



Dalė Roikienė – Šiaulių universiteto Užsienio kalbų studijų katedros docentė.

Moksliniai interesai: sintaksė, sakinio semantika; vertimo problemos.

Adresas: Povilo Višinskio g. 38, LT-76325 Šiauliai.

El. paštas: daler@super.lt.

Dalė Roikienė: Associate Professor of Šiauliai University, Department of Foreign Languages Studies.

Research interests: syntax, semantic structure of the sentence; translation problems.

Address: Povilo Višinskio str. 38, LT-76325 Šiauliai.

E-mail: daler@super.lt.

Dalė Roikienė

Šiauliai University, Faculty of Humanities

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF INCORPORATION IN ENGLISH AND LITHUANIAN

Anotacija

Straipsnio tikslas – trumpai pristatyti inkorporacijos reiškinį ir sugretinti inkorporacijos atvejus anglų ir lietuvių kalbose. Labai apibendrintai galima teigti, kad inkorporacinės konstrukcijos yra konstrukcijos, kuriose veiksmažodis ir vienas iš jo argumentų sudaro glaudų vienetą. Inkorporacija būdinga daugumai Sibiro ir Šiaurės Amerikos kalbų, tačiau inkorporacijos atvejų galime rasti anglų ir lietuvių kalbose. Analizė paremta Džeko Londono romano „Baltoji Iltis“ ir jo vertimo į lietuvių kalbą medžiaga. Straipsnyje gretinami daiktavardžių, prielinksnių ir būdvardžių inkorporacijos atvejai.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: gretinamoji kalbotyra, inkorporacija, daiktavardžių inkorporacija, prielinksnių inkorporacija, būdvardžių inkorporacija, anglų kalba, lietuvių kalba.

Abstract

The aim of the paper is to present general understanding of incorporation and to compare and contrast it in English and Lithuanian. Generally incorporated constructions are understood as constructions in which a verb and one of its arguments form a particularly tight unit. Incorporation is typical to many Siberian and North American language families. Although English and Lithuanian do not belong to them, some types of incorporation can be identified in their grammatical structure. The analysis is based on the evidence drawn from Jack London's novel "White Fang" and its translation into the Lithuanian language. The paper analyses the cases of noun, preposition, and adjective incorporation.

KEY WORDS: contrastive linguistics, incorporation, noun incorporation, preposition incorporation, adjective incorporation, English, Lithuanian.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15181/rh.v0i16.1023>

Introduction

In the course of time there have been many assumptions about contrastive linguistics. The term “contrastive linguistics” was firstly mentioned by Benjamin Lee Whorf (Whorf 1941). Jacek Fisiak defines the term “contrastive linguistics” as “a sub-discipline of linguistics concerned with the comparison of two or more languages or subsystems of languages in order to determine both the differences and similarities between them” (Fisiak 1981, 1). Volker Gast (Gast 2011) states that the term “contrastive linguistics” is closely related to comparative linguistics and can be defined in broad and narrow meaning. “Narrowly defined, contrastive linguistics can be regarded as a branch of comparative linguistics that is concerned with pairs of languages which are ‘socio-culturally linked’ (Gast, 2011, 1), i.e. contrastive analysis is the method which is employed to explore two languages which “can be said to be socio-culturally linked when they are used by a considerable number of bi- or multilingual speakers, and/or a substantial amount of ‘linguistic output’ (text, discourse) is translated from one language into the other” (Gast, 2011, 1). Besides the social or cultural relation, the languages should have similarities in the structure, aspects of their grammar, lexis, phonetics and etc.

On the other hand, a relation between two languages is unnecessary when broader meaning is concerned. Gast (2011, 1) suggests that “the term ‘contrastive linguistics’ is also sometimes used for comparative studies of (small) groups (rather than just pairs) of languages, and does not require a socio-cultural link between the languages investigated. Any pair of group of languages can be subject to a contrastive analysis”. So, Lithuanian and English may also be analysed and compared, even if they belong to different language typology.

In contrastive analysis, the theory of translation is also of paramount importance. According to Jonh Catford (1965), translation studies can be considered as a branch of comparative linguistics. It is suggested that “the theory of translation is concerned with a certain type of relation between languages and is consequently a branch of comparative linguistics” (Cat-

ford 1965, 20). It logically follows that in order to translate certain items from one language into another it is necessary to find equivalents of the target language and then to apply a comparative method.

