UNDERLYING PREDICATIONS AND LATIN-OLD ENGLISH TRANSLATION: TWO PREDICATES UNDER SCRUTINY[1]

0. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to study the translation into Old English of two Latin verbal predicates: *deliberare/Ġencan* and *amitto/gewitten*[2]. For this purpose, we will resort to one of the most elaborate theoretical linguistic models, viz. Functional Grammar (henceforth FG)[3].

One of the key notions of FG that plays a fundamental role in our translation study is that of *underlying predication*. Dik (1979) claims that predications are characterized in such a way that makes them the best representation

---

[1] This article is a revised version of the paper "Underlying predications and translation: on the Old English version of a Latin text", which we presented in the 7th International Congress of English Historical Linguistics, held in Valencia (September 1992).

[2] From *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre* (in Goolden 1958:6-7).

[3] The following abbreviations are used in this paper:
(i) predicative categories: V (verb);
(ii) syntactic functions: S (subject) and O (object);
(iii) semantic functions: Ag (agent) Loc (Locative) and Exp (expiriencer);
(iv) operators: π_3 (degree of certainty, an operator that modifies the propositional content of the clause);
(iv) phrasal categories: NP (noun phrase) and PP (prepositional phrase);
(v) the hierarchical structure of the clause: E_1(variable designating state of affairs), ILL (illocutionary force) and PRED (predication);
(vi) translation terms: L1 (source language) and L2 (target language).

Ricardo Mairal & Javier Martín, *Selim* 3 (1993): 43-56

of sentences. Then, on the basis of this idea, a translation model (Dik 1979 and 1986; Van der Korst, 1990) is formulated by means of *describing the procedure for arriving at the mechanical translation of underlying predications of one language into underlying predications of another language*.

In this paper we will investigate, on the basis of the information provided by the underlying predications, to what extent the underlying predication of the source language (Latin) can be related to an equivalent underlying predication of the target language (Old English).

1. UNDERLYING PREDICATION

Dik (1989) proposes to treat clausal constituents under the form of an abstract underlying clause structure, which will be mapped onto the actual linguistic expresions by a number of expresion rules, which provide these constituents with the order, form and intonation pattern (Dik l989:45). Then the analysis of the clause entails the distinction of several *layers* or *levels* of formal and semantic organization. These layers would be illustrated in the following chart:

(1)

CLAUSE "speech act"	
PROPOSITION	"posible fact"
PREDICATION	"state of affairs"
PREDICATE	"property/relation"

This type of analysis has been called *the layered hypothesis*. It was originally proposed by Hengeveld (1987,1988 and1989), Dik (1989) and Dik and Hengeveld (1990). These linguists propound to represent utterances by means of a *multilayered clause model*. Dik and Hengeveld (1990:2-3) support the view that two main levels should be distinguished in an analysis of the

clause: the *representational* and the *interpersonal* level, each being modified by a number of operators and satellites. By the higher level or interpersonal they mean that *concerned with those linguistic means which are used by the speaker to evoke a certain comunicative effect in the addressee*, whereas the lower level or representational is concerned with *those linguistic means which are used by the speaker to provide the addressee with a description of a state of affairs*.

The representational level is built on the basis of (i) a predicate frame (Level 1), which specifies a predicate plus the number of arguments required, and (ii) a predication (Level 2), which locates the State of Affairs in terms of its time ocurrence, frequency of ocurrence and actuality of occurrence. The illocutionary level is constructed on the basis of (i) an illocutionary frame (Level 4), which signals the value of a sentence as product of a speech act, and (ii) the propositional level (Level 3) which represents the sentence as a possible fact, something which can be verified or denied.

