SEMANTIC SENTENCE-TYPES IN LITHUANIAN AND ENGLISH

L. VALEIKA

1. Introductory

In a syntactic theory recognizing the centrality of the verb, the sentence is described in terms very similar to those used in the description of word-combinations, viz. the verb is the headword and the other constituents are its subjective, objective and adverbial determiners respectively[1]. The central importance of the verb in language is pointed out by recent neurological investigations supporting descriptive and generative theory which proposes that verbs have the primary role in the sentence[2]. The importance of the verb in the sentence can be illustrated by the so-called impersonal sentences, e. g. *Lyja. Sninga. Šąla.*

Traditionally, verbs are divided into transitive and intransitive. Transitive verbs are described as verbs expressing an action capable of "passing over" from the "agent" to the "patient"; intransitive verbs are qualified as verbs whose action does not "pass over" to the "patient". The inappropriateness of such a definition in respect of many transitive verbs has been pointed out by structural grammarians. So, for instance, R. Robins has this to say: "The weakness of semantic definitions is well illustrated here: *hit* in *I hit you* is syntactically a transitive verb and is often chosen as an example because the action referred to may plausibly be said to pass across my fist to you; but *hear* in *I hear you* is involved in exactly the same syntactic relations with the two pronouns, and is regarded as a transitive verb, though in this case the "action", if any action is in fact referred to, is the other way round; and who does what and whom, in the situation referred to by the syntactically similar verb in *I love you*"[3]. Similar cases puzzled traditional grammarians, and they continue to puzzle structural grammarians.

According to structuralists, verbs may be divided into three main groups: linking (or copulative), intransitive and transitive. Linking verbs are thought of as a structural link between subject and its complement (i. e. predicative). They there-

---

[1] The centrality of the verb is discussed in J. Fillmore, The Case for Case. — Universals in Linguistic Theory, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968; as well as in W. P. Lehman, Converging Theories in Linguistics, — Language 48—2, 1972, p. 266—274.

[2] See W. P. Lehman, op. cit., p. 266.

[3] R. H. Robins, General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey, London, 1964, p. 265.

fore never occur without a complement. To delimit them, structuralists used the so-called be-substitution test: if the appropriate forms of be can be inserted into a structure in place of another verb without making a major change in the structural meaning, the original verb is a linking verb, e. g. *The man looked hungry→The man was hungry*[4]. A further formal test is that linking verbs have no passive forms. The test, however, is of limited value since most intransitive verbs also lack passive forms. Intransitive verbs are defined as verbs that may appear in the active voice as complete predicates without any complement. Like linking verbs, they are not generally used in the passive voice. E. g. *The boy is running↔*The boy is being run*. Transitive verbs always have a complement when in the active voice and have passive forms. Yet, the passive test may sometimes fail to distinguish between transitive and intransitive verbs[5]. The point is that some traditional transitives cannot be used in the passive voice, e. g. *resemble*, *become* (i. e. suit), *owe*, *possess*, etc. As regards Lithuanian, the passive test cannot be applied at all: unlike English, Lithuanian can derive passives from intransitives. So, for instance, we cannot say *Berniukas yra bėgiojamas*, but the construction *Čia (yra) berniuko bėgiojama* seems to be quite acceptable. Consider one more example: *Mes vaikščiojame čia→Čia mūsų vaikščiojama*.

Special mention should be made of Barkhudarov's definition of transitives. According to the scholar, a transitive verb is a verb used in a phrase as head when the adjunct (i. e. complement) is represented by a noun belonging to a class different from that of the subject and non-replacable by adverbs[6]. The definition involves two restrictions: (1) the adjunct must be a noun belonging to a class different from that of the subject and (2) the adjunct cannot be replaced by an adverb. E. g.:

John saw a house   *John became a soldier*

John saw a soldier   **John became a house*

Practically, however, this definition does not cover all cases. So, for instance, it is not in a position to distinguish certain types of link-verbs from transitives, e. g. *John has a brother*; *John has a car*. Nor can it distinguish transitives from locatives, e. g. *Mary left the house*. Other structuralists have given up the semantic approach and attempted to describe verb-types in terms of the number of nominals with

[4] The invariance of the constructions is discussed in L. Valeika, Dar apie tarinio vardininką ir tarinio įnagininką, — Mūsų kalba, 4, 1972, p. 31—34.

