ROCZNIKI HUMANISTYCZNE
Tom LX, zeszyt 5 – 2012

ANNA BONDARUK

PREDICATIONAL, SPECIFICATIONAL, EQUATIVE AND IDENTIFICATIONAL COPULAR CLAUSES IN ENGLISH AND POLISH

A b s t r a c t. The paper confronts the typology of copular sentences proposed by Higgins (1979) for English with the Polish data. Higgins distinguishes in English four types of copular sentences, such as predicational, specificational, equative and identificational. The paper shows that these four types of sentences are also present in Polish although their inventory is much bigger than in English because, in addition to the verbal copula, Polish also has a pronominal copula *to*, and even shows the co-occurrence of these two elements in the same clause (the so-called dual copula sentences). All these three types of copula sentences may have a predicational function, but the remaining three functions can only be associated with the clauses containing *to* or those with both *to* and *być*. The paper presents examples of ambiguous sentences and the tests to eliminate the ambiguity. An attempt has also been made to reduce Higgins' typology. It has been shown that Polish inverted equative sentences show properties typical of specificational sentences. As for identity statements, arguments have been provided in favour of the claim that both in English and in Polish they can be classified as either specificational or equative.

INTRODUCTION

Higgins (1979) distinguishes four types of copular sentences in English, namely predicational, specificational, equative and identificational. His classification has been adopted by a large number of linguists working on copula constructions in various languages, including English (MIKKELSEN (2005, 2006, 2011), DEN DIKKEN (2006)), Hebrew (ROTHSTEIN (2001)), Polish (CITKO (2008)), Russian (PARTEE (1998, 2010), PERELTSVAIG 2001)), and

PROF. DR. ANNA BONDARUK – Professor in the Department of Theoretical Linguistics at the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; address for correspondence: IFA, Al. Racławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin; e-mail: bondaruk@kul.lublin.pl

Scots Gaelic (ADGER AND RAMCHAND (2003)), among others. The paper re-examines his typology of copular constructions in the light of the data taken from English and Polish with the aim of testing how this classification works for these two languages and how each type is syntactically represented. Another question addressed in the paper concerns a possible reduction in the number of categories posited by Higgins.

The paper starts with the presentation of Higgins' typology and the way it applies to English. Then his classification is confronted with the Polish data. Afterwards, some ambiguous cases are provided both from English and Polish and an attempt is made to disambiguate them by means of the tests available in the literature. Finally, the problem of reducing the number of categories put forward by Higgins is considered. The paper closes with the conclusions.

1. HIGGINS' (1979) CLASSIFICATION AND ITS APPLICATION TO ENGLISH

Higgins (1979) identifies four types of copular constructions, i.e. predicational, equative, specificational and identificational.[1] Each of these types is illustrated by examples (1)-(4), respectively.

(1) Mark is a doctor.	predicational
(2) Cicero is Tully.	equative
(3) The best student is Mary.	specificational
(4) This place is London.	identificational

Predicational sentences ascribe a property to a subject and in this respect they are similar to non-copular sentences, although, in contradistinction to non-copular clauses, the property in predicational copular sentences is expressed by a post-copular element only (cf. (1)). Other instances of predicational sentences in English include cases such as (5) and (6), where the post-copular element corresponds to an AP or a PP, respectively:

(5) Mark is intelligent.
(6) Mark is from Warsaw.

[1] A similar typology is proposed by Declerck (1988). However, in Declerck's classification, in addition to the four types put forward by Higgins, a fifth type is recognised, i.e. definitions, such as (i) below:

(i) A pyramid is what Egyptians built to bury their pharaohs in.

Likewise, English has predicational pseudo-cleft constructions, exemplified in (7) below:

(7) What I have discovered is really shocking.

It is worth noting that predicational sentences in English can contain not only an indefinite (cf. (1)), but also a definite post-copular DP, as can be seen in (8).[2]

(8) Mark is my best friend.

As we shall see in section 3, sentences like (8) are most difficult to classify. Moreover, predicational sentences are non-reversible, as can be seen in (9).

(9) *A doctor is Mark.

Mikkelsen (2005: 117) finds sentences such as (9) to be infelicitous, rather than ungrammatical, and appeals to pragmatic and discourse factors to account for their degraded status. However, sentences such as (8), with the definite post-copular element can be reversed, which is nonetheless accompanied a change meaning, i.e. the reversed structure has a specificational meaning, compare: [3]

(10) My best friend is Mark.

Sentence (10) specifies who my best friend is and therefore does not represent a predicational, but a specificational sentence.

Equative sentences, according to Higgins (1979), signal identity between the two DPs found on both sides of the copula verb. In English there exist cases such as (2) above, in which two proper nouns surround the copula. They represent equatives in a narrow sense (or 'true equatives', according to Heycock and Kroch (1999: 373)) and are not very productive, as it is not very common for individuals to have two different names. Another type of equatives present in English is illustrated by the following sentences.