Then, underlying predications will have the form as drawn in (2):

(2)

LAYERS	
Clause	$(E_1: [\ ILL\ (S)\ (A)\ (X_1: etc.\ (X_1))]\ (E_1))$
Proposition	$(X_1: [\ e_1: etc.\ (e_1))]\ (X_1))$
Predication	$(e_1: [Pred.\ (x_1)]\ (e_1)$
Term	$(x_1: Pred\ (x_1))$

The structure underlying linguistic expresions consists of four hierarchically ordered layers[1], each one designating different entities as proposed in Lyons (1977).

[1] Dik and Hengeveld distinguish a number of operators and satellites in each layer (for further reference of these operators and satellites we refer the reader to the works mentioned above).

We will use this hierarchical model not only for the description of sentences but also for a description of clausal complements. In some cases, we will see how the different clausal complements signal different types of layers namely predications, propositions and utterances (Dik and Hengeveld 1990).

In sum, the information specified in the underlying predications does not only contain syntactic and semantic features but also pragmatic and propositional. These latter two will play a conspicuous role in translation studies since they provide more tools to achieve a higher degree of accuracy in translation.

2. UNDERLYING PREDICATION AND TRANSLATION

As pointed out above, underlying predications will be the starting point for our translation research. In line with Dik (1979 and 1986) and van der Korst (1990:290), a translation procedure ammounts to three phases:

(i) reconstruction of the underlying predication of a sentence,
(ii) substitution of the underlying predication according to the equivalences and
(iii) application of the expression rules of the target language.

This paper will concentrate on the first two leaving for the moment those issues dealing with expression rules.

Then, our first task will consist of reconstructing the underlying predication for both the source language (Latin) and the target language (Old English). In doing so, we will follow the main postulates of FG, succintly presented in the previous section.

The second phase of our work -perhaps the most interesting- will be concerned with the (non-)equivalences of the expressions under scrutiny. Once we have the underlying predication for a predicate of L1 and a predicate of

L2, we will see to what extent these are equivalent and therefore can be substituted.

This substitution of predicates involves a number of factors:

-quantitative and qualitative valency of the two predicates;
- syntactic and sematic functions;
- selection restrictions and
- type and nature of clausal complements.

Summarizing, we have presented so far the fundamental ideas that guide our research in this paper. In the third section, these ideas will be put to the test of translating two underlying predications of a Latin text into the corresponding Old English predications.

3. TWO PREDICATES UNDER SCRUTINY

3.1. deliberare/Íencan

Let us detain now to determine the semantic weight of the first two lexemes that we have chosen, given the limitations of this paper, to carry out our analysis. The semantic weight will serve to evaluate their differences and, ultimately, "to make a choice".

As a preliminary step, the determination of this semantic weight is based on the analysis of both the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes since we believe that the intersection of both constitutes the meaning of a word. Following the methodological premises oulined above, the semantic analysis of the predicates will have the form of an underlying predication.

The Latin predicate *delibero* pertains to the semantic field of verbs of cognition. Within this vast semantic field, this verb will be classified under

the dimension[1] "to think carefully". The Old English predicate *Ŧencan*, on the other hand, represents the archilexematic content of the semantic field. This simple difference will play an important role in determining the "best[2] possible translation".

More specifically, the pair *delibero/Íencan* is a case of non-lexical equivalence between the source and the target language. In this circumstance, as van der Korst (1990:291) remarks:

> When a word (predicate) of the source language corresponds to more than one word (predicate) of the target language, a choice will have to be made. In fact, this is the crux in (machine) translation.

Indeed, the Latin verb *delibero* does not show a one-to-one correspondence with the Old English *Íencan*. In these cases, the predicates might differ in various respects:

- qualitative valency: Semantic function assignment[3];
- quantitative valency: Syntactic function assignment[4] and
- selection restrictions[5]

---

[1] The organization of the vocabulary in semantic fields follows the tenets of Lexematics (Coseriu 1981). For the introduction to the term *dimension*, see Geckeller (1971).

[2] By *best* we refer to the most approximate translation once we have revised the linguistic information provided by the underlying predications.