[5] Cf. Otto Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar, Part III, Syntax, vol. 2, London, 1965, pp. 232, 300.

[6] Л. С. Бархударов, Структура простого предложения современного английского языка, М., 1966, p. 78.

which the verb combines in the sentence[7]. Thus came into being a new term, viz. valency. The term valency denotes the potential ability of a verb to combine with nominal complements. Valency may be of two types: optional and obligatory. The sentence structure is determined by the valency of the verb. Of the two types of valency the most important is the obligatory valency: the sentence as a structurally complete utterance is built on the obligatory combinability of the verb. Optional determiners (or complements), being less regular in the sentence, are not so important for the sentence. They function as elements which supply additional information about the verb. Yet, for a full description of the sentence optional determiners are of great importance, as they help us to see the potentialities of the sentence, its syntactic growth. This is of extreme importance in a transformational description of word-combination, i. e. in a description in which the connection betwen the sentence and the word combination is established. Giving an objective estimation of the description, we must say that it is rather superficial: it deals with the surface structure of the sentence and fails to reveal the semantics of the sentence. The verb as a class is rather heterogeneous and cannot be measured with one standard. Adopting the above method, we shall have to include structures of great variety, e. g. *Jis rašo laišką*; *Jis priėjo mišką*; *Jis paliko tėvynę*; *Man skauda galvą*, etc. Still the old terms should not be discarded as useless. They can be used in the description of verbs provided we restrict them to certain types of verb. To put it more definitely, the verb as a class should be subdivided into subclasses. We have already excluded link-verbs and we think that verbs of motion, location as well as verbs followed by temporal complements should also be exempted and given separate treatment. E. g. *Mes priėjome kaimą*: *We have approached a village*; *Aš gyvenu čia*: *I live here*; *Gerai išmiegojau naktį*: *I have spent the night well*. The remaining types of verb, i. e. verbs with obligatory objective complements, should be treated as transitives.

It should be observed, however, that transitives are not homogeneous either: some transitives are primaries, while others present derivatives of the underlying locatives. Consider the following sentences:

1. *Marytė skaito knygą   Mary is reading a book* (non-derived or transitive proper);
2. *Džonas išbarstė taką gėlėmis : John strewed the path with flowers* (derived transitive).

[7] On valency see Н. И. Филичева, О словосочетаниях в современном немецком языке, М., 1969, p. 43; С. Д. Кацнельсон, Типология языка и речевое мышление, Л., 1973, p. 47; Б. М. Лейкина, Некоторые аспекты характеристики валентностей, — Доклады на конференции по обработке информации, машинному переводу и автоматическому чтению текста, вып. 5, М., 1961, p. 1; E. Geniušienė, Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių sintaksinė klasifikacija, — Kalbotyra, XXIII (1), V., 1971, pp. 7—15.

Cases like (2), according to Anderson[8], exhibit the phenomenon called objectivization (or in our sense — transitivazation) of locative complements. Other transitive verb clauses show a different relationship to locatives. As has been shown by Anderson, verbs of mental perception (e. g. *think, know*) as well as the so-called affective verbs combine with subjective complements which are locative by origin. So, for instance, verbs such as *like, think*, which now take a subjectivized locative, at an earlier stage in the history of the English language preserved traces of their locative origin in the form of a dative inflexion. The same view has been expressed by Kuryłowicz who regards the dative in the familiar Indo-European languages as an off-shoot of the locative used with personal nouns[9]. As regards Lithuanian, constructions with dative subjects are to be found in the so-called "impersonal" sentences. The number of such verbs does not seem to be great; they can be referred to as belonging to a closed set (e. g. *diegti, gelti, mausti, niežėti, peršėti, skaudėti, sopėti, ganėti, knietėti, pabaisti, pagailti, pakakti, stigti, trūkti, užtekti*). E. g.: 1) *Man pagailo berniuko*; 2) *Marytei patinka uogienė*.