The aim of the paper is to present general understanding of incorporation and to compare and contrast it in English and Lithuanian. The analysis is based on the evidence drawn from Jack London's novel "White Fang" and its translation into the Lithuanian language performed by Stasys Navickas.

General understanding of incorporation

the phenomenon of incorporation was first described as noun incorporation in American Indian languages. The standard definition of noun incorporation belongs to Edward Sapir: "It is the process of compounding a noun stem with a verb that is here proposed to call noun incorporation, no matter what the syntactic function of the noun logically is" (Sapir 1911, 257). Donka Farkas and Henriete de Swart present a more general definition of the term: these are constructions "in which a verb and one of its arguments form a particularly tight unit" (Farkas, de Swart 2004, 1). However, in linguistics the unified approach to incorporation does not exist. Some approaches to incorporation can be singled out. The syntactic approach has been presented in the works of Mark Baker (1988, 1996) and supported by a number of other authors who used his theory as a basis for their research. Baker proposes the following understanding of this phenomenon: "Noun incorporation is the phenomenon in which a nominal that would otherwise bear a grammatical relation to the verb (such as direct object) is expressed not as an independent noun phrase, but rather as a morphological root that is integrated into the inflected verb to form a kind of composite form" (Baker et al. 2004, 138). It is a syntactic process, by which an argument of the verb moves from its syntactic A-position to adjoin the verb. According to Baker (1988), the noun starts out as the head of the constituent, which includes the modifier, and it is separated from the modifier by head movement. Then it can be incorporated into the verb creating a new morphologically complex verb.

Another approach to this phenomenon is purely lexical, i.e. incorporation is conceptualized as a type of word formation, related to compounding. This approach can be recognized in Sapir's definition. He argued that

the morphological process of noun incorporation should be separated from syntactic process. The roots of lexical approach to word-formation can be found in the works of Noam Chomsky (1970) and Morris Halle (1973). They launched many theoretical discussions, particularly on incorporation, and were supported by a number of linguists, who “have successfully argued that all types of incorporation have to be regarded as lexical phenomena” (Scalise, Guevara, 2005, 24).

The semantic approach to incorporation is presented by Veerle van Geenhoven (1998). She developed a theory of Semantic Incorporation focusing on West Greenlandic noun incorporating verbs that are viewed as semantically derived from the base verbs.

Types of incorporation in English and Lithuanian

incorporating structures are a particularly characteristic feature of the various Siberian and North American language families. Although neither English nor Lithuanian belong to such kind of languages, even several types of incorporation can be identified in their grammatical structure. The analysed corpus exhibited noun incorporation (nouns incorporated into a verbal entry), preposition incorporation (prepositions incorporated into a verbal entry), and adjective incorporation (adjectives incorporated into a verbal entry).

1. Noun incorporation. The analysis of the corpus allowed distinguishing some subtypes of noun incorporation:

a) **Incorporation of nouns denoting instruments.** The process of instrument incorporation into the verb is called *verbalization*. This phenomenon can be presented by the following examples where the activity verbs are named after the instrument used to accomplish them with:

*He **stoned** John to death.* vs. *He killed John with a stone.*

*John **brushed** the horse.* vs. *John stroked the horse with a brush.*

*I **raked** the leaves in the garden.* vs. *I pushed the leaves with a rake.*

In English a noun can be incorporated into a verbal entry either without any change of form (*stone – to stone, brush – to brush, rake – to rake*) or using derivational affixes, also known as ‘verbalizers’: *-ize* as in *computer – to computerize*, *be-* as in *head – to behead*.

In Lithuanian the derivatives with the suffix *-uoti* exhibit the same situation, i.e. a thing referring to the parent noun is used as an instrument: *burės – buriuoti* ‘sail – to sail’, *irklas – irkluoti* ‘paddle – to paddle’, *skaptas – skaptuoti* ‘gouge – to gouge’, *meškerė – meškerioti* ‘rod – to fish’.