[3] The assignment of semantic functions has been a source of dispute among the various linguistic schools. However, in order to avoid terminological tedium, we will remain faithful to the terminology presented in Dik (1989), who draws on Fillmore (1968, 1971 and 1977). Studies such as Chomsky (1981, 1986a and 1986b), Halliday (1985) etc. present a different picture.

[4] We follow Dik (1979 and 1989) with respect to syntactic function assignment: the syntactic functions Subject and Object are assigned at the level of the predication formation component rather than at both the level of the predication formation and expression components, as Conolly (1991) has put forward.

[5] Selection restrictions have also been alluded under the name of *contextual restrictions.*

However, the difference does not necessarily stem from the syntagmatic axis alone but, conversely, this might be codified in the paradigmatic organization. This leads to formulate what we call the *Scalarity Principle:*

(3) **SCALARITY PRINCIPLE:** Those predicates higher on the scale (paradigmatic) tend to take an ample range of complementation patterns as well as a wide semantic scope whereas those lower on the scale (syntagmatic) tend to have a reduced ammount of patterns; and, accordingly, its semantic scope is narrower.

Thus, *delibero* and *Íencan*:

(4)
a. delibero_{V} (x_1: human (x_1))$_{Exp/S}$ (x_2: PP_{de} <animate-concrete'> (x_2))$_{Go}$
De aliqua re deliberare
"To discuss something"

b. delibero_{V} (x_1: human (x_1))$_{Exp/S}$ (x_2: NP <'animate-concrete'> (x_2))$_{Go/O}$
Re deliberata, post diem tertium ad Caesarem reversuros[1]
"Having discussed the matter, they would go back to Ceasar's positions after three days"

(5)
a. Íencan_{V} (x_1: human (x_1))$_{Exp/S}$
Agunnon Íencan Ía bocerns
"Coeperunt cogitare scribæ"[1]

[1] In Lewis and Short (1966:236).

b.Íencan$_V$ (x$_1$: human (x$_1$))$_{Exp/S}$ (x$_2$: [p$_3$ X$_1$] (x$_2$))$_{Go/O}$
Secge he hwæt ic Íence
"Let him say what my thoughts are"[2]
c. Íencan$_V$ (x$_1$: human (x$_1$))$_{Exp/S}$ (x$_2$: PP$_{on}$ <'animate-concrete'> (x$_2$))$_{Go}$
God ys on Dryhten to Íenceanne
"Bonum est confidere in Domino"[3]

d. Íencan$_V$ (x$_1$: human (x$_1$))$_{Exp/S}$ (x$_2$: [p$_3$ X$_1$] (x$_2$))$_{Go/O}$
Hie Íohton hu hie hine acwellan meahton[4]
"They were thinking how to kill him"

e. Íencan$_V$ (x$_1$: human (x$_1$))$_{Exp/S}$ (x$_2$: [p$_3$ X$_1$] (x$_2$))$_{Go/O}$
Nænig heora Íohte, Íæt he Íanon scolde gesecean folc[5]
"Nobody thought that he would search for his people afterwards"

Since we are concerned with the predication-formation component we do not draw a distinction between cases like (6) and (7):

(6)
Him Ías Íing Íencendum
"Hæc eo cogitante"[6]
(where the subject of thought is in the accusative)

---

1 *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:1046)

2 *The Blickling Homilies* 181, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:1046)

3 *Libri Psalmorum* 117:8, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:1046)

4 *Libri Psalmorum* 241:8, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:1046)

5 *Libri Psalmorum* 123:4, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:1046)

6 *The Gospel according to St. Mathew* I:20, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:1046).

(7)
We moton Íæs Íencan Íe egeslic on Íissum bocum is gewritten[1]
"We must think about the threatening things that are written in this book"
(in these cases the subject of thought is in the genitive)

It is the expression rules, concieved as a bridge between the underlying predications and the actual linguistic expressions, that account for case marking (such as accusative vs. genitive in (6) and (7)).