2. Personal Sentences

2.1. Transitive versus Intransitive Sentences

If we look at the verb-lexemes in Lithuanian or English dictionaries, we shall see that one and the same verb-lexeme may be used in both transitive and intransitive sentences. E. g.:

1. *Berniukas skaito knygą* : *The boy is reading a book*;
2. *Berniukas skaito* : *The boy reads already*.

Traditional grammarians confined themselves to drawing up lists of such verbs without trying to give a theoretical explanation of the so-called verb-migration. Structural grammarians who were mostly preoccupied with taxonimic analysis did not give the problem proper consideration either. To explain the usage, linguists needed a theory which would be concerned with paradigmatic relations between constructions. Such a theory has been proposed by generative grammarians. According to them, transitive verbs are secondary, i. e. they derive from an underlying string such as X causes X_1 to V. In this way the sentence *He drives the car* is derived from *He is causing smth; the car drives*.

---

[8] John M. Anderson, The Grammar of Case. Towards a Localistic Theory, Cambridge, 1971, pp. 101—102.

[9] J. Kuryłowicz, Le problème du classement des cas, — Biuletyn polskiego towarzystwa językoznawczego, 1964, pp. 190—195.

Transitive verbs derived so are referred to as causatives[10]. It should be observed, however, that not all transitives are easy to account for in this way. There exist in Lithuanian and English a number of verbs which cannot be described in exactly the same way. E. g. *Džonas nužudė Peterį* : *John killed Peter*; *Peteris mirė*: *Peter died*. John Lyons believes that between such pairs holds the same syntactic and semantic relationship as between the sentences discussed above. Just to quote the scholar: "In such sentences we may say that the relationship of the transitive to the intransitive is lexicalized. It is a matter of lexical structure of English that we say *John killed Bill* rather than *John died Bill*"[11]. Other scholars[12] doubt that similar verbs are alternative phonological realizations of the same verb. The main reason for not deriving "kill" from "cause to die" seems to be the lack of identity of meaning between "kill" and "cause to die". We think that futile are the efforts of those linguists who believe that any causative verb invariably yields an intransitive verb: the slot for the corresponding intransitive verb may remain vacant. Much depends on the systemic peculiarities of a language. In Lithuanian, for instance, the verb *nužudyti* has the corresponding intransitive verb *žūti*.

It will be noted that linguists are not agreed upon the notion of causativity: some linguists treat it as a wide category, others think it should be restricted to a specified group of verbs. Those who adhere to the former view treat as causatives all transitives and intransitives and those who hold the latter view treat as causatives only those verbs which can occur both transitively and intransitively with the same lexical items used as transitive objects and intransitive subjects, e. g. *John turned the wheel→The wheel turned.*

A serious definition and full generative treatment of causatives is lacking. As far as transitive verbs are concerned, the most workable criterion seems the one suggested by John Anderson. He refers to verbs as causatives if they answer the question "what did X_1 do to X_2?" E. g. *John killed Peter : What did John do to Peter?* But: *John wrote (read) a book : *What did John do to the book?* According to Anderson *reading* is not something one does to *a book* (though it is perhaps something one does with it). "The restriction seems to me to be a reflexion of a notional distinction between verbs like *kill* or *damage* and verbs like *read*, such when some sort of change of state in the object is a necessary consequence of the action denoted by the former — whereas there is no such necessary implication in the case of *read*[13]".

---

[10] See Carlota S. Smith, On Causative Verbs and Derived Nominals in English, — Linguistic Inquiry, vol. 3, No 1, 1972; John Lyons, Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics, Cambridge, 1969, pp. 352—356.

[11] John Lyons, op. cit., p. 352.

[12] J. A. Fodor, Three Reasons for not Deriving "Kill" from "Cause to Die", — Linguistic Inquiry, vol. 1, pp. 429—438.