The equivalent instrument incorporation in English and Lithuanian can be illustrated with the example from the corpus:

(1) *Then after the break-up of the ice on the Porcupine, he had built a canoe and **paddled down** that stream to where it effected its junction with the Yukon just under the Arctic Circle (203). Paskui, kai Porkupaine pajudėjo ledas, jis pasidirbo valtį ir **nusiyrė pasroviui** iki tos vietos, kur upė, jau pačioje Arktikoje, jungiasi su Jukonu (99).*

But not all sentences with instrument incorporation in the corpus were translated equivalently in Lithuanian:

(2) *He walked as deliberately as though all the snow **were carpeted** with porcupine quills, erect and ready to pierce the soft pads of his feet (138). Jis ėjo taip atsargiai, lyg visas sniegas būtų **prismaigstytas** stačių dygiakiaulės dyglių, tykojančių įsmigti į jo švelnius padus (40).*

(3) *He **was kept chained** in a pen at the rear of the fort, and here Beauty Smith teased and irritated and drove him wild with petty torments (215). Jis buvo **laikomas pririštas grandine** užtvaroje už forto, kur Gražuolis Smitas įvairiais kankinimais erzindavo ir siutindavo jį (110).*

(4) *It was after such encounters that the dead and wounded **were carted back** to towns, and their places filled by men eager for the man-hunt (272). Po tokių susidūrimų mirusieji ir sužeistieji **būdavo vežami** į miestus, o jų vietas užimdavo kiti žmogaus medžioklės mėgėjai (164).*

These examples show that not all nouns denoting instruments in Lithuanian can form derivatives with the suffix *-uoti*, i.e. not all instruments are *susceptible to incorporation*. *The Lithuanian language does not allow the incorporation of* *kilimas – *kilimuoti*, *grandinė – *grandinuoti*, *vežimas – *vežimuoti*.

Instrument incorporation included the cases of **body parts**, i.e. body parts are used as instruments:

(5) *She **nozzled** him and caressed him and licked the cuts made in him by the weasel's teeth (153). Ji mylavo jį, glamonėjo ir laižė žebenkšties padarytas žaizdas (54).*

(8) *For that matter, life and **footing** were synonymous in this unending warfare with the pack, and none knew it better than White Fang (201). Šitoj nuolatinėj kovoje „gyvybė“ ir „**tvirtai stovėti ant žemės**“ buvo sinonimai, ir niekas to geriau nežinojo už Baltąją Iltį (98).*

(6) *“The wolf’s **nailed** somebody,” Matt said (244). – Vilkas kažką **sučiupo**, – tarė Metas (139).*

(7) *He watched them closely as they **shouldered** the luggage and were led off down the hill by Matt, who carried the bedding and the grip (248). Jis atidžiai žiūrėjo, kaip jie **susikrovė ant pečių** visus tuos ryšulius ir kaip Metas, nešdamas patalynę ir lagaminą, nuvedė juos nuo kalnelio žemyn (142).*

(8) *But while he **eyed** the approaching hand, he at the same time contrived to keep track of the club in the other hand, suspended threateningly above him (230). Tačiau, **stebėdamas** artėjančią ranką, jis tuo pat metu matė ir antroji rankoj laikomą ir grėsmingai ties juo pakibusią lazdą (125).*

As it is evident from these examples the English language demonstrates incorporation of **body parts** into the verbal entry: *foot – to foot, nail – to nail, shoulder – to shoulder, eye – to eye*. In Lithuanian the situation is different, i.e. in all these instances only semantic incorporation is observed: *stovėti ant žemės* ‘stand on the ground (on feet)’, *sučiupo* ‘grab (with nails, hands)’, *stebėdamas* ‘observe (with eyes)’. However, both languages contain a large group of verbs with incorporated body parts performing a semantic function of instrument: the noun *eyes* is incorporated in *observe, stare, see, glance, look, read, blink, wink*, the *lips* in *purse, kiss, sip, suck, whistle, smile*, the *ears* in *listen to, hear*, the *nose* in *smell, sniff, breathe*, the *mouth* in *spit, slobber*, etc. In Lithuanian the noun *eyes* is incorporated in the verbs *žiūrėti, stebėti, spoksoti, matyti*, etc; *lips* in *šypsotis, švilpti, bučiuoti, gurkšnoti, siurbčioti*, etc; *the nose* in *užuosti, uostyti, šnarpšti, šnirpšti*, etc; *the mouth* in *(nusi)spjauti, spjaudyti(s), (ap)seilėti, seilėtis*. Such cases were common in the analysed corpus:

