NOMINALISING TRANSFORMATIONS OF PREDICATE NOMINAL CONSTRUCTIONS IN LITHUANIAN AND ENGLISH

L. VALEIKA, A. MEŠKAUSKAS

0. Introductory

As is generally known, transformational properties of a kernel sentence depend to a great measure on its semantic and structural peculiarities. This suggests that any discussion of nominalising transformations of kernel sentences should be anticipated by a discussion of the semantic and structural properties of the source constructions. As the latter question has been dealt with[1], this paper presents by itself a continuation of the analysis initiated in the article, mentioned below.

By way of summary let us briefly state the main findings of our inquiry. As was shown in the paper, predicate nominal kernels may be simple and expanded. E. g. 1. *Šuo yra žinduolis: The dog is a mammal*; 2. *Jis yra geras žmogus: He is a kind man.* 3. *Jis yra svarbus asmuo: He is a person of consequence*; 4. *Jis yra abejingas man: He is indifferent to me.* Some such kernels contain predicatives with obligatory determiners (see sample sentences 2, 3 and 4, respectively). It is important as well as interesting to observe that determiners which are indispensable in a kernel sentence may be easily omitted in respective nominalisations. E. g. *Jis yra svarbus asmuo: He is a person of consequence → jo asmenybė: his personality.* The inconsistency is only seeming and it generally appears when similar nominalisations are viewed without reference to the underlying construction or the context. Nominalisations such as *Jo asmenybė: His personality* are usually preceded by antecedent sentences or are determined by general speech situation. From this it follows that the complexity of an underlying structure does not necessarily imply the complexity of the corresponding nominalisation. From the semantic viewpoint all predicate nominal contructions were subdivided into essive, translative, and locative. By essive constructions we mean structures of permanent state (e. g. *Šuo yra žinduolis: The dog is a mammal*); by translatives — structures of transitory state (e. g. *Jis yra mokytojas: He is a teacher*); and by locatives — structures expressing the agent's location (e. g. *Marytė yra Vilniuje: Mary is in Vilnius*).

1.0. Constructions Deriving from N+būti : be+N Kernels
1.1. Nominalising Transformations of Essive Kernels

As regards linguistic information, constructions deriving from essive kernels are outdone by other types of nominalisations: owing to its semantic and structural properties, the type of nominalisation is generally of minimal syntactic

[1] L. Valeika, A Few Observations on the Structure and Semantics of Predicate Nominal Constructions in Lithuanian and English, — Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai. XIV, 1972.

length[2]; on the other hand, not all of the kernels are endowed with the same potentialities. Thus the so-called generic kernels in Lithuanian can produce only nominalisations with the verbal noun as head: *Šuo yra žinduolis → šuns buvimas žinduoliu*. In English, the kind of nominalisation is not met with: to be so nominalised, the kernel must have the feature 'determined', i. e. 'definite' or 'indefinite'. E. g. *It (this creature) is a mammal → its being a mammal.*

As for non-generic essive kernels, they produce constructions of two kinds: constructions with the link-verb nominalised and constructions with the predicative nominalised. E.g.

A. *Jis yra Anglijos pilietis → jo buvimas Anglijos piliečiu*
   He is British citizen → his being a British citizen
B. *Jis yra svarbus asmuo → jo (svarbi) asmenybė*
   He is a person of consequence → his personality
C. *Mes esame žmonės → žmonija*
   We are men → mankind
   Jie yra vyrai → vyrija
   They are men → mankind

As can be seen, the nominalisations are not homogeneous: nominalisations in column A are used with their subjective determiners and nominalisations in column B have no subjective determiners. The reason for this should be sought in the semantics of the nominalisations: unlike nominalisations in A, nominalisations in B incorporate subjective determiners in their semantic structure[3]. In view of this, constructions in A and those in B could be referred to as analytic and syntactic, respectively.

1.2. Nominalising Transformations of Translative Kernels

In the paper cited on page 37 translative kernels were delimited by generative analysis. Apart from a generative analysis, translative kernels can be distinguished on a surface level as well.

As already suggested, translative kernels are secondary, i. e. they describe states newly acquired by the agent. Essive kernels refer to the agent's natural state (e. g. *Žmogus yra žinduolis : Man is a mammal*). In view of this, the former kernels can be characterized as dynamic and the latter as statatives proper. One of the criteria that help to distinguish translatives from essives is the so-called imperative test: *Žmogus yra žinduolis → būk žinduoliu* (essive): *Man is a mammal +→ be a mammal*

---

[2] By syntactic length we mean the number of kernel sentences involved in the derivation of a construction.