This analysis reveals that *Íencan* does not correspond to *delibero* but to *cogito*, which shows the same semantic behaviour as *Íencan*. The first obvious difference lies in the fact that both predicates differ in their quantitative valency. This proves our Scalarity Principle (cf. above).

Our analysis in terms of the Scalarity Principle is also reinforced if we take into account the other two lexemes corresponding to the archilexeme *Íencan* in Old English: *hogian* and *hycgan*:

(8) hogian_{V} $(x_1\text{: human } (x_1))_{\text{Exp/S}}$ $(x_2\text{: } \text{PP}_{\text{ymbe}} \text{ <'entity'> } (x_2))_{\text{Go}}$
He lythwon hogode ymbe his sawle Íearfe
"He thought little about the needs of his soul"[2]

(9) hycgan_{V} $(x_1\text{: human } (x_1))_{\text{Exp/S}}$ $(x_2\text{: } \text{PP}_{\text{ymbe}} \text{ <'entity'> } (x_2))_{\text{Go}}$
HycgeÍ ymbe se Íe wille
"He shall think about he who will"[3]

---

[1] *Laws of King Athelstan*, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:1046).

[2] *An Anglo-Saxon Reader in Prose and Verse* 101, 201 in Bosworth and Toller (1964:549).

[3] *The Anglo-Saxon Version of the Metres of Boethius* 19,2 in Bosworth and Toller (1964:578).

As is shown in (8) and (9) *Íencan*, *hogian* and *hycgan* differ with respect to their quantitative valency, that is the choice is defined by syntax. These verbs, however, also have clausal complementation, although with a different meaning:

(10) hogian_{V} $(x_1\text{: human } (x_1))_{\text{Exp/S}}$ $(x_2\text{: } [p_3\ X_1]\ (x_2))_{\text{Go/O}}$
We sceoldon hogian hu we hi begyton
"We must consider how we may obtain it"[1]

(11) hycgan_{V} $(x_1\text{: human } (x_1))_{\text{Exp/S}}$ $(x_2\text{: } [p_3\ X_1]\ (x_2))_{\text{Go/O}}$
Uton we hycgan hwær we ham agen and Íonne geÍencan hu we Íider cumen
"Let us consider where we may have a home and then devise how we may come thither"[2]

Examples (10) and (11) do not contradict our explanation in terms of the Scalarity Principle: although one may draw the conclusion that the different quantitative valencies that *Íencan* and *hogian* and *hycgan* have cannot account for the restrictions imposed on the final choice, the fact that these two verbs have a different meaning when they undergo clausal complementation reinforces our Scalarity Principle explanation: there is a difference of contextual value and the two predicates lose the archilexematic meaning of *Íencan* and acquire a more specific meaning that belongs to another dimension[3] ("to think carefully") within the same semantic field: *to consider*.

3.2. amitto/gewitten

---

1 *The Homilies of Ælfric* II 316, 25 in Bosworth and Toller (1964:549).

2 *Apollonius of Tyre* 83a, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:578).

3 Following Coseriu (1981).

The second pair of predicates that we examine is the one formed by *amitto* and *gewitten*. This equivalence involves two fixed expressions, *vitam amittere* and *gewittan of life*. Since there exist a L2 equivalence the steps that van der Korst (1989:297) calls *paraphrasing* and *deparaphrasing* can be avoided:

(12)
amitto$_V$ (x_1: human (x_1))$_{Exp/S}$ (x_2: NP <'entity'> (x_2))$_{Go/O}$
Decius amissit vitam[1]
"Decius passed away"

[1] In Lewis and Short (1966:109). We also draw on Gaffiot (1934).

(13)
gewittan$_V$ (x_1: human (x_1))$_{Exp/S}$ (x_2: PP$_{of}$ <'entity'> (x_2))$_{Loc}$
He of life gewat
"He departed this life"[1]

Nevertheless, the fact that there is an equivalence in the target language, does not prevent this equivalence from showing a different complementation pattern: an NP (nominal complementation) in Latin and a PP (prepositional complementation) in Old English.