(9) *His comrade **looked** at him curiously (101). Jo draugas smalsiai **pažvelgė į jį** (7).*

(10) *He stopped **to listen** to it, then he finished his sentence with a wave of his hand toward the sound of the cry, “– one of them?” (102). Jis nutilo, norėdamas geriau **išgirsti**, paskui, mostelėjęs ranka nuaidėjusio kaukimo link, užbaigė sakinį: – Vienas jų? (8).*

(11) *He **sucked** meditatively at his pipe for some time before he went on* (103). *Jis kurį laiką susimąstęs čiulpė savo pypkę, <...>* (8).

b) **Incorporation of nouns denoting location.** Here we can notice that the incorporation occurs in both English and Lithuanian languages:

(12) *Immediately after such fights he **had been imprisoned** again* (230). *Po tų grumtynių jį bėgint vėl įkalindavo* (125).

(13) *Grey Beaver had intended **camping** that night on the far bank of the Mackenzie, for it was in that direction that the hunting lay* (182). *Tą naktį Pilkasis Bebras ketino **stovyklauti** priešingame Makenzės krante, nes ten buvo medžioklės sritis* (80).

In English verbs incorporating nouns denoting location are homophonous or nearly homophonous with the corresponding nouns: *prison – to prison* (to put in prison), *camp – to camp* (to spend time in the camp). In Lithuanian these are suffix derivatives: *kalėjimas – įkalinti* (to put into prison), *stovykla – stovyklauti* (to spend time in camp). This type of incorporation could be regarded as multiple incorporation as prepositions are also incorporated in the meaning of the verb.

Speaking about noun incorporation it should be noted that English and Lithuanian have cases where semantic structure of verbs is different from syntactic. Česys Grenda (2001) claims that “there are verbs that are used without any objective case but actually their meaning is equal to the collocation ‘action + object’” (2001, 240). Following Grenda (2001) several groups of these verbs can be distinguished:

1. Verbs including semes ‘pick, look for + thing’: *mushroom – to mushroom*, *berry – to berry*; in Lithuanian we have *grybauti*, *uogauti*, *aviečiauti*, *žemuogiauti*, *riešutauti*, *malkauti*, etc. It should be noted that in English this pattern is observed only with nouns of generic meaning: *raspberry – *to rasperry*, *strawberry – *to strawberry* **are not possible**.

2. Verbs including semes ‘catch + thing’: *Fish – to fish*, *mouse – to mouse*; in Lithuanian: *žuvauti*, *lydekauti*, *vėžiauti*, *peliauti*, etc. However, not all names of the animals can be used to form this type of verbs in English: *pike – *to pike*, *crayfish – *to crayfish*.

3. Verbs including semes ‘produce + offspring’: *Lamp – to lamp*, *kitten – to kitten*, *to have kittens*, *foal – to foal*, *pig – to pig*; in Lithuanian: *ėriuotis*, *kačiuotis*, *kumeliuotis*, *paršiuotis*, *veršiuotis*, etc.

4. Verbs including semes 'lay, spread + substances': *silver – to silver, asphalt – to asphalt, veneer – to veneer, pitch – to pitch, varnish – to varnish, but gold – to gild; in Lithuanian: auksuoti, sidabruoti, asfaltuoti, faneruoti, derovuoti, lakuoti, moliuoti, tinkuoti, žovyruoti, žemėti, purvinti, etc.*

5. Small group of verbs with the meaning 'to spend time': *summer – to summer, winter – to winter; in Lithuanian: vakaroti, vasaroti, žiemoti, nakvoti, dienoti.*

2. Prepositions incorporated into a verbal entry. Another type of incorporation, which is closely related to noun incorporation and was observed in the corpus, is incorporation of prepositions. As it was already mentioned, prepositions can be incorporated in the meaning of the verb during the process of noun incorporation and it can be regarded as multiple incorporation.