[3] See В. В. Гуревич, Соотношение синтаксических и семантических признаков в производных словах, — Синтаксические исследования по английскому языку, т. 416, Москва, 1971, p. 88.

(essive). But: *Jis yra mokytojas → būk mokytoju* (translative); *He is a teacher → be a teacher* (translative).

It should be observed, however, that some such constructions may be homonymous, e. g. *Jis yra anglas* : *He is an Englishman*. The constructions may function both as essives and as translatives. Thus if we mean that person in question comes from England, i.e. if we mean his nationality, the phrase will be treated as essive, but if we mean to say that he behaves the way the English do, the phrase will be conceived as a translative one.

From the semantic point of view it is interesting to note a certain parallelism between adjective predicative constructions and translative constructions. The statement can be easily verified by a simple transformation of translative constructions into the corresponding adjective predicative constructions: *Jis yra vyras → jis yra vyriškas*; *He is a man → he is manly.*

This is to be expected since the semantic structure of translative constructions contains two components, viz. "passing into a definite state and acting accordingly". Therefore the transformation of the predicative-noun sentence into a respective predicative-adjective sentence may be regarded as a reliable criterion for the distinction of essive and translative constructions. As a third criterion, we might mention the determination of the predicative noun by the adjective *tikras* and the adverb *quite*:

> *Jis yra tikras vyras* : *He is quite a man*
> *Jis yra tikras idiotas* : *He is quite an idiot*

From the semantic point of view, translative kernels subdivide into two groups:

a) qualitative, e. g. *Jis yra didvyris   He is a hero → Jis yra didvyriškas* : *He is heroic.*

b) non-qualitative, e.g. *Jis yra mokytojas* : *He is a teacher*

As already seen, qualitative translatives are constructions with the agent's attributive characteristics emphasized (e. g. *He is a man*, i. e. he has the strong qualities of a man). Non-qualitative translatives refer to the agent's state without emphasis on its qualitative aspects, as in *He is a teacher*, i. e. his profession is teaching.

1.2.1. Nominalising Transformations of Qualitative Translatives

The vast majority of qualitative translatives yield nominalisations in *-umas* in Lithuanian and *-ness, -ism* in English:

> *Jis yra vyras → jis yra vyriškas → jo vyriškumas*
> *He is a man → he is manly → his manliness*
> *Jis yra didvyris → jis yra didvyriškas → jo didvyriškumas*
> *He is a hero → he is heroic → his heroism*

Jis yra (geras) draugas → jis yra draugiškas → jo draugiškumas
He is a friend → he is friendly → his friendliness
Jis yra vaikas → jis yra vaikiškas → jo vaikiškumas
He is a child → he is childish → his childishness

As regards the productivity of translative kernels, the two languages are not on a par — in Lithuanian practically every translative kernel can yield the type of nominalisation; in English, the derivation of the nominalisations is restricted. This is due to the fact that English is characterized by the poverty of denominal adjective deriving suffixes. This is a great stumbling block, since the nominalising transformations apply only to qualitatives whose predicatives derive respective adjectives.

1.2.2. Nominalising Transformations of Non-qualitative Translatives

In Lithuanian and English non-qualitative translatives are rather productive. In Lithuanian, non-qualitative translatives derive nominalisations in *-ystė, -ybė, -ija, -ūra*:

Jis yra profesorius → (jo) profesūra
Jis yra vyskupas → jo vyskupystė
Jis yra mokytojas → jo mokytojystė
Jis yra advokatas → jo advokatystė, jo advokatybė
Jis yra našlys → jo našlystė
Jis yra kandidatas (į parlamentą) → jo kandidatūra (į parlamentą)
Jis yra diktatorius → jo diktatūra
Jis yra tėvas → jo tėvystė
Ji yra motina → jos motinystė
Ji yra mergina → jos mergystė

In English, the type of kernels yield nominalisations in *-hood, -ship, -ture, -ry, -cy, -age*:

He is a pupil → his pupilhood
He is a father → his fatherhood
He is a professor → his professorship
He is a candidate (to Parliament) → his candidature (to Parliament)
He is a captain → his captaincy
He is a dentist → his dentistry
They are readers → readerage[4]
They are teachers → teacherage

---

[4] On the use of the suffix *-age*, see Hans Marchand, The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation, München, 1969, p. 234.