[2] The symbol DP is used throughout the paper, but it is meant to denote any type of nominal expression and bears no theoretical significance.

[3] Reversed or inverted structures are taken in the paper to represent the structures in which either the predicate complement precedes the (logical) subject as in the case of predicational sentences such as (9) or the order of the two DPs has changed, i.e. the second DP has come to precede the first DP as in the case of equatives (cf. (13) and (14) below) or specificational sentences (see (16) and (17) below). This is an oversimplification as in the literature inverted specificational sentences are taken to be inverted predicational sentences (cf. MORO (1997), MIKKELSEN (2005)). We do not dwell on this issue here, as it lies outside the scope of the typology of copular constructions undertaken in the paper.

(11) Sylvia Obenauer is HER. (MIKKELSEN (2011: 4))
(12) She is Ms. Doherty.

In (11) only the subject is a proper name, while the other element corresponds to a pronoun, while in (12) the situation is just opposite; the subject is a pronoun and the post-copular item is a proper name. Cases like that are more frequent than (2) and, as mentioned by Mikkelsen, can serve as an answer to a question such as "Who is who?" in a situation where a person can be identified by name or by sight. Heycock and Kroch (1999) observe that there is a group of productive equatives in English, as in (13).

(13) Your attitude towards Jones is my attitude towards Davies.
(HEYCOCK AND KROCH (1999: 377))

Sentence (13) can be reversed as in (14), as can be all equatives.

(14) My attitude towards Davies is your attitude towards Jones.

Heycock and Kroch (1999: 375) also note that some equatives represent just tautologies, as can be seen in (15) below:

(15) Honest is honest.

Specificational sentences in Higgins' system specify who a given individual is or what a particular object is. Unlike predicational sentences, they do not predicate any property of the pre-copular entity. In other words, in specificational clauses, a pre-copular element supplies a variable, whereas the postcopular one specifies a value for that variable (AKMAJIAN (1979: 162-165)). In (3) above, for instance, the value is *Mary* for the variable *the best student*. Higgins compares specificational sentences to a list; a subject corresponds to the heading for the list, while the post-copular element is an item on that list. This meaning is particularly noticeable in case such as (16), where both DPs around the copula are plural.

(16) The persons I am going to vote for are Jane, Mary and Bill.

In a way analogous to equatives, mentioned above, specificational sentences can be reversed, as confirmed by (17), which is a reversed version of (16).

(17) Jane, Mary and Bill are the persons I am going to vote for.

The sentence in (17) is ambiguous between a predicative and specificatonal interpretation, the issue we will return to in section 3. Just like there are predicational pseudoclefts (cf. (7)), there exist also specificational pseudocleft sentences, as can be seen in (18).

(18) What I have found are the very books I need.[4]

It is noted in the literature (compare, e.g. HEYCOCK AND KROCH (1999), MIKKELSEN (2005), PARTEE (2010)) that specificational sentences are unacceptable with an indefinite pre-copular DP, as in (19) below, which corresponds to sentence (9), repeated for convenience:

(19) *A doctor is John.

However, certain types of indefinite DPs can be found in this position, compare the following, taken from Mikkelsen (2005: 118):

(20) A doctor who might help you is Harry Barcan.

The final group of copula clauses put forward by Higgins corresponds to identificational sentences.[5] Higgins (1979: 237) notes that these sentences are "typically used to teach names of people or places" (cf. (4)). In (4) a demonstrative phrase *this place* occupies a subject position, but it is also possible for a sole demonstrative pronoun to be found in this position, cf. example (21) below.

(21) This is London.

Higgins observes that in identificational clauses the demonstrative has deictic reference and is not anaphoric. Mikkelsen (2011: 11) also notes that there exist identificational sentences, not discussed by Higgins, that instead of the demonstrative exhibit the pronoun *it*, as in (22).

(22) It is London.

To sum up, all the four types of copular constructions distinguished by Higgins are present in English and are represented by a variety of syntactic structures.

2. HIGGINS' TYPOLOGY APPLIED TO POLISH

Before testing how Higgins' typology works for Polish, let us mention the fact that Polish is different from English in that, in addition to a verbal copula *być* 'be', it contains also the so-called pronominal copula *to*. Con-

[4] Specificational cleft sentences are also possible, cf. the following:
(i) It was the very books that I need that I have found.

[5] Declerck (1988) uses a different term for identificational sentences; he calls them 'descriptively identifying'.

sequently, copular clauses can take three distinct forms, noted by Citko (2008), instantiated in (23)-(25) below.

(23) Marek jest uczniem.[6]
Mark-NOM is pupil-INSTR
'Mark is a pupil.'

(24) Marek to uczeń.[7]
Mark-NOM TO pupil-NOM
'Mark is a pupil.'

(25) Marek to jest uczeń.
Mark-NOM TO is pupil-NOM
'Mark is a pupil.'