Jeffrey Gruber (1976) proposes the idea that 'evidence for the occurrence of some sort of prelexical structure is given by certain verbs which appear to be characterizable in terms of more elementary units' (1976, 9). According to Gruber, incorporation of prepositions can be optional and obligatory. For example, incorporation of *across* is obligatory in the verb *cross*: *John crossed the bridge. *John crossed across the street.* Other verbs exhibiting obligatory preposition incorporation are *enter, leave, approach, join*. In cases of optional incorporation, verb may have a preposition either incorporated or following it. For example: *The pencil pierced the cushion. The pencil pierced through the cushion.*

In Lithuanian, the incorporation of prepositions is observed in derivatives with prefixes having action restriction meaning: *ap(i)-, at(i)-, į-, iš-, nu-, pa-, par-, per-, pra-, pri-, su-, už-*. For example, the verb *bėgti* 'run' has the meaning of directional action that can be reinforced with a preposition: *apibėgti (apie), atbėgti (nuo ko, į kur), įbėgti (į kur), išbėgti (iš kur), nubėgti (nuo kur), pabėgti (po kuo ir nuo ko), parbėgti (namo), perbėgti (per ką), prabėgti (pro ką), pribėgti (prie ko), subėgti (iš visur, su kuo), užbėgti (už ko).* Consider the following examples from the corpus:

(14) *They did not remain in one place, but travelled across country until they regained the Mackenzie River, down which they slowly went, leaving it often to hunt game along the small streams that entered it, but always returning to it again (129). Jie neužtrukdavo vienoje vietoje, o keliavo vis tolyn, kol pasiekė Makenzės upę, neskubėdami pasileido pasroviui, dažnai nuklysdami*

mažais į ją įtekančiais upeliais pasimedžioti maisto, bet visad sugrįždavo atgal prie upės (32).

(15) *He went down past the blasted pine, **crossed** the open space, and trotted in amongst the trees* (159). *Jis nusileido pro pušies stuobrį, **perbėgo per aikštelę** ir nurisnojo tarp medžių* (59).

(16) *The different lines were rapidly **approaching a point*** (116). *Skirtingi bėgančiųjų keliai greitai **artėjo į vieną tašką*** (21).

(17) *The wolves **were rushing him**, they were all about him and upon him* (121). *Vilkai **skubėjo prie jo**, apsupę ratu jau puolė* (25).

In English examples (14) and (15) present the obligatory preposition incorporation and examples (16) and (17) optional preposition incorporation. In Lithuanian the meaning of prefix derivatives is reinforced with prepositions (examples (14) and (15)); examples (16) and (17) present no preposition incorporation.

3. Adjectives incorporated into a verbal entry. The analysis of the corpus exhibited the cases of adjective incorporation in both languages. According to Ken Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, “Adjective incorporation is the process involved in the derivation of deadjectival verbs” (Hale and Keyser 2005, 8). In English such verbs are represented by zero-derivation cases, like *clear, thin, black, dim, lower, mature, narrow, pale, slow, tense, busy, tame, perfect, blind*. Another group of deadjectival verbs include such verbs, as *reddden, widen, lengthen, strengthen, tighten, darken, blacken, brighten, dampen, darken, deepen; modernize, randomize, civilize, legalize, visualize, italicize* etc. These are composite verbs, derived when the adjectival complement adjoins to the left of a verb.

In Lithuanian incorporation of adjectives is also quite productive. Verbs derived from adjectives are classified on the basis of suffixes they are formed with:

1. **-inti, -ina, -ino:** *blaiivinti, gerinti, platinti, žeminti, aukštinti*. This group is one of the most typical and productive in this verbal category.

2. **-uoti, -uoja, -avo:** *geltonuoti, ruduoti, juoduoti, žiliuoti*. These derivatives have the meaning of the presence or the sudden appearance of certain feature: *geltonuoti, mėlynuoti, žaliuoti*. The difference in meaning depends on the context, suddenness of the action, completeness of the action.

3. **-ėti, -ėja, -ėjo:** *baltėti, tamsėti, griežtėti, pilkėti*. Derivatives from gradable qualitative adjectives make the greatest part of this group.