2.0. Constructions Deriving from N + būti : be + Adjective Kernels

2.1. General Observations

In Lithuanian N + būti + Adjective kernels produce nominalisations in *-umas,* *-ybė, -ystė, -enybė, -atvė, -astas, -ata, -(i)ava, -uma, -ūra*[5]. The most productive are derivations in *-umas*. These well compare to verbal nominalisations in *-imas(-ymas)*.

In English, the kernels yield nominalisations in *-ness, -ance, -ence (-ancy, -ency),* *-cy, -ty (-ity), -icity, -dom, -th,* the most productive being derivations in *-ness*. These may be compared to verbal derivations in *-ing*. English, unsimilar to Lithuanian, produces some deadjectival nouns by conversion (zero-affixation):

The earth and sky were grey → the grey of the earth and sky
Your hair is golden red → the golden red of your hair
Your eyes are blue → the blue of your eyes

It must be noted, however, that the number of such derivations is not large. Conversion appears to be much more wide-spread among the verbs. This can be accounted for by the relatively larger number of deadjectival noun-deriving suffixes as compared to verbal noun-deriving suffixes.

Not all suffixes enjoy the same productiveness. As already mentioned, in Lithuanian the suffix characterized by the highest productiveness is *-umas*; its English counterpart is *-ness*. Comparing samples in *-umas* and *-ness*, we find that the Lithuanian suffix is more productive: if *-umas* can be tacked on to any descriptive adjective[6], *-ness* shows certain restrictions. The restrictions exist in so far as adjectives in *-ate, -ant, -ent* chiefly derive nouns in *-acy, -ancy, -ency*, those in *-al, -ial,* *-an, -ian, -ar, -able* derive nouns in *-ity*; adjectives in *-able, -ible, -ic* derive deadjectival nouns in *-ity*[7].

In examining the nominalisations of N + būti: be + Adjective kernels, we observe that some nominalisations are constructions in the proper sense of the word, while others present only one word, i.e. a nominalised predicative (e.g. *gerumas : kindness; tingumas : laziness*). According to the principle of valency correspondence we should expect a s u b j e c t i v e   d e t e r m i n e r   +   d e a d j e c t i v a l   n o u n   p h r a s e : *Žmogus yra geras → žmogaus gerumas; The man is kind → the man's kindness.* In this respect deadjectival nouns are similar to nouns derived from intransitive verbs : *Kalba — sidabras, tyla — auksas: Speech is silver, silence is gold.* Yet, cases when deverbal nouns are used without subjective determiners (i.e. absolutely) must be rare: the vast majority of verbal nouns are characterized by their inability to stand

---

[5] See Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, I, Vilnius, 1965, p. 306—316.

[6] See Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, I, p. 306.

[7] See Hans Marchand, op. cit., p. 335.

alone as subject or object of verbs which normally take N abstract subjects. This is to say that deadjectival nouns are much more independent in the sentence. The reason for this should be sought in the semantics of deadjectival and deverbal nouns: nouns derived from adjectives are more abstract in meaning than their counterparts derived from intransitive verbs. They are sometimes referred to as abstract nouns proper. Abstractedness is like generality. Sentences auch as *Cruelty frightens John* or *Sincerity frightens John* are used in the same way as *The dog is a mammal*. Deverbal nouns which are less abstract in meaning generally require subjective or objective determiners: **Behaviour frightens John*; **The use frightens John*. This is otherwise expressed by saying that deadjectival nouns exhibit greater readiness to generalize than deverbal nouns. All this shows that deadjectival nouns are more noun-like than deverbal ones.

The fact that deadjectival nouns can be used without their subjective determiners is a specific feature that should not be overestimated. Their independence is only seeming, as in point of fact they are determined. Substantivized quality cannot be conceived without the bearer of the quality, i.e. on a deep structure level the subjective determiner is obligatory. It is only on a surface structure level that it is supressed. The absence of such a determiner is conditioned by stylistic purposes and may be compared to the use of passive sentences like *Angliškai yra kalbama daugelyje šalių* : *English is spoken in many countries*, where the object (i. e. the agent) is omitted. When required, subjective determiners can be easily restored: *Žmonių nuoširdumas baugina jį*: *People's sincerity frightens him*. Quite frequently subjective determiners are substituted for by other determiners[8]. Thus, for example, the subjective determiner in *Vaikų nuoširdumas mane žavi* : *The children's sincerity charms me* can be replaced by definite determiners *šis, toks* : *this, such*. E. g. *Šis (toks) nuoširdumas žavi mane This (such) sincerity charms me*.