Therefore, the difference between the two underlying predications can be said to be one of qualitative valency.

The scalarity principle proves again useful in this translation procedure because these two predicates, which are lower on the scale (syntagmatic), have only one pattern of complementation and, accordingly, its semantic scope is narrower: *to die*.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have presented the outlines of a predicate comparison procedure of translation in terms of the Scalarity Principle, which sets the complementation patterns of a given predicate in the syntagmatic as well as in the paradigmatic axis and relates the complementation patterns to the semantic scope of the predicate under scrutiny. This principle has proved valid for a translation procedure by application to two Latin predicates and their Old English equivalents.

Ricardo Mairal Usón (Universidad Autónoma de Madrid)
Javier Martín Arista (Universidad de Zaragoza)

[1] *Beowulf* 4934, in Bosworth and Toller (1964:470).

REFERENCES

BACH, E. and T. Harms eds. 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

BOSWORTH, J. and T.N. Toller (1898)1964. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

CHOMSKY, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

CHOMSKY, N. 1986a. *Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Pantheon.

CHOMSKY, N. 1986b. *Barriers*. Cambridge (Massachusetts): MIT Press.

COLE, P. and M. Sadock eds. 1977. "Grammatical relations" *Syntax and Semantics* 8. New York: Academic Press.

CONOLLY, J. H. 1991. *Constituent Order in Functional Grammar: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*. Berlin and New York: Foris Publications.

CONOLLY, J.H. and S.C. Dik eds. 1989. *Functional Grammar and the Computer*. Dordrecht: Foris.

COSERIU, E. 1981. *Principios de semántica estructural*. Madrid: Gredos.

DIK, S. C. 1979. *Functional Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris.

DIK, S. C. 1986. "Two papers on the computational application of Functional Grammar" (*Working papers in Functional Grammar* 18). Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

DIK, S. C. 1989. *The Theory of Functional Grammar Part I: The Structure of the Clause*. Dordrecht: Foris

DIK, S.C. and K. Hengeveld: 1990. "The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of perception verb complements" (*Working papers in Functional Grammar* 37). Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.

FILLMORE, C. 1968. "The case for case" in Bach and Harm eds. 1968:1-88.

FILLMORE, C. 1971. "Types of lexical information" in Steinberg and Jacobovits eds. 1971:370-392.

FILLMORE, C. 1977. "The case for case reopened" in Cole and Saddock eds. 1977:59-81.

GAFFIOT F. 1934. *Dictionarie Illustré Latin-Francais*. Paris: Librairie Hachette.

GECKELLER, H. 1971. *Strukturelle Semantik und Wortfeldtheorie* translation by Marcos Martín Hernández (1976) *Semántica estructural y teoría del campo léxico*. Madrid: Gredos.

GOOLDEN, P. ed. 1958. *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre*. London: Oxford University Press.

HALLIDAY, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London and New York: Arnold.

HENGEVELD, K. 1987. "Clause structure and modality in Functional Grammar" in Van der Auwera and Goosens eds. 1987:53-66.

HENGEVELD, K. 1988. "Illocution, mood and modality in a functional grammar of Spanish". Journal of Semantics 6.3/4 (1988):227-269.

HENGEVELD, K. 1989. "Layers and operators". Journal of Linguistics 25.1(1989): 127-157.

LEWIS, C.T. & C. Short (1879) 1966. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

LYONS, J. 1977. *Semantics* (2 vols). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

STEINBERG, D.D. and L.A. Jakobovits eds. 1971. *Semantics, an interdisciplinary reader in philosophy, linguistics and psychology*. London: Cambridge University Press.

VAN DER AUWERA, J. and L. Goosens eds. 1987. *Ins and outs of the predication*. Dordrecht: Foris.

VAN DER KOST, B. 1990. "Functional Grammar and Machine Translation" in Conolly and Dik eds. 1989:289-316.

* * *