Although all the above-mentioned sentences have been translated into English in the same way, they differ in that (23) contains just a verbal copula *być* 'be', (24) exhibits the pronominal copula *to*, and finally (25) combines both copulas *to* and *być* (Citko calls such sentences dual copula sentences). Since a detailed description of the syntactic properties of these three sentence types is provided in Citko (2008), we are not going to repeat her observations here. They will be only mentioned where they are relevant for the discussion carried out in the paper.

Let us now turn back to Higgins' typology to see how all the types he distinguishes are represented in Polish. Predicational sentences in Polish can assume all the three forms mentioned above, namely with the verb *być*, with *to*, and with both *to* and *być*.[8] Actually all the three sentences in (23), (24) and (25) are predicational, as they ascribe the property of being a pupil to Mark.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that predicational clauses with AP and PP predicates are possible but only in the structure containing *być*, as confirmed by (26) and (27), respectively.

(26) Marek jest zdolny.
Mark is talented.
'Mark is talented.'

[6] The following abbreviations have been used: com. – common, fem. – feminine, neut. – neuter. NOM – nominative, INSTR – instrumental, pl. – plural, sg. – singular, 3 – 3rd person.

[7] The pronominal *to* is glossed as TO throughout the paper.

[8] This conclusion is in line with Citko (2008), but contra Błaszczak and Geist (2000a), who treat as predicational only clauses with *być* in Polish, while those with *to* are regarded by them as either equative or specificational.

(27) Marek jest z Warszawy.
Mark is from Warsaw
'Mark is from Warsaw.'

As regards the copular clauses with *to* and *to być*, they do not normally co-occur with predicates other than DPs, in fact *to* seems to link only identical categories, typically DPs. Compare the following:

(28) * Marek to (jest) zdolny.
Mark TO is talented
'Mark is talented.'

(29) * Marek to (jest) z Warszawy.[9]
Mark TO is from Warsaw
'Mark is from Warsaw.'

Both (28) and (29) are unacceptable as they contain AP and PP predicates within *to* and *to być* clauses. These sentences clearly contrast with (26) and (27), which contain the copula *być* and therefore can co-occur with AP and PP predicates.

What is more, the predicational sentences in (23)-(25) cannot be reversed without losing their predicational meaning. Compare:

(30) #Uczeń jest Markiem.
pupil-NOM is Mark-INSTR
'#A pupil is Mark.'

(31) Uczeń to Marek.
pupil-NOM TO Mark-NOM
'#A pupil is Mark.'

(32) Uczeń to jest Marek.
pupil-NOM TO is Mark-NOM
'#A pupil is Mark.'

Sentence (30) is ungrammatical unless it has the interpretation in which a pupil is pretending to be Mark. Sentences (31) and (32), on the other hand, are acceptable but they have a different meaning from their non-reversed equivalents in (23)-(25), namely (31) and (32) have a specificational interpretation, as they specify who is a pupil.

Just like in English, definite DPs can be found in Polish predicative clauses, as can be seen in the following sentences:

[9] Sentences (28) and (29) are acceptable only if *to* is interpreted as an emphatic pronoun, not as a pronominal copula.

(33) Marek jest moim najlepszym przyjacielem.
Mark-NOM is my-INSTR best-INSTR friend-INSTR
'Mark is my best friend.'

(34) Marek to mój najlepszy przyjaciel.
Mark-NOM TO my-NOM best-NOM friend-NOM
'Mark is my best friend.'

(35) Marek to jest mój najlepszy przyjaciel.
Mark-NOM TO is my-NOM best-NOM friend-NOM
'Mark is my best friend.'

As has been mentioned in section 1, such clauses are difficult to classify as they are ambiguous between a predicational, specificational and equative interpretation, the issue that will be returned to in section 3.

However, in contradistinction to English, Polish lacks pseudo-cleft sentences and consequently, there are no predicational or specificational pseudo-clefts in this language.

Equative sentences in Polish can contain only the pronominal copula *to*, or both *to* and *być*, and never can they show just a verbal copula *być* alone. This is supported by the following data:

(36) Kardynal Karol Wojtyła to Papież Jan Paweł II.
cardinal Karol Wojtyła-NOM TO Pope John Paul II-NOM
'Cardinal Karol Wojtyła is Pope John Paul II.'

(37) Kardynal Karol Wojtyła to jest Papież Jan Paweł II.
cardinal Karol Wojtyła-NOM TO is Pope John Paul II-NOM
'Cardinal Karol Wojtyła is Pope John Paul II.'

The above examples clearly contrast with the following, containing just the verbal copula:

(38) #Kardynal Karol Wojtyła jest Papieżem Janem Pawłem II.
cardinal Karol Wojtyła-NOM is Pope John Paul II-INSTR
'Cardinal Karol Wojtyła is Pope John Paul II.'

