicated content only divides it, separately pointing out a general categorial element (*activity*, *state*, *feeling*) together with its inherent grammatical parameters of verbalisation: tense, aspect, person, etc. and a specific element, belonging to the class of Nabstr, which lexically denotes particular 'events' – activities: *robić + pranie = prać* (to do + washing = to wash), *wykonać skok = skoczyć* (to perform + jump = to jump), *dokonać włamania = włamać się* (to commit + burglary = to burgle); feelings: *czuć + strach = bać się, lękać się* (to feel + fright = to be frightened); *mieć + zamiar // plan = zamierzać // planować* (to have + plan // intention = to plan); characteristics: *mieć // posiadać cechę (jaką) = cechować się (czym)* (to have + characteristics = to be characterised by) > *mieć rozum // być mądrym, odznaczać się głupotą // być głupim* (to have brains // to be brainy, to show stupidity = to be stupid), etc. However, these constructions are formed in a 'regular' way and are never subject to lexicalisation; both their components exist in the code as lexical *units*.

4) Analycity in the lexicon is understood, in most general terms, as denoting single objects, activities or concepts by means of constructions made up of several words, which usually remain in the relation of hyperonymy, e.g. *kotlet schabowy – schaboszczak* (pork chop – pork chop; the latter expression colloquial), *miesiąc maj – maj* (the month of May – May), *akcja żniwna – żniwa* (harvest activities – harvesting), *czynność pisania – pisanie* (the activity of writing – writing) – see Anusiewicz 1978: 15 or Tabakowska 2001: 81).

Then also such nominal phrases as *pogoda deszczowa* vs. *deszcz* (rainy weather vs. rain), or *kolor czerwony* vs. *czerwień* (the colour red vs. red) are analytic // periphrastic structures. The relation between components of such nominal syntagmas does not differ from the VNE constructions *robić pranie = prać* (to do the washing = to wash), *czuć lęk – bać się // lękać się* (to feel fright = to be frightened). The problem of classifying lexemes (hyperonyms) and their semantic-informative function in constructions with their own co-hyponyms should be studied in greater detail. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that grammatical analycity (i.e. the *analycity* of word forms) has been associated, most frequently, with the plane of nominal or verbal inflection. Alina Kowalska (1976) wrote:

"The name of analytic forms usually refers to combinations of an auxiliary word and a full verb, i.e. constructions consisting of two or more words which play the same role in language as synthetic forms, in which the indicator of grammatical category is an inflectional ending. With respect to their structure such constructions are simi-

lar to free word combinations, because each of their components is an individually meaningful word, but each combination has a homogeneous lexical and grammatical meaning, which makes it similar to a single word and largely lets it function as such, in a way similar to the function of fixed phraseological expressions . Such analytical constructions include: the combination of a preposition with a noun, a noun with an article and the co-called analytic inflectional verb forms. The structure of such combinations varies, depending on inherent characteristics of their components, namely the character of the auxiliary word and the nature of the so-called full word. A common trait of the constructions under discussion consists in the fact that they can be treated as combinations of two full words. Degrees of grammaticalisation of analytical constructions vary, too (ibid. 8–9 ff.; translation mine).

Accordingly, the very concept of analycity, also as a formal (defining) feature of the VNA category, acquires a wider theoretical context. This problem has been often discussed in linguistic literature (inter alia Zawadowski 1959, Żyrmunskij 1965; Guchman 1955, et al.), as it posed a serious difficulty when attempts are made to fully (formally) describe the structure of language understood as an abstract system[17] governed by grammatical rules, with explicitly defined and categorised elements. Most frequently, however, analycity vs. synthecity was associated with inflection (especially in the case of nouns). Mainly on this basis a distinction was made between synthetic languages (including Polish) and analytic languages (e.g. English, German, French).[18] However, the validity of such a typology may seem doubtful nowadays, as it may be easily proved that analycity (or rather: n*on-continuity*) as a characteristics of language signs 'permeates' the entirety of human language and may occur at any of its levels, regardless of how clearly they are distinguished. It can be found on the plane of phonetics and phonology (diphthongs of various types and origins, polysegmental phonemes, phonetic asynchrony), morphology (inflectional analytical forms of various lexical-grammatical categories, e.g.. *będę pisał – napiszę* (I will be writing – I will write), (*prosić*) *pomocy // o pomoc* (two variants of the expression 'ask for help')*, bardziej piękny – piękniejszy* (two variants of the expression 'more beautiful', latter lit. beautifuller*), syntax (complex conjunctions, obligatorily complex prepositional forms performing a single syntactic function and complex predicates), and finally also in the lexicon (non-continuous derivatives (*bać się* – to be afraid), compounds, fixed phrases and multiverbalisms – especially historical ones). Many of these have provided a basis for synthetic lexis of the *composita* type; cf. especially such compounds as *Wielka Noc > Wielkanoc*, (lit.: Great Night > Greatnight, meaning 'Easter') *dwie ście // sta > dwieście*, (two hundreds > two hundred) *z + nad > znad* (literally: from + over > fromover*). In general linguistics the concept of analycity refers, especially due to graphic traditions, to all non-continuous lexical and grammatical

---

[17] It is believed nowadays, independently of differences among various approaches, that natural language is a social product and a social tool which shapes the society which uses it to perform the multitude of tasks serving the purpose of widely understood communication, as well as cognition, creation and interpretation of the world or 'worlds'.