4. **-auti, -auja, -avo**: *narsauti, puikauti, atbulauti, priešingauti, dykauti, narsauti, paikauti, rūstauti, smarkauti*.

There are some derivatives with **-oti, -enti**: *kreivoti, bjauroti; gyventi, graudenti, purenti*. (DLKG 1996, 387–393).

Qualitative adjective derivatives with **-ėti** and **-inti** make pairs of intransitive and transitive verbs: *gerėti – gerinti, saldėti – saldinti, liesėti – liesinti, storėti – storinti, tvirtėti – tvirtinti*. This is a regular derivation from adjectives with the same derivative meanings: *storėti* ‘to become thicker unconsciously’, and *storinti* ‘to make thicker’.

The corpus included instances of deadjectival verbs (adjective incorporation) of zero derivation type.

(18) *This was not Bill's way, for he was easily **angered** by sharp words* (114). *Tai Biliui nebuvo įprasta, nes paprastai kandūs žodžiai jį lengvai **supykindavo*** (19). (anger – to anger; piktas – pykinti).

(19) *There's no mistakin' it, Bill's almighty blue. I'll have **to cheer** him up tomorrow* (114). *Nėra abejonės, kad Bilis nukabino nosį. Reikės rytoj jį **pralinksminti*** (19). (cheer – to cheer; linksmas – pralinksminti).

(20) *He was confused and **blinded** by the rush of it and the beat of angry wings* (149). *Smarkus antpuolis ir aršus sparnų plakimas jį suglumino ir **apakino*** (50). (blind – to blind; aklas – apakinti).

Adjective incorporation with *-en* was also very common in the corpus:

(21) *In the fall of the year when the days **were shortening** and the bite of the frost was coming into the air, White Fang got his chance for liberty* (179). *Rudenį, kai dienos ėmė trumpėti ir pasirodė pirmosios šalnos, Baltajai Ilčiai pasitaikė proga sugrįžti į laisvę* (78).

(22) *His bondage had softened him. Irresponsibility **had weakened** him* (180). *Jo kūnas, gyvenant vergijoje, išlepo. Aprūpintas gyvenimas jį **susilpnino*** (78).

(23) *Major staggered to his feet, but the blood spouting from his throat **reddened** the snow in a widening path* (231). *Majoras soyruodamas šiaip taip dar pakilo, bet plūstąs iš jo gerklės kraujas platėjančia juosta **nudazė** sniegą* (126).

The last example presents adjective incorporation only in English: *red – to redden*. In Lithuanian the colour is incorporated in the meaning of *kraujas* ‘blood’ as this is the usual colour of blood, though incorporated

structures *raudonuoti* (intransitive) or *raudoninti* (transitive) would be possible as well.

Conclusions

1. Noun incorporation included incorporation of instrument, body parts, and location. In English, incorporation of instrument was realised by means of conversion (*hammer – to hammer, brush – to brush, rake – to rake*). In Lithuanian it was realised employing the suffix **-uoti**: *burės – buruoti* ‘sail – to sail’, *irklas – irkluoti* ‘paddle – to paddle’, *skaptas – skaptuoti* ‘gouge – to gouge’, *meškerė – meškerioti* ‘rod – to fish’. Body parts were also incorporated into the verb: *foot – to foot, nail – to nail, shoulder – to shoulder, eye – to eye*. In Lithuanian in such cases only semantic incorporation was observed: *stovėti ant žemės* ‘stand on the ground (on feet)’, *sučiupo* ‘grab (with nails, hands)’, *stebėdamas* ‘observe (with eyes)’. Incorporation of location is common in both languages: in English the form of such verbs coincided with the parent noun: *prison – to prison* (to put in prison), *camp – to camp* (to spend time in the camp), in Lithuanian these were suffix derivatives: *kalėjimas – įkalinti, stovykla – stovyklauti*.

2. Preposition incorporation in English may be obligatory (*John crossed the bridge. *John crossed across the street.*) or optional (*The pencil pierced the cushion. The pencil pierced through the cushion.*). In Lithuanian, preposition incorporation was realized by derivational prefixes: *ap(i)-, at(i)-, į-, iš-, nu-, pa-, par-, per-, pra-, pri-, su-, už-*. The meaning of verbs can be reinforced with preposition: *apibėgti (apie), atbėgti (nuo ko, į kur), įbėgti (į kur), išbėgti (iš kur), nubėgti (nuo kur), pabėgti (po kuo ir nuo ko), parbėgti (namo), perbėgti (per ką), prabėgti (pro ką), pribėgti (prie ko), subėgti (iš visur, su kuo), užbėgti (už ko)*.