Sentence (38) is only acceptable when it means that Karol Wojtyła is at the moment acting as Pope John Paul II and thus has no equative meaning. In fact, sentences like those in (36) and (37), which contain two proper nouns are truly equative, although just like in English, they are relatively rare.[10] To the group of true equatives also belong sentences with two pronouns as in (39).

[10] Błaszczak and Geist (2000b) call such sentences equative in narrow sense.

(39) Ja to ty, a ty to ja.
I-NOM TO you-NOM and you-NOM TO I-NOM
'I am you and you are me.'

Just like in English, Polish equative sentences are reversible (cf. (40a) and (40b) below), and they are much more common if they do not contain proper names as in (36) and (37), but exhibit pronouns and definite DPs, as in (40).

(40a) Ja to (jestem) ten mężczyzna.
I-NOM TO am this-NOM man-NOM
'I am this man.'

The reversed version of (40a) is provided in (40b), and it also has equative meaning.

(40b) Ten mężczyzna to (jestem) ja.[11]
this-NOM man-NOM TO am I-NOM
'This man is me.'

Besides the equative meaning, sentences such as (40a) and (40b) can also be regarded as having specificational meaning, the problem to be discussed in detail in section 4.

Specificational sentences in Polish can only contain the pronominal copula *to* and hence can be found in sentences with just *to* or with both *to* and *być*, as in (41):

(41) Mój kolega to (jest) Marek.
My-NOM colleague-NOM TO is Mark-NOM
'My colleague is Mark.'

Specificational sentences can be reversed, as in (42), yielding ambiguous structures.

(42) Marek to (jest) mój kolega.
Mark-NOM TO is my-NOM colleague-NOM
'Mark is my colleague.'

The sentence in (14) can have a specificational, predicational or equative reading (cf. also (34) and (35)), just like the corresponding sentences in English (see (17) above).

[11] For space reasons, whenever possible instead of providing two examples one with *to* and the other with to *być*, only one is supplied with the verb *być* in brackets, which implies its optionality.

Finally, identificational sentences in Polish can only host the pronominal copula, as can be seen in (43), but not a verbal copula, as confirmed by (44).

(43) To miasto to (jest) Londyn.
this-NOM city-NOM TO is London-NOM
'This city is London.'

(44) *To miasto jest Londynem.
this-NOM city-NOM is London-INSTR
'This city is London.'

Likewise, indentificational sentences such as (45) below are possible.

(45) To jest Londyn.
this is London-NOM
'This is London.'

In sentences like (45) the word *to* seems to represent a demonstrative pronoun, not a pronominal copula. However, the element following the verbal copula *być* is marked for nominative, not for instrumental, as is usually the case with the verbal copula (cf. (23) above), and thus seems to resemble post-copular DPs found with the pronominal copula *to*, which regularly bear nominative case.

3. AMBIGUITIES IN COPULAR CLAUSES AND WAYS OF RESOLVING THEM

In sections 1 and 2 some mention has been made of ambiguous copular constructions. Let us now take a closer look at them and try to provide some tests helpful in resolving their ambiguity.

In English, the ambiguous cases include examples such as (8), repeated for convenience below as (46).

(46) Mark is my best friend.

The above-mentioned sentence can have three distinct interpretations, i.e. predicational, equative and specificational, because 1) it ascribes the property of being my best friend to Mark, 2) it identifies Mark with my best friend, and finally, and 3) it provides Mark as the value for the variable my best friend. The corresponding Polish example is also three-way ambiguous, compare:

(47) Marek to (jest) mój najlepszy przyjaciel.
Mark-NOM TO is my-NOM best-NOM friend-NOM
'Mark is my best friend.'

In the literature a lot of tests have been proposed to resolve the ambiguity of English copular constructions. Let us mention some of them and check whether they can be equally well applied to Polish. First of all, there are two different questions that we can ask in relation to (46), (cf. Błaszczak and Geist (2000a), Mikkelsen (2005: 76), Partee (2010: 29)), i.e.

(48) Who is Mark? Mark is my best friend.
(49) What is Mark? Mark is my best friend.

In (48) the answer we provide has a specificational meaning, whereas in (49) it has a predicational interpretation. The equative meaning is also possible in (48), but, as noted by Mikkelsen (2005), it crucially depends on demonstration, i.e. pointing to a person, we ask: Who is Mark? As noted in the literature (cf., for instance, Williams (1983: 426)), *what* asks for a property and therefore is used as a diagnostic for an NP in a predicative use, while *who* asks for entities. Although this test works well in English, it cannot be applied to the Polish data such as (47) above, since the only question form available in cases like that is as follows:

(50) Kto to jest Marek?
who TO is Mark
'Who is Mark?'