[18] See EJO (*Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego* ed. by K. Polański), the following entries: [analityczne tendencje w języku], [syntetyczne tendencje w języku] and [peryfraza]; for further information, see Jędrzejko 1998: p. 153.

forms, which in various languages are represented by expressions varying in degrees of semantic and formal complexity, characterised by various structures, global meanings, functions, syntactic properties, etc. Their sole common feature is an intuitively felt 'cohesion' or 'homogeneity' of their meaning and/or function (cf. EJO, Polański ed., 1995).

Thus, in the light of what has been said, the terms *analytism // analytical construction* are 'handy' (and justified from the semasiological point of view), but they might also be too general. From the onomasiological point of view all types of complex predication are *composita*, but only type E periphrastics is rooted in conceptual metaphor. Such terms as *predicates // periphrastic constructions // verbo-nominal periphrastics*, understood in the narrow sense, seem more precise with reference to such imaginative, idiomatic structures. Periphrastic predicates are analytisms, too, as they have 'global lexical-grammatical meaning' and denote individual events, although their content is formally divided into two mutually complementary lexical components.

However, it must be remembered that boundaries between various types of verbal analytisms are fuzzy both in grammar and the lexicon, because the category of *complex predicates* as such is not homogeneous. It may be said, applying the non-Aristotelian concept of 'flexible' categories, that the category 'complex predicate' is a prototypical-radial, or polycentric one, because the diversity of its elements can be seen in several dimensions. It is not difficult to notice that some examples of periphrases fit better with the scalar model: *rozmowa wlecze się // toczy // biegnie (wartko, żywo) // ustaje*; *uczucie się żarzy // rozpala // płonie // gaśnie* (conversation is dragging // rolling // flowing // dying; feelings are burning // glowing // cooling); while others – with the radial model: *czuć* (to feel) + *Nabstr* > *unieść się gniewem*, *strach porywa // targa kim, zatonąć w rozpaczy // w marzeniach* (to fly into a rage, lit. to go over with rage; to freeze with fear, lit. fear grasps one; to plunge into despair, lit. to drown in despair; to be wrapped in dreams, lit. to drown in dreams); *snuć wspomnienia // domysły* (to take a stroll down memory lane // to make a conjecture about sth; lit. to plait memories // to plait suspicions); *mieć myśli* > *myśli się plączą* (to have thoughts > thoughts become entangled)*, rozwiązać problem, wysnuć wniosek* (to solve a problem, to draw a conclusion; lit. to unravel the problem, to spin conclusion). 'Periphrastic families' connected with the same predicate are clearly polycentric categories, motivated by various metaphors, e.g. *WSTYD* > *OGIEŃ* (FIRE)*: płonąć wstydem* (to burn with shame); > *CHOROBA* (ILLNESS) : *nabawić się wstydu* (lit.: to contract shame); > *POKARM* (FOOD) : *najeść się wstydu, nakarmić // dławić się wstydem,* etc. (lit.: to feed on shame > to choke with shame); > *WŁADCA: wstyd opanował // ogarnął kogo* (lit.: shame conquered sb, shame filled sb). On the other hand, because of various degrees of the fixedness of form and the integration of content, some VNA seem closer to syntax: *czuć gniew, robić uwagi, okazać radość prowadzić wojnę, odebrać nadzieję* (to feel anger, to make remarks, to express joy, to make war, to deprive of hope), other to lexis and phraseology: *uciąć drzemkę, wpaść w panikę, spłatać figla, wymierzyć cios* (to have a nap, to fall int panic, to play a trick, to land a blow; lit. to cut a nap, to fall into panic, to slice a trick, to measure blow). Particular subclasses within the class not only represent various conceptual domains but also various grammatical categories, e.g. *wydać rozkaz, dać nadzieję* (to give an order, to give hope) – verbal infinitive expressions; *wydanie rozkazu, dawanie nadziei* (giving an order, giving hope) – nominal expressions; *rozkaz*

nadszedł, *nadzieja zgasła* (order came, hope died) — sentences. However, as cognitive grammar points out, they create, or participate in creating, these very categories (Taylor, op. cit.). However, this is a separate issue that requires further study.