[13] John M. Anderson, op. cit., p. 64.

Most causative verbs in English have intransitive equivalents, i. e. verbs which refer to the same process without mentioning the agent, i. e. the instigator of the process. These verbs in English generally have the same phonological shape as the transitive, i. e. no special suffix is added. In Lithuanian, a special suffix may be added -in-. E. g., *Valstietis augina javus→Javai auga.*

Apart from the suffix, causative verbs in Lithuanian can be distinguished by the absence of the reflexive suffix -si: *Berniukas suka ratą→Ratas sukasi.* Causatives having the same morphological shape with their derivative are infrequent in Lithuanian. E. g. *Mama kepa pyragus→Pyragai kepa.*

Many causative verbs are derivationally related to adjectives. The causative derived so may be referred to as an inchoative causative (e. g.: 1) *mažas→mažinti; didelis →didinti;* 2) *rich→enrich; slack→slacken*). Consider a few examples:

Darbdavys sumažino atlyginimą→Atlyginimas sumažėjo;
John made his mind rich→ His mind enriched.

But, as has been pointed out by Anderson, similar prefixes or suffixes are verbalizing rather than specifically causative. Causative transitive verbs we shall call causative objective, and their derivatives — causative subjective. As already seen, causative objectives and causative subjectives subdivide into non-inchoative and inchoative.

Another group of causatives is represented by the so-called reflexive sentences. By reflexive sentences we mean sentences in which the same semantic elements function both as agent and patient (i. e. ergative and nominative). E. g.: In *Peter killed himself, Peter* is the agent and the patient of *kill.* In Lithuanian grammar such reflexives are called tiesioginės reikšmės sangrąžiniai veiksmažodžiai (reflexives of direct meaning)[14]. Somewhat similar to reflexive sentences are reciprocal sentences. Like in reflexives proper, the subject of reciprocal sentences is both agent and patient. E. g.: *Peter and John killed each other←Peter killed John × John killed Peter.* But reciprocal sentences differ from reflexives in two ways. First, in reciprocal sentences there must be at least two individuals in this agent-patient role. Second, the agents and patients which are paired are non-identical: neither of the underlying sentences means *Peter killed himself* or *John killed himself.* That is, the sentence *Peter and John killed each other* is not identical with *Peter and John killed themselves*[15].

---

[14] Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, II, V., 1971, pp. 191—192.

[15] More about it see Wallace L. Chafe, Directionality and Paraphrase, — Language, vol. 47, No 1, 1971, pp. 5—26.

Transformationally, true reflexives derive from clauses of covert causation[16], i. e. clauses with implied causation (e.g.→*Floyd melted the glass* (covert causation) versus→*Floyd caused the glass to melt* (overt causation). But this is only a number one condition. To derive true reflexives, the sentence must contain the so-called inalienable direct object. E. g.:

Džonas prausia veidą ir rankas→Džonas prausiasi;
John is washing his face and hands→John is washing.

Sentences deriving from clauses with alienable direct or inalienable direct object are not reflexive, even though these derivatives may contain reflexive verbs (as in Lithuanian, for instance). E. g.:

A. 1. *Džonas suka ratą→Ratas sukasi;*
   2. *John is turning the wheel→The wheel is turning;*
B. 1. *Džonas pastatė sau namą→Džonas pasistatė namą;*
   2. *John has built a house for himself→John has built himself a house.*

This suggests that the particle -si in Lithuanian does not necessarily form reflexives proper: it may point to the nominative, i. e. not ergative subject. In other words, the particle -si- is endowed with two meanings: reflexive (ergative) and nominative (non-ergative). Non-ergative reflexives look like passive sentences[17]. Cf.:

A. 1. *Džonas kerpa (savo) plaukus→Džonas kerpasi* (ergative);
   2. *John is shaving his beard→John is shaving* (ergative);
B. 1. *Peteris kerpa Džonui plaukus→Džonas kerpasi* (non-ergative or nominative)→*Džonas yra kerpamas;*
   2. *Peter is shaving John ('s beard)→John is shaving* (non-ergative or nominative)→*John is being shaved;*
C. 1. *Berniukas sunešiojo batus→Batai susinešiojo* (non-ergative)→*Batai yra sunešioti;*
   2. *The boy has worn out his shoes→The shoes have worn out* (non-ergative)→ *The shoes have been worn out.*

In Lithuanian, such verbs are usually used with the particle -si. In English, similar verbs are not marked. It is only when the speaker wishes to emphasize the independence of the action from any causer that the reflexive pronoun may be added. Cf.:

1. *Mary opened the door→The door opened;*
2. *X opened the door→The door opened by itself.*

---

[16] On covert and overt causatives, see D. A. Cruse, A Note on English Causatives, — Linguistic Inquiry, vol. 3, No 4, 1972, pp. 520—528.
[17] More on passive reflexives in Lithuanian see A. Paulauskienė, Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodis, V., 1971, p. 21.

The particle -si may also be suppressed. E. g. *dilti : dyla*; *kepti : kepa*. We may observe a situation when the particle -si may not be used with true reflexives: this is particularly true of motion verbs[18]. E. g.: 1) *Berniukas gula (sėda)*; 2) *Jis su gaidžiais kelia.*

This can be accounted for by the fact that verbs like *gulti, kelti, klaupti, tūpti* or *bėgti, plaukti*, etc. are reflexive by nature. They seldom or never occur in the so-called covert causative constructions. E. g.: 1) **Berniukas guldo save*; 2) **Jis kelia save.*

As regards English, reflexive pronouns are used in reflexive constructions rather irregularly. According to John Lyons it is a characteristic feature of English that many verbs can be used in reflexive sentences without the occurrence of an object pronoun[19]. Hence the ambiguity of English sentences, e. g. *I have changed.*

There is a further distinction that would appear to be relevant here. In Lithuanian and English we find one of the traditional subtypes of object which is semantically and syntactically sufficiently distinct to be separated from the other objects. This is the so-called object of result. Notionally, such an object is the result of the action of the verb. E. g.:

1. *Braunas pastatė (sau) namus→Braunas pasistatė namus*; *Mr. Brown has built a house for himself→Mr. Brown has built himself a house.*
2. *Dailininkas nupiešė paveikslą*; *The artist painted a picture.*

It is interesting to note that sentence (1) may be interpreted in two ways — *Braunas paprašė X, kad pastarasis pastatytų jam namus* : *Brown has asked X to build a house for himself* and *Braunas pats statė sau namus* : *Brown himself built a house (for himself)*. Of great interest is sentence (2) as well. The point is that verbs like *piešti, tapyti, teplioti*, etc. may be used without their objects. The omission of the object seems to be conditioned by its semantic peculiarities: it is generally indefinite objects (i. e. objects vague in meaning) that are omitted. E. g.: *Berniukas piešia kažką→ Berniukas piešia* : *The boy is painting something→The boy is painting.*

This should not be confused with elliptical or incomplete sentences, i. e. sentences which are incomplete grammatically but complete contextually[20]. Thus, the sentence *Berniukas piešia (kažką)* is structurally complete; its other variant *Berniukas piešia (vasarą)* is structurally incomplete, but complete contextually, since the object will be recovered from the preceding context.

Somewhat similar to the above type are sentences such as *Berniukas skaito knygą* : *The boy is reading a book* and *Berniukas skaito* : *The boy reads already.* Accord-

---

[18] Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, op. cit., pp. 200—201.
[19] John Lyons, op. cit., p. 362.
[20] See John Lyons, op. cit., pp. 174—175.

ing to some linguists[21] similar verbs are endowed with two functions, viz. they may be used as transitives and intransitives. Such an approach may be right, if we take a structuralist view of language. From the point of view of transformational generative grammar, however, the view cannot be accepted. The derivation of the sentence *Berniukas skaito* from *Berniukas skaito knygą* is vulnerable to attack on the grounds of semantic inadequacy. As a matter of fact, *Berniukas skaito : The boy reads* derives from a sentence with a modality feature. E. g.: *Berniukas gali (moka) skaityti (x)→Berniukas skaito : The boy can read (x)→The boy reads (already)*.