Another test that can help in disambiguating ambiguous cases such as (46) relates to the complement position of verbs like *consider* (see, for instance, Partee (1998: 119), Mikkelsen (2005: 109)). Only the structures representing small clauses can serve as complements of this verb (cf. Moro (1997: 31)). As argued by Partee (2010), only predicational clauses have this kind of structure and therefore they can be found in this sentence position, whereas neither specificational nor equative sentences can be complements of *consider*. This is confirmed by the following data, taken from Partee (2010: 9):

(51) They considered Cicero a great orator. predicational
(52) *They considered Cicero Tully. equative
(53) #? I consider the best person for this job Diana. specificational

This test can be applied to Polish, and also in this language the only possible complement of the verb *uważać* 'consider' is a predicational clause. Compare the following:

(54) Uważam Marka za dobrego przyjaciela. predicational
I-consider Mark for good friend
'I consider Mark a good friend.'

(55) *Uważam Jana Pawła II za Karola Wojtyłę. equative
I-consider John Paul II for Karol Wojtyła
'*I consider John Paul II Karol Wojtyła.'

(56) * Uważam mojego najlepszego przyjaciela za Marka. specificational
I-consider my best friend for Mark
'#?I consider my best friend Mark.'

Consequently, the sentences such as (57) and (58) below are no longer ambiguous either in English or in Polish, as they can have only a predicational interpretation:

(57) I consider Mark my best friend. predicational

(58) Uważam Marka za mojego najlepszego przyjaciela. predicational
I consider Mark for my best friend
'I consider Mark my best friend.'

Still another test postulated by Mikkelsen (2005: 72) to distinguish various types of copular clauses postulated by Higgins (1979) concerns question tags. Mikkelsen notes that predicational clauses require a tag different from specificational ones, as can be seen in (59) and (60), taken from Mikkelsen (2005: 72):

(59) The tallest girl in the class is Swedish, isn't she? predicational
(60) The tallest girl in the class is Molly, isn't it? specificational

Equatives behave like predicational clauses, as confirmed by (61):

(61) SHE is Molly Jacobson, isn't she? equative

As Mikkelsen mentions, (61) is felicitous when accompanied by a gesture pointing to an individual. The above-mentioned sentences show that in the case of predicational and equative sentences the pronoun in the tag denotes a human being, whereas the tag that follows specificational clauses must contain a non-human pronoun *it*. Mikkelsen (2005: 72) interprets this observation in the following way: "the subject of predicational and equative sentences is referential, whereas the subject of specificational clauses is property-denoting".

Although the question tag test is very reliable in establishing the difference between predicational and specificational clauses in English, it cannot be applied to Polish, as the types of tags the language uses, i.e. *nieprawdaż* 'isn't it true', *czy nie* 'or not' do not contain any pronoun. However, the contrast between specificational and predicational sentences becomes noticeable even in Polish when Left Dislocation is made use of. In the

case of Left Dislocation, the dislocated phrase leaves a resumptive pronoun in its original position. Compare the following data from Mikkelsen (2005: 75):

(62) (As for the tallest girl in the class), she is Swedish. predicational
(63) (As for the tallest girl in the class), it/that is Molly. specificational

In (62) the anaphoric pronoun *she* is used in the main clause and the structure is predicational, while in the specificational (63) only the pronoun *it* or *that* is allowed. Equatives resemble predicational structures, since they only accept the pronoun *sh*e in place of the dislocated subject, as shown in (64).

(64) (pointing to a player on the field)
(As for HER), she is Molly equative
(MIKKELSEN (2005: 75))

The Left Dislocation data seem to resemble the instances of question tags, given in (59)-(61). Once again the possibility of using the pronoun *she* in predicational and equative sentences suggests the presence of a referential subject, whereas its absence in specificational clauses implies the lack thereof.

In the case of Polish Left Dislocation, predicational sentences show a resumptive pronoun co-referential with the dislocated phrase, as can be seen in (65), while in specificational sentences only the pronoun *to* 'this' is possible, as confirmed by (66).

(65) (Jeśli idzie o Marka), on to jest artysta. predicational
as goes for Mark he-NOM TO is artist-NOM
'As for Mark, he is an artist.'

(66) (Jeśli idzie o tę aktorkę), (*ona) to to jest Hanka Bielicka. specificational
as goes for this actress (*she) this TO is Hanka Bielicka-NOM
'As for this actress, it/this is Hanka Bielicka.'

This test can be applied to (47) and yields the following two options:

(67) (Jeśli idzie o Marka), on to jest mój najlepszy przyjaciel. predicational
as goes for Mark he-NOM TO is my-NOM best-NOM friend-NOM
'As for Mark, he is my best friend.'

(68) (Jeśli idzie o Marka), to to jest mój najlepszy przyjaciel. specificational
as goes for Mark this TO is my-NOM best-NOM friend-NOM
'As for Mark, this is my best friend.'

As expected, in the predicational (67) there appears the pronoun co-referential with the dislocated phrase *Marek*, while in the specificational (68) there occurs a pronoun *to* in the position of the dislocated phrase. The contrast noted between Polish predicational and specificational clauses suggests, just

like in English, the presence of a referential subject in the former and its lack in the latter. Equatives pattern once again with predicational sentences, as shown in (69).