Undoubtedly, periphrastic VNA have some unique features: formal and functional, semantic (semantic-syntactic) and, finally, cognitive-pragmatic. All these features combined provide a set of defining criteria that describe the representatives of the class.

References

Anusiewicz Janusz (1978): *Konstrukcje analityczne we współczesnym języku polskim*. — Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Bogusławski Andrzej (1978): Jednostki języka a produkty językowe. Problem tzw. orzeczeń peryfrastycznych. — [In:] Mieczysław Szymczak (ed.): *Z zagadnień słownictwa współczesnego języka polskiego*; Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 17–30.

Bosilkov Konstantin (1979): Glagolno-imennite ustojčivi saetanija — razviva ta se kategorija v savremennite slavjanske jezici. — *Sapostavitelno ezikoznanije* 4; Beograd, 38–40.

Buttler Danuta (1968): Połączenia typu *ulec zniszczeniu* w języku polskim. — *Poradnik Językowy* 7, 349–359.

Buttler Danuta (1988): Leksykalne czasowniki posiłkowe w konstrukcjach peryfrastycznych typu *wywrzeć wpływ* na przełomie XIX i XX wieku. — [In:] Mieczysław Basaj, Danuta Rytel (eds.): *Z problemów frazeologii polskiej i słowiańskiej* 4; Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 71–82.

Cattell Ray (1984): Composite Predicates in English. — *Syntax and Semantics* 17; Sydney–Orlando–San Diego.

Comrie Bernard, Thompson Sandra (1985): Lexical Nominalization. — [In:] *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. 3: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*; Cambridge: Cambridge Univerisy Press, 349–398.

Deribas Vasilij M. (1983): *Ustojčivyje glagol'no-imennyje slovosočetanija russkogo jazyka. — Slovar' — spravonik.* — Moskva: Izd. Russkij Jazyk.

Dyszak Andrzej (1992): *Orzeczenia analityczne z wykładnikami przykrych doznań fizycznych we współczesnej polszczyźnie.* — Bydgoszcz: Wyższa Szkoła Pedagogiczna w Bydgoszczy.

Engelen Bernhard (1968): Zum System der Funktionsverbgefüge. — *Wirkendes Wort* 18, 289–303.

Fife John (1994): Wykłady z gramatyki kognitywnej. [Translated by Henryk Kardela]. — [In:] Henryk Kardela (ed.): *Podstawy gramatyki kognitywnej*; Warszawa: Zakład Semiotyki Logicznej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Polskie Towarzystwo Semiotyczne, 9–64.

Giry-schneider Jacqueline (1987): *Les prédicats nominaux en français. Les phrases simples à verbe support.* — Genève: Droz, 19–34.

Grzegorczykowa Renata (1974): Konstrukcje peryfrastyczne, derywaty i leksemy niepodzielne w semantycznym opisie języka. — [In:] Kazimierz Polański (ed.): *Słownictwo w opisie języka*; Katowice, 65–68.

Grzegorczykowa Renata (1999): Problemy dyskusyjne w interpretacji tzw. orzeczenia imiennego. — [In:] Wiesław Banyś, Leszek Bednarczuk, Stanisław Karolak (eds.): *Studia lingwistyczne ofiarowane Profesorowi Kazimierzowi Polańskiemu na 70-lecie urodzin*; Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 118–124.

Guchman Mirra M. (1955): Glagolnyje analitičeskije konstrukcji kak osobyj tip sočetanij čactičnogo i pełnogo słowa. — *Voprosy grammatičeskogo stroja* 1, 322–361.

Hajrov Šamil V. (1990): Analitični predikatni izrazi v slovanskih jezikih. — *Slavistična revija* 38, 27–37.

Hartenstein Kurt (1994): Konstrukcje z czasownikiem funkcyjnym (opisowe) we współczesnym języku rosyjskim — [In:] Zofia Kurzowa, Władysław Śliwiński (eds.): *Współczesna polszczyzna mówiona w odmianie opracowanej*; Kraków: Universitas, 45–63.

Hopper Paul J., Thompson Sandra A. (1985): The iconicity of the universal categories "noun" and "verb". — [In:] John Haiman (ed.): *Iconicity in syntax: Proceedings of a Symposium on Iconicity in Syntax, Stanford, June 24-6, 1983.* (= Typological Studies in Language 6); Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 151–183.

Jackendoff Ray S. (1974): A deep structure projection rule. — *Linguistic Inquiry* 5, 481–505.

Jędrzejko Ewa (1992): Słownictwo analityczne w opisie leksykalnym. Propozycja opisu i klasyfikacji. — [In:] Andrzej Markowski (ed.): *Opisać słowa*; Warszawa: Elipsa, 50–61.