Yet, to say that all sentences expressing a bility can be used so would be untrue to fact. So, for instance, the English sentence *He can play the piano* can hardly be used in this way, but *Jis skambina* can. The reason for this should be sought in the semantic structure of the verb *play*. In English, the verb *play* is polysemantic. To put it otherwise, the sentence *He plays* is too vague to occur. Its Lithuanian counterpart *Jis skambina* gives a more or less‚ clear idea: it generally implies playing on some string instrument. It seems best to treat such verbs as syntactic homonyms[22]. Clauses containing the type of verb with an object followed may be referred to as modal objective and clauses deriving from them as modal subjective. The type of clauses (i. e. *Jis skambina*) closely resembles the following: *Mes valgome antrą valandą We eat at two o'clock*.

It will be obvious that the sentences under discussion (i. e. *Berniukas skaito: The boy reads*) differ from the type of sentence mentioned above: the deletion of the object is contextually determined and may be recoverable for the purpose of semantic interpretation. The usage can be accounted for by the familiarity of the objects to the speakers, which, in its own turn, can be explained by the high frequency of the occurrence of similar sentences. Other verbs, whose semantic structure is less definite, do not admit of the usage, e. g. *daryti : do, gaminti : make (produce)*. Such sentences we shall call pseudo-intransitive[23].

But to return to modal subjectives. Very similar to them are sentences exhibited by the following: 1) *This material does not wash*; 2) *The clothes washed easily*; 3) *The books are not going to sell quickly*; 4) *She does not frighten easily*.

It looks as if the sentences should have a corresponding causative sentence like, for instance, *Mary washed the clothes*. On second thought, there is hardly any relevant connection between them. As noted by O. Jespersen[24],‚the type of sentence results from the 'activo-passive' use of some verbs. According to Halliday[25], this

[21] For instance, Л. С. Бархударов, op. cit., p. 89.
[22] František Daneš, A Three-Level Approach to Syntax, — Travaux Linguistique de Prague, 1, Prague, 1964, p. 239.
[23] John Lyons, op. cit., p. 361.
[24] Otto Jespersen, A Modern English Grammar, III, London, 1928, pp. 347—352.
[25] Cited after John Lyons, op. cit., p. 366.

type is especially frequent in simple present tense, particularly in negative sentences; it is not, however, restricted to these verbal forms, and may occur with any tense, especially with certain -ly adverbs. Underlying all these is a feature of characterization of the process as such, either a qualification of it or a generalization about its feasibility. John Lyons[26] calls such sentences 'process-orientated' sentences, which suggests that emphasis in them is always on the process, on its plausibility. For example, *The book sold quickly* means that the selling of the book was quick, not that someone managed to sell it quickly. The fact that *the book sold quickly* can be accounted for by the specific properties of the book (e. g. its value, price, etc.). In view of this, such clauses are best treated as deriving from modal sentences like *It was possible to sell the book quickly*[27]. Before we can go on to other types of sentence, consider some more examples: 1) *It polishes easily*; 2) *It washes easily*; 3) *His plays act well*.

The first two sentences are ambiguous. *It* in the first sentence may stand both for *polish* (i. e. substance used for polishing) and *the floor* (i. e. the object of polishing). That is, the first clause can be viewed as a derivative of the corresponding modal sentence *It can polish the floor easily*. When used in its second meaning, the accent is on the specific properties of the floor itself, not on the *polish*. The latter clause can be derived from something like *One can polish the floor easily*. The same analysis applies to *It washes easily*. But clause (3) is something of a problem. What is its derivational structure? If it means the ease of acting, the respective underlying sentence should be *It is easy to act his plays*; if it refers to the specific properties of the staged play, the underlying sentence should be *It is possible to act his plays well*. In both cases, however, the properties of the play are accentuated. Therefore, the clauses might be called modal subjectives as well. In Lithuanian, similar clauses are infrequent. Most speakers would frown upon the word-for-word translation of the above clauses — *Ši medžiaga lengvai skalbiasi*. Instead, Lithuanian speakers would say *Šią medžiagą lengva skalbti*. In this respect English seems to be more alike to Russian, where the reflexivization is wide-spread (e. g. Эта рубашка хорошо стирается).