(69) (Jeśli idzie o mnie), ja to (jestem) ty.
as goes for me I-NOM TO (am) you-NOM
'As for me, I am you.'

The final test to be mentioned here relates to agreement. In English predicational and specificational sentences the verb always agrees with the first element, as shown in (70) and (71) below, taken from Moro (1997: 28).

(70) The pictures of the wall were the cause of the riot. predicational
(71) The cause of the riot was the picture of the wall. specificational

Thus, it seems that agreement is not particularly helpful in establishing which sentence is predicational and which specificational. This time the situation is different in Polish. In this language agreement is with the second element in both predicational and specificational sentences, as demonstrated in the following data.

(72) Zepsute hamulce to była przyczyna wypadku. predicational
broken brakes-3pl. TO was-3sg. fem. cause-3sg. fem. of-accident
'The broken brakes were the cause of the accident.'

(73) Przyczyna wypadku to były zepsute hamulce. specificational
cause-3sg. fem. of-accident TO were-3pl. broken brakes-3pl.
'The cause of accident was the broken brakes.'

Although this test does not seem to distinguish predicational from specificational clauses, it shows a clear difference between English and Polish. Also, it is worth noticing that equative sentences show a different agreement pattern, i.e. agreement with the first element, e.g.:

(74) Ja to jestem ty, a ty to jesteś ja. equative
I-NOM TO am you-NOM and you-NOM TO are I-NOM
'I am you and you and me.'

In (74) the verb clearly agrees with the pre-copular element and consequently, the agreement pattern present in equatives is distinct from that found in either predicational or specificational clauses.

To sum up, five tests have been used to demonstrate the differences between the various classes of copular sentences posited by Higgins. It has been noted that questioning and question tags work well for English, but they cannot be applied to Polish. The tests that work for both these languages correspond to Left Dislocation and the complement of *consider*/

uważać. The agreement test shows a clear difference between English and Polish. In the former the verb always agrees with the first element. In Polish predicational and specificational sentences agreement is with the second, post-copular item, whereas in equatives the verb agrees with the pre-copular element.

4. REDUCTION OF THE CLASSES OF COPULAR CLAUSES

First of all, let us consider whether it might be possible to subsume equatives under specificational clauses in Polish. It has been noted in section 2 that equative sentences such as (40a), repeated for convenience below as (75), are ambiguous between the equative and specificational interpretation.

(75) Ja to (jestem) ten mężczyzna.
I-NOM TO am this-NOM man-NOM
'I am this man.'

Although this might serve as an argument for conflating these two categories into one, there exists a difference between these two classes as regards agreement. As has been noted in section 3, in equative sentences agreement is with the pre-copular item, while in specificational sentences the verb agrees with the post-copular item (cf. (73)). The latter situation obtains in reversed equative sentences, such as (40b) (repeated below as (76).

(76) Ten mężczyzna to (jestem) ja.
this-NOM man-NOM TO am I-NOM
'This man is me.'

Since in (76) the verb agrees with the second element, the sentence is specificational rather than equative as regards agreement, and therefore it seems that reversed equatives and specificationals do have something in common. The Left Dislocation test seems to confirm this conclusion, as can be seen in (77).

(77) (Jeśli idzie o tego mężczyznę), to to jestem ja.
as goes for this man this TO am I-NOM
'As for this man, it is me.'

(77) shows the presence of the non-referential pronoun *to*, typical of specificational clauses. Consequently, the above-mentioned data indicate that reversed equatives, with the exception of true equatives such as (36), (37) and (74), can actually be subsumed under specificational clauses.

In fact, except for true equatives, all types of inverted copula clauses in Polish seem to represent specificational sentences. This claim gets support from inverted predicational sentences such as (31) and (32), which have a specificational meaning, and from sentences such as (78), which contains just the copula *być* 'be' and which exhibits the predicate in the instrumental in the clause initial position.

(78) Uczniem, którego szukasz jest Marek.
pupil-INSTR who you-look-for is Mark-NOM
'A pupil who you are looking for is Mark.'

The above-mentioned example clearly specifies a value for the variable *dobry uczeń* 'a good pupil' and hence is specificational.

The class of copular clauses postulated by Higgins (1979) that has actually been eliminated by Mikkelsen (2005) is that of identificational clauses. Mikkelsen argues that identificational sentences such as (79) below are in fact specificational, because they allow the tag with the pronoun *it*, not *she*, as shown in (80), which is typical of specificational sentences (cf. (60)).

(79) That is Susan. (MIKKELSEN (2005:121))
(80) That is Susan, isn't it?