3. Adjectives in English were incorporated employing zero derivation or conversion (*clear – to clear, thin – to thin, black – to black*) and the suffix **-en** (*red – to redden, dark – to darken, bright – to brighten*). In Lithuanian adjective incorporation is very productive and was realised employing suffixes: **-inti**, (*blaivinti, gerinti, platinti*), **-uoti** (*geltonuoti, ruduoti, juoduoti*), **-ėti** (*baltėti, tamsėti, griežtėti*), **-auti** (*narsauti, puikauti, atbulauti*).

References

- Baker 1988 – Mark Baker. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Baker 1996 – Mark Baker. *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker 2004 – Mark Baker, Roberto Aranovich, Lucia Golluscio. Two Types of Syntactic Noun Incorporation: Noun incorporation in Mapudungun and its typological implications. *Language* 81, 138–177.
- Catford 1965 – John Catford. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky 1970 – Noam Chomsky. Remarks on nominalization. *Readings in English transformational grammar*. 184–221.
- DLKG – *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika*. Red. V. Ambrazas. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1996.
- Farkas, Swart 2004 – Donka Farkas and Henriette de Swart. Incorporation, Plurality, and the Incorporation of Plurals: a dynamic approach. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 3, 45–73. www.let.uu.nl/~Henriette.deSwart/personal.
- Fisiak 1981 – Jacek Fisiak. *Language and Languages; Contrastive Linguistics; Study and Teaching*. Oxford and New York: Pergamon.
- Gast 2011 – Volker Gast. *Contrastive Linguistics: Theories and Methods*. www.un-jena.de.
- Geenhoven 1998 – Veerle van Geenhoven. *Semantic Incorporation and Indefinite Expressions*. Stanford, CSLI Publications.
- Grenda 2001 – Česys Grenda. *Veiksmazodžio semantika ir žodžių junginio struktūra*. Rinktiniai kalbotyros straipsniai. Šiauliai: Šiaulių universiteto leidykla.
- Gruber 1976 – Jeffrey Gruber, J. (1976). *Lexical Structures in Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Halle 1973 – Morris Halle. Prolegomena to a Theory of Word Formation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 3–16.
- Hale, Keyser 2005 – Ken Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser. Aspect and the Syntax of Argument Structure. N. Erteschik-Shir, T. R. Rapoport (eds.). *The Syntax of Aspect-Deriving Thematic and Aspectual Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sapir 1911 – Edward Sapir. The Problem of Noun Incorporation in American Languages. *American Anthropologist* 13, 250–82.
- Scalise, Guevara 2005 – Sergio Scalise, Emiliano Guevara. The Lexicalist Approach to Word-Formation and the Notion of Lexicon. P. Štekauer and R. Lieber (eds.). *Handbook of Word-Formation*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 147–187.
- Whorf 1941 – Benjamin Lee Whorf. Language and Logic. J. B. Carrol (ed.). *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 233–245.

Sources

- London 1971 – Jack London. *The Call of the Wild. White Fang*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Londonas 1977 – Džekas Londonas. *Baltoji Iltis*. Vilnius: Vaga.

Dalė Roikienė

ANGLŲ IR LIETUVIŲ KALBŲ INKORPORACIJOS GRETINAMOJI ANALIZĖ

Santrauka

Straipsnio tikslas – trumpai pristatyti inkorporacijos reiškinį ir sugretinti inkorporacijos atvejus anglų ir lietuvių kalbose. Analizė paremta Džeko Londono romano „Baltoji Iltis“ ir jo vertimo į lietuvių kalbą medžiaga. Straipsnyje gretinami daiktavardžių, prielinksnių ir būdvardžių inkorporacijos atvejai.