2.2. Descriptive Clauses

Descriptive clauses are exhibited by the so-called nominal predicate constructions, e. g.:

A. 1. *Žmogus yra žinduolis*
   2. *Man is a mammal* } essive construction

---

[26] John Lyons, op. cit., p. 366.

[27] John M. Anderson, op. cit., p. 68.

B. 1. a) *Jonas yra inžinierius*; b) *John is an engineer* ⎫
   2. a) *Petras yra įdomus*; b) *Peter is interesting* ⎬ translative
   3. a) *Petrui nesveika*; b) *Peter is unwell* ⎭ construction

As the type of clauses has been dealt with[28], we shall content ourselves with the above illustrations.

2.3. Locative Clauses

The term 'locative' must be understood to include spatial relations and, consequently, may express the agent's place or the agent's moving to a definite place. Hence, non-directional and directional locatives. As has been pointed out by Lyons[29], the opposition of 'locative' (i. e. non-directional and directional) may be regarded as a particular manifestation of a more general distinction between static and dynamic. From a generative point of view, static locatives derive from dynamic ones, e. g.: *Marytė yra Maskvoje* : *Mary is in Moscow←Marytė išvyko į Maskvą* : *Mary has gone to Moscow.*

Depending on the semantics of a locative complement, locative clauses divide into concrete and abstract.

A. 1. *Vaza stovi ant stalo* : *The vase stands on the table;*
   2. *Džonas važiuoja į Londoną* : *John is going to London;*

B. 1. *Džonas yra susirinkime* : *John is at the meeting;*
   2. *Džonas eina į susirinkimą* : *John is going to the meeting.*

2.4. Temporal Clauses

By temporal clauses we mean constructions whose verb is followed by a temporal complement, e. g.:

1. *Paskaita truko valandą* : *The lecture lasted an hour;*

2. *Pokalbis tęsėsi pusvalandį*   *The conversation lasted half an hour;*

3. *Pragulėjau visą dieną* : *I passed my time lying abed;*

The first two clauses are typically temporal, while the third clause is temporal-objective.

---

[28] L. Valeika, op. cit., pp. 31—34; L. Valeika, A Few Observations on the Structure and Semantics of Predicate Nominal Constructions (A Generative Approach to Link-Verbs), — Baltų kalbų veiksmažodžio tyrinėjimai, V., 1973, pp. 231—237.

[29] John Lyons, op. cit., pp. 300—302.

2.5. Possessive Clauses

As has been suggested by some linguists[30], in many languages the relationship between possessive and locative clauses is rather obvious. Historical studies point out the comparative recentness of *have*-type constructions in various Indo-European languages, and the existence of "earlier" possessive constructions more obviously parallel to locative clauses. Attempts are made to relate such development to a general tendency towards "personal subjects" in many languages[31]. Fillmore has demonstrated that many surface subjects may well have been dative[32], e. g. *I have several books←He gave me several books.* So what are possessive clauses and what is their relationship to locative clauses? To possessive clauses linguists generally attribute structures containing the verb *have*. Yet, on closer scrutiny, we find that semantically such clauses are too varied to come under one term. In other words, the relationship between the subject-have-complement is not always possessive in the strict sense of the word, e. g.:

1. *Miestas turi teatrą   The town has a theatre;*
2. *Birželis turi 30 dienų : June has 30 days;*
3. *Namas turi balkoną : The house has a balcony;*
4. *Džonas turi mašiną : John has a car.*