She also notes that the other class of identificational sentences, as in (81), requires the pronoun *she* not *it* in the tag (cf. (82)), and therefore is to be interpreted as an equative (Mikkelsen's identity) statement.[12]

(81) That woman is Susan (MIKKELSEN (2005: 119))
(82) That woman is Susan, isn't she?

[12] Mikkelsen notes two other differences between these two subclasses of identificational sentences. One relates to the possibility of using non-restrictive modifiers and the other to the use of grammatical gender in Danish. She observes that a non-restrictive relative can be added only to equative identificational clauses such as (i), not to specificational identificational ones, such as (ii).

(i) That woman, who everybody can see clearly, is Susan.
(ii) * That, who everybody can see clearly, is Susan.

In Danish, specificational identificational clauses require a neuter pronoun *det* 'that', whereas equative identificational clauses co-occur with the common gender pronoun *den* 'that'. Compare the following from Mikkelsen (2005: 122):

(iii) Det er Susan.
that-neut. is Susan
'That is Susan.'
(iv) Den kvinde er Susan.
that-com. woman is Susan
'That woman is Susan.'

As has been noted in section 3, Polish also has two classes of identificational sentences, similar to those attested in English. However, the question tag test cannot be applied to these sentences, since, as has already been mentioned, pronouns do not appear in Polish question tags. Alternatively, we can look at the agreement pattern found in these sentences. First of all, agreement in Polish identificational clauses seems to be with the second element, as shown in (83) and (84) below:

(83) To była Maria.
that was-3sg. fem. Mary-NOM
'That was Mary.'

(84) Ta kobieta to była Maria.
that-NOM woman-NOM TO was-3sg. fem. Mary-NOM
'That woman was Mary.

The verb in (83) clearly agrees with the second element, which is feminine, unlike the neuter pronoun *to* 'this'. In (84) it is more difficult to determine which item the verb agrees with, as both of them are feminine. However, the agreement pattern found in (83) might indicate that Polish identificational clauses resemble specificational sentences (cf. (73)). However, the agreement test, as noted in section 3, does not distinguish between predicational and specificational sentences, each of which shows agreement with the second element in the dual copula sentences in Polish (see (72) and (73)). Therefore some other evidence is needed to help us decide which class identificational sentences in Polish really represent.

Let us consider how the Left Dislocation works for cases such as (83) and (84) above. Compare the following:

(85) (Jeśli idzie o to), to to była Maria.
as goes for it that TO was Mary-NOM
'As for this, it was Mary.'

(86) (Jeśli idzie o tę kobietę), ona to jest Maria.
as goes for this woman she-NOM TO is Mary-NOM
'As for this woman, she is Mary.'

(85) admits only the demonstrative pronoun in Left Dislocation and thus patterns with specificational clauses (cf. (66)), while in (86) the personal pronoun is used to resume the dislocated element and therefore this structure seems to resemble equatives (cf. (69)). It is also worth mentioning that the dislocated variant of (84) with the pronoun *to* is also possible, as can be seen in (87), which indicates that this sentence is ambiguous between the equative (cf. (86) above) and specificational interpretation.

(87) (Jeśli idzie o tę kobietę), to to jest Maria.
as goes for this woman that TO is Mary-NOM
'As for this woman, that is Mary.'

Also, as has been noted in section 2, the case marking found in identificational sentences such as (83) indicates that they are very much like specificational sentences. The postverbal nominal phrase has a nominative case, not instrumental, in a way similar to specificational sentences with just the verb *być* 'be', as can be seen in (88) (example (78), repeated for convenience).

(88) Uczniem, którego szukasz jest Marek.
pupil-INSTR who you-look-for is Mark-NOM
'A pupil who you are looking for is Mark.'

Thus, it seems that just like English, Polish has two types of identificational sentences, namely specificationals and equatives and consequently, there is no need to recognize a separate class of identificational sentences in this language.

5. CONCLUSION

The paper has shown that the four classes of copular sentences distinguished for English by Higgins (1979) are also present in Polish. It has been demonstrated that Polish has a richer inventory of copular sentences, because of the fact that, in addition to the verbal copula *być* 'be', it also exhibits a pronominal copula *to*, and what is more these two types can be combined to form the so-called dual copula sentences. It has also been argued that whereas all the three forms of copular sentences can realize the predicational structure in Polish, only the pronominal and the dual copula structures can have the remaining three interpretations, namely equative, specificational and identificational. Also, some ambiguous cases have been studied and some tests have been offered for disambiguating them. Some of the tests such as question-answer and question tags, work just for English, while some other, such as Left Dislocation and the complement of *consider*/*uważać*, can be applied to both these languages. As regards agreement, an important difference between English and Polish concerns predicational and specificational sentences. In English both these sentence types show agreement with the first element, whereas in Polish the verb *być* 'be' agrees with the second element. Finally, an attempt has been made at reducing the

number of categories put forward by Higgins. It has been argued that reversed equative sentences in Polish, with the exception of true equatives, may be subsumed under the specificational class. Also identificational clauses in both English and Polish do not seem to require a separate category. In fact, they seem to belong either to specificationals or to equatives in both analysed languages.