Inkorporaciją galima nagrinėti sintaksiniu, leksiniu ir semantiniu aspektais. Sintaksinis aspektas buvo pristatytas Marko Bakerio darbuose (1988, 1996). Jis teigia, kad inkorporacija – sintaksinis procesas, kurio metu veiksmožodžio argumentas prisijungia prie veiksmožodžio palikdamas savo A-poziciją. Leksinį inkorporacijos aspektą, kai inkorporacija suprantama kaip žodžių darybos tipas, nagrinėjo Noamas Chomskis (1970) ir Morrisas Halle (1973). Inkorporaciją galima nagrinėti ir kaip semantinį reiškinį. Remdamasi vakarų grenlandų kalbos daiktavardžius inkorporuojančiais veiksmožodžiais Veerle van Geenhoven (1998) išplėtojo semantinės inkorporacijos teoriją.

Straipsnis nagrinėja inkorporaciją kaip leksinį reiškinį. Korpuso analizė leido išskirti daiktavardžių, prielinksnių, būdvardžių inkorporacijos atvejus. Daiktavardžių inkorporaciją dar galima suskirstyti į instrumento, kūno dalių, vietos inkorporaciją. Anglų kalboje instrumento inkorporacija realizuojama konversijos būdu, t. y. be jokių formos pakitimų (*hammer – to hammer, brush – to brush, rake – to rake*). Lietuvių kalboje instrumento inkorporacija realizuojama priesaga **-uoti**: *burės – buriuoti* ‘sail – to sail’, *irklas – irkluoti* ‘paddle – to paddle’, *skaptas – skaptuoti* ‘gouge – to gouge’, *meškerė – meškerioti* ‘rod – to fish’. Kūno dalys taip pat gali būti inkorporuojamos į veiksmožodį: *foot – to foot, nail – to nail, shoulder – to shoulder, eye – to eye*. Lietuvių kalboje tokiais atvejais turime tik semantinę inkorporaciją: *stovėti ant žemės* ‘stand on the ground (on feet)’, *sučiupo* ‘grab (with nails, hands)’, *stebėdamas* ‘observe (with eyes)’. Vietos daiktavardžių inkorporacija būdinga abiem kalboms: anglų kalboje tokių veiksmožodžių forma sutampa su pamatiniu daiktavardžiu: *prison – to prison* (to put in

prison), *camp – to camp* (to spend time in the camp), lietuvių kalboje tai yra priesagų vediniai: *kalėjimas – įkalinti, stovykla – stovyklauti*.

Prielinksniai taip pat gali būti inkorporuoti į veiksmažodį. Anglų kalboje prielinksnių inkorporacija gali būti privaloma (*John crossed the bridge. *John crossed across the street.*) arba fakultatyvi (*The pencil pierced the cushion. The pencil pierced through the cushion.*). Lietuvių kalboje prielinksnių inkorporacija pastebima priešdėlių, turinčių veiksmo ribojimo galią, vediniuose: *ap(i)-, at(i)-, į-, iš-, nu-, pa-, par-, per-, pra-, pri-, su-, už-*. Veiksmažodžio reikšmę dar gali rodyti ir prielinksnis: *apibėgti (apie), atbėgti (nuo ko, į kur), įbėgti (į kur), išbėgti (iš kur), nubėgti (nuo kur), pabėgti (po kuo ir nuo ko), parbėgti (namo), perbėgti (per ką), prabėgti (pro ką), pribėgti (prie ko), subėgti (iš visur, su kuo), užbėgti (už ko)*.

Būdvardžiai anglų kalboje inkorporuojami pasitelkiant nulinę derivaciją (*clear – to clear, thin – to thin, black – to black*) arba priesagą **-en** (*red – to redden, dark – to darken, bright – to brighten*). Lietuvių kalboje būdvardžių inkorporacija labai produktyvi ir realizuojama pasitelkiant priesagas: **-inti** (*blaiivinti, gerinti, platinti*), **-uoti** (*geltonuoti, ruduoti, juoduoti*), **-ėti** (*baltėti, tamsėti, griežtėti*), **-auti** (*narsauti, puikauti, atbulauti*).

Apibendrinant galima teigti, kad anglų ir lietuvių kalboms būdinga inkorporacija, tik ji realizuojama pasitelkiant šioms kalboms būdingas priemones.