2.2. Nominalising Transformations of Kernel Sentences with Preposed Predicative Determiners

As already mentioned, kernels of the N+būti : be type may be simple and expanded. Some expanded kernels can do without their predicative determiners, while others — cannot. To put it otherwise, some kernels present structurally complete utterances by themselves, i.e. without additional elements, while others must incorporate additional words, without which the kernel could not function as a structurally complete utterance. To cite but a few examples:

A. *Mūsų balos pilnos akivarų*
   The man is full of new ideas

---

[8] On the term determiners, see L. Valeika, Some Functional Aspects of Noun Modifiers in Lithuanian and English, — Kalbotyra, XXIII (3), 1972, p. 81—92.

B. *Mūsų šalis yra turtinga naftos*
   Our country is rich in oil

As can be seen from the examples, the predicative determiners *akivarų   ideas* cannot be deleted without destroying the utterances. Such determiners will be called non-omissible determiners. The other determiners *naftos : oil*, can be deleted without any substantial damage to the utterances. These determiners are best called omissible determiners. Structural completeness should not be confused with the definiteness of a construction. The utterances as given in B, although being structurally complete, are indefinite when deprived of their determiners. Such constructions are pretty general, as the concept of *turtingumas : richness* covers a wide range of items, one of which is *nafta : oil*. The relationship between this concept and the items the concept is built on might be likened to the relationship as existing between *langue* and *parole*. The syntactic importance of all this lies in the fact that utterances with the predicative used in a general sense contain no determiners, while those with a predicative used in a specific sense, contain obligatory determiners. In a syntactic dictionary (if such a dictionary were ever compiled) we should have to make two entries – *turtingas$_1$: rich$_1$* and *turtingas$_2$ rich$_2$*. It should be stressed that Lithuanian and English have comparatively few kernels with non-omissible postposed predicative determiners.

Typical preposed determiners of the predicative (and, of course, attributive) adjective are adverbs of degree and quality. As is generally known, some adverbs of degree are derivationally related to adjectives, e. g. *slight → slightly*; *increasing → increasingly*. The relationship may be synchronic and diachronic. One should expect then that, to be nominalised, the adverb of degree must have a corresponding adjective: *The task is extremely difficult → the extreme difficulty of the task.*

Adverbs of degree which are derivationally related to other parts of speech or those whose relationship is only diachronic cannot be thus nominalised. E. g. *The cask is almost empty +→* the almost emptiness of the cask*; *He is nearly ready +→*his near readiness*; *He is hardly clever → his hard cleverness*; *He is fairly clever +→* his fair cleverness.*

As the main requirement of a transformational procedure is meaning invariance, some such kernels can be transformed so provided there is an adjective having the same meaning, e.g. *He is very stupid → his great stupidity*; *Jis yra laba kvailas → jo didelis kvailumas*. It would be hard to say at present which language is less anomalous in this respect. The whole question needs probing into. We can only make the following assumption: owing to the more regular character of Lithuanian morphology, suppletive forms should be less common here.

Adverbs of quality do not pose similar problems. The vast majority of the adverbs are derivationally related to adjectives. There is only one difficulty concern-

ing quality adverbs, viz. their differentiation from adverbs of degree. In delimiting adverbs of quality , we follow structuralists who define adverbs of quality on transformational grounds: adverbs of degree permit transformations like *its unusually complex look → its complexity is unusual.* Adverbs of quality admit of the following transformations: *He is politically blind → politically he is blind: he is blind politically.* An adverb qualifies as an adverb of quality if it satisfies only one of these criteria.

As adverbs of quality are transformationally related to adjectives, the resultant deadjectival noun will be preceded by the corresponding adjective, e.g.