REFERENCES

ADGER, D. and G. RAMCHAND. 2003. Predication and equation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(3): 325-359.

AKMAJIAN, A. 1979. *Aspects of the grammar of focus in En*glish. New York: Garland.

BŁASZCZAK, J. and L. GEIST. 2000a. Zur Rolle des Pronomens *to*/*ėto* in spezifizierenden Kopulakontruktionen im Polnischen und Russischen. In G. ZYBATOW, U. JUNGHANNS, U. MEHLHORN, and L. SZUCSICH (eds.) *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics (Linguistik Intenational 5)*. 247-257. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

BŁASZCZAK, J. and L. GEIST. 2000b. Kopulasätze mit den pronominalen Elementen *to*/*ėto* im Polnischen und Russischen. In E. LANG (ed.) *Copular and AUX – Constructions. ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 16: 115-139. Berlin: ZAS.

CITKO, B. 2008. Small clauses reconsidered: Not so small and not all alike. *Lingua* 118: 261-295.

DECLERCK, R. 1988. *Studies on copular sentences, clefts and pseudoclefts*. Dordrecht: Leuven University Press and Foris.

DEN DIKKEN, M. 2006. *Relators as linkers The syntax of predication, predicate inversion and copulas*. (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

HEYCOCK, C. and A. KROCH. 1999. Pseudocleft connectedness: Implications for the LF interface level. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(3): 365-397.

HIGGINS, R.F. 1979. *The pseudo-cleft construction in English*. New York: Garland.

MIKKELSEN, L. 2005. *Copular clauses. Specification, predication and equation*. Amsterdam and Philadephia: John Benjamins.

MIKKELSEN, L. 2006. Specificational copular sentences. Paper presented in Kobe Area Circle of Linguistics, Kobe Shoin Women's University, November 2006.

MIKKELSEN, L. 2011. Copular clauses. In K. VON HEUSINGER, C. MEIENBORN and P. PORTNER (eds.) *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

MORO, A. 1997. *The raising of predicates: Predicative noun phrases and the theory of clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PARTEE, B. 1998. Copula inversion puzzles in English and Russian. In K. DZIWIREK, H. COATS and C. VAKARELIYSKA (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Seattle Meeting 1998*. 361-395. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

PARTEE, B. 2010. Specificational copular sentences in Russian and English. In A. GRØNN and J. MARIJANOVIC (eds.) *Russian in Contrast, Oslo Studies in Language* 2(1): 25-49.

PERELTSVAIG, A. 2001. On the nature of intra-clausal relations. Doctoral dissertation, Montreal, McGill University.

ROTHSTEIN, S. 2001. *Predicates and their subjects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

WILLIAMS, E. 1983. Semantic vs. syntactic categories. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6(3): 423-446.

ZDANIA KOPULARNE PREDYKATYWNE, SPECYFIUJĄCE, UTOŻSAMIAJĄCE I IDENTYFIKUJĄCE W JĘZYKU ANGIELSKIM I POLSKIM

S t r e s z c z e n i e

Artykuł konfrontuje typologię zdań kopularnych, zaproponowaną przez Higginsa (1979) dla języka angielskiego, z danymi z języka polskiego. Higgins wyróżnia w angielszczyźnie cztery typy zdań kopularnych, tj. predykatywne, specyfikujące, utożsamiające i identyfikujące. W artykule pokazano, że te cztery typy zdań obecne są także w polszczyźnie, choć ich inwentarz jest znacznie większy niż w języku angielskim, ponieważ polszczyzna posiada, poza kopulą werbalną, również kopulę zaimkową *to*, a także wykazuje obecność dwóch tych elementów w jednym zdaniu (tzw. zdania o dwóch kopulach). Wszystkie te trzy typy zdań kopularnych mogą występować w funkcji predykatywnej, pozostałe zaś trzy funkcje mogą być realizowane wyłącznie poprzez zdania z *to* lub zarówno z *to*, jak i z *być*. Przedstawione są przykłady zdań wieloznacznych oraz przywołane są testy umożliwiające eliminację tych dwuznaczności. Ponadto, podjęta została próba redukcji typologii Higginsa. Wykazano, że zdania utożsamiające o odwróconej kolejności składników w języku polskim wykazują cechy typowe dla zdań specyfikujących. Jeśli zaś idzie o zdania identyfikujące, to przedstawiono argumenty za tym, że zarówno w angielszczyźnie, jak i w polszczyźnie można je zakwalifikować albo jako zdania specyfikujące, albo utożsamiające.

Streściła Anna Bondaruk

Słowa kluczowe: zdania kopularne, predykatywne, specyfikujące, utożsamiające, identyfikujące, polski, angielski.

Key words: copular clauses, predicational, specificational, equative, identificational clauses, Polish, English.