Jędrzejko Ewa (1993a): *Nominalizacje w systemie i w tekstach współczesnej polszczyzny*. — Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.

Jędrzejko Ewa (1993b): Status semantique des predicats analytiques. — *Linguistica Silesiana* 15, 29–39.

Jędrzejko Ewa (1998a): A Verb-nominal Phraseology in Lexicography. — [In:] Piotr Kakietek (ed.): *Topics on Phraseology: Theory and Practice*, Vol. 1; Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Jędrzejko Ewa (1998b): Z problemów opisu analitycznej leksyki werbo-nominalnej. — [In:] Ewa Jędrzejko (ed.): *Słownik polskich zwrotów werbo-nominalnych. Zeszyt próbny*; Warszawa: Energeia, 4–65.

Jędrzejko Ewa, ed. (1998): *Słownik polskich zwrotów werbo-nominalnych. Zeszyt próbny.* — Warszawa: Energeia.

Jędrzejko Ewa (2002): *Problemy predykacji peryfrastycznej. Konstrukcje — znaki — pojęcia*. — Katowice: Gnome.

Kopylenko Mihail M. (1978): Sočetaemost' glagolov udalenija s abstraktnymi su čestvitelnymi v drevneslavjanskom literaturnom jazyke. — [In:] Tatjana S. Roznova (ed.): *Problemy russkoj frazeologii. Respublikanskij sbornik*; Tula, 18–30.

Lakoff George (1987): *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal About the Mind.* — Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langacker Ronald W. (1987): *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar.* — Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Langacker Ronald W. (1995): *Wykłady z gramatyki kognitywnej* [translated by Joanna Berej et al.], Henryk Kardela (ed.). — Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Lewicki Andrzej M. (1988): Frazeologia stylu naukowego. — [In:] Mieczysław Basaj, Danuta Rytel (eds.): *Z problemów frazeologii polskiej i słowiańskiej*, vol. 5; Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1–37.

Loewe Iwona (2000): *Konstrukcje analityczne w poezji młodopolskiej.* — Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Mindak Jolanta (1983): *Peryfrastyczne konstrukcje predykatywne z parafrazą przymiotnikową (na materiale polskim, serbo-chorwackim i macedońskim).* — Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Otfinowski Andrzej (1992): Czasowniki operatorowe. — [In:] Andrzej Otfinowski (ed.): *Zeszyty Naukowe WSP w Bydgoszczy. Studia Filologiczne* 28; Bydgoszcz, 67–78.

Pisarkowa Krystyna (1972): Próba określenia posiłkowości predykatu w języku polskim. — [In:] *System morfologiczny i syntaktyczny współczesnego języka polskiego*; Wrocław Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 97–117.

Polański Kazimierz, ed. (1982–1993): *Słownik syntaktyczno-generatywny czasowników polskich*, vol. 1–5. — Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Kraków: Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN.

Polański Kazimierz, ed. (1999): *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego.* — Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.

Polenz Peter von (1963): *Funktionsverben im heutigen Deutsch. Sprache in der rationalisierten Welt.* (= Beihefte zu Zeitschrift „Wirkendes Wort" 5). — Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.

Radovanović Milan (1977): Dekomponovanje predikata (na primerima iz srpskohrvatskog jezika). — *Ju̱noslovenski filolog* 33; Novi Sad, 53–80.

Ross John R. (1968): *Auxilliares as Main Verbs.* — Boston, Mass.

Tabakowska Elżbieta (2000): *Kognitywne podstawy języka i językoznawstwa.* — Kraków: Universitas.

Taylor John R. (2001): *Kategoryzacja w języku* [translated by Anna Skucińska]. — Kraków: Universitas.

Topolińska Zuzanna (1977): Perifrastični inchoativni konstrukcii vo južnomakedonskite dijalekti. — *Makedonski jazyk* 35, 29–42.

Topolińska Zuzanna (1982): Perifrastični predikatski izrazi na medjuslovenskim relacijama. — *Južnoslovenski Filolog* 38, 35–49.

Vetulani Grażyna (2000): *Rzeczowniki predykatywne języka polskiego.* — Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. Adama Mickiewicza.

Zawadowski Leon (1959): *Constructions grammaticales et formes périphrastiques.* — Kraków–Wrocław––Warszawa: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

Żmigrodzki Piotr (2000): *Właściwości składniowe analitycznych konstrukcji werbo-nominalnych w języku polskim.* — Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Żyrmunskij Walerij M. (1965): Ob analitičeskih konstrukcijah. — [In:] *Analitičeskije konstrukcii w jazykach različnih tipov*; Moskva–Leningrad, 5–57.