It would be hard to establish a single deep sentence from which the above sentences derive. Still, it is obvious that the deep sentence should contain a verb of *giving* or *acquiring*. When realized, however, its derivative may acquire a different interpretation and enter different sentence systems. So, for instance, *Miestas turi teatrą : The town has a theatre* is best treated as locative, while *Džonas turi mašiną : John has a car* as possessive. The first clause conveniently transforms into *Mieste yra teatras : There is a theatre in the town*, while the second does not. Neither in Lithuanian nor in English can we say **Pas Joną yra mašina : *At John is a car.* The sentence *Pas Joną yra mašina* is possible if *Pas Joną* is conceived as expressing location (Cf. *Aš mačiau jį pas Joną*, i. e. Jono namuose : *I saw him at John's*, i. e. at John's house). Location is generally expressed by inanimate nouns[33].

[30] John M. Anderson, op. cit., p. 107; John Lyons, op. cit. , p. 392.

[31] See, for instance, C. Bally, L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues indo-européennes. — Festschrift Louis Gauchat, Aarau : Sauerlander, 1926, pp. 68—78.

[32] J. Fillmore, op. cit., pp. 1—88.

[33] See Paul G. Chapin's review of Robert P. Stockwell, Paul Schachter and Barbara Hall Partee, Integration of Transformational Theories on English Syntax (Command Systems Division, Electronics Systems Division, Air Force Systems Command, ESD-TR-68-419), Los Angeles: University of California, 1968 in: Language 48—3, 1972, p. 651.

3. Impersonal Sentences

Traditionally, impersonal sentences are illustrated by the following types:

   1. a) *Šąla (gęsta, bąla, sninga,* etc.) : *It is freezing;*
     b) *(Buvo) vakaras, naktis,* etc. : *It was evening, night, etc.;*
   2. *Man reikia eiti namo* : *It is necessary (for me) to go home.*

Sentences of the first group are subjectless in Lithuanian. The apparent exceptions to this rule are *Lietus lyja; Diena aušta.* The use of the so-called cognate subject, however, does not render the sentences personal. In English, similar sentences are used with the pronoun *it.* In sentences like *It is raining* we do not associate the process of raining with any actual agent, we think of it as going on by itself, as a spontaneous process. Verbs like *to rain, to snow* had originally no subject, but in the course of time the pronoun *it* was introduced as subject to make these sentences comply with the usual type of sentence in English[34].

Of special interest are sentences of the second group. In traditional grammar the type of sentence is assigned to impersonal sentences[35]. Yet, we feel that the sentences differ from sentences of the first group. The difference lies in the presence of the dative noun (or pronoun). What function does it perform? Traditional grammarians treated it as the object, as the function of the subject was identified with the nominative case. Yet, as has been shown by Katsnelson[36], the subject may be indicated by other cases and its position in the sentence as well. If we compare, for instance, *Berniukui rūpi saldainiai* and *Saldainiai rūpi berniukui,* we shall see that the first sentence exhibits direct word order and the second — indirect. This goes to say that the subject in the first sentence should be *berniukui.* If we accept this view, the sentence *Berniukui rūpi saldainiai* should be described as personal. As regards English, the type of sentence is less frequent. Cf.: *Man patinka : I like it; Man reikia palto : I need a coat; Man gera čia : I like it here;* But: *Man reikia eiti : It is necessary for me to go.*

Vilniaus V. Kapsuko universitetas
  Anglų filologijos katedra

---

[34] А. И. Смирницкий, Синтаксис английского языка, М., 1957.

[35] J. Balkevičius, Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos sintaksė, V., 1963, p. 138; Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, II, op. cit., pp. 215—218.

[36] С. Д. Кацнельсон, op. cit., pp. 63—64.

SEMANTINIAI SAKINIŲ TIPAI LIETUVIŲ IR ANGLŲ KALBOSE

Reziumė

Straipsnyje aprašomi semantiniai sakinių tipai lietuvių ir anglų kalbose. Išskiriami asmeniniai ir beasmeniai sakiniai. Asmeniniai skirstomi į tranzityvinius ir intranzityvinius, deskriptyvinius, lokatyvinius, temporalinius ir posesyvinius.