1. a) *Mūsų visuomenė yra m o r a l i š k a i sveika → mūsų visuomenės m o r a - l i š k a s sveikatingumas*
   b) *Jis yra i d i o t i š k a i senamadiškas → jo i d i o t i š k a s senamadiškumas*
2. a) *The phrase is s e m a n t i c a l l y indivisible → the s e m a n t i c indivisibility of the phrase*
   b) *He is p o l i t i c a l l y wise → his p o l i t i c a l wisdom*

It should be observed, however, that not all nominalisations can be analysed in the above way: some nominalisations, especially those containing participles as head determiners, are better analysed as deriving from two kernels. E. g.

1. a) *Artėjanti įšėlusios gamtos rūstybė → įšėlusi gamta yra rūsti (įšėlusios gamtos rūstybė) × įšėlusios gamtos rūstybė artėja*
   b) *Smilkalais kvepianti bažnyčios vėsa → bažnyčia yra vėsi (bažnyčios vėsa) × bažnyčios vėsa kvepia smilkalais*
   c) *Seniai bepatirtas žmonos švelnumas ← žmona yra švelni (žmonos švelnumas) × X seniai bepatyrė žmonos švelnumą*
2. a) *The growing militancy of the movement ← the movement is militant (the militancy of the movement) × the militancy of the movement is growing*
   b) *Her well-known kind-heartedness ← she is kind-hearted (her kind-heartedness) × X well knows her kind-heartedness*
   c) *His strange political wisdom ← he is politically wise (his political wisdom) × his political wisdom is strange*

2.3. Nominalising Transformations of Kernel Sentences with Postposed Predicative Determiners

Kernels with postposed predicative determiners conveniently divide into four groups:

   a) subjective (e. g. *Jis nėra populiarus kaip rašytojas*[9]: *He is not popular as a writer*).

---

[9] The more usual variant would be *Kaip rašytojas jis nėra populiarus.* For the convenience of analysis we prefer a linear arrangement of the constituents.

b) objective (e.g. *Jis yra geras man   He is kind to me*)

c) causal (e. g. *Jo akys yra raudonos nuo dulkių : His eyes are red with dust*)

d) adverbial (e. g. *Amerikiečiai yra žiaurūs Vietname : Americans are cruel in Vietnam*)[10]

Let us first consider kernels with non-omissible postposed determiners. The characteristic feature of them is the fact that, unlike kernels with non-omissible preposed determiners, the nominalisations invariably incorporate the determiners. E. g. *Jis yra reikalingas pagalbos → pagalbos reikalingumas; He is fond of her → his fondness for her*. Another characteristic peculiar to the kernels is their comparative conservatism: although in principle they can yield the nominalisations, practically, however, the number of such nominalisations is limited. This is expecially true of Lithuanian, where the use of constructions containing abstract nouns is not very common. And to make the last point, kernels with non-omissible postposed determiners and their nominalisations are comparable to kernels with two-valent verbs and their nominalisations (i.e. adjective constructions). E.g.

1. a) *Jis yra reikalingas pagalbos → pagalbos reikalingumas*
   b) *Jis rašo laišką → laiško rašymas*

2. a) *He is aware of the gravity of the situation → his awareness of the gravity of the situation*
   b) *He writes a letter → his writing of the letter*

Most kernels with a predicative adjective contain optional postposed determiners. As such kernels include true adjectives (i.e. adjectives which can be used both predicatively and attributively), their nominalisations present more or less regular formations. As regards the composition of such nominalisations, they may be two-word or three-word constructions. This is to say that the optional determiners of the predicatives may be included at will. E. g.

1. a) *Jis yra aplaidus tarnybinėse pareigose → jo aplaidumas (tarnybinėse pareigose)*
   b) *Amerikiečiai žiaurūs Vietname → amerikiečių žiaurumas (Vietname)*
   c) *Jis yra atviras man → jo atvirumas (man)*
   d) *Jis yra ištikimas pašaukimui → jo ištikimybė / ištikimumas (savo pašaukimui)*

---

[10] For a fuller treatment of the predicative adjective constructions in English, see Г. М. Никитина, Опыт сопоставительного изучения адъективных словосочетаний, — Ученые записки, Вопросы романо-германской филологии, том 54, Москва, 1970, p. 216.

e) *Šis augalas yra atsparus šalčiams → šio augalo atsparumas (šalčiams)*

f) *Lietuvių kalba yra artima indoeuropiečių prokalbei → lietuvių kalbos artimumas indoeuropiečių prokalbei*

2. a) *He is great as a man of science → his greatness (as a man of science)*

b) *She is as quick as a bird → her (bird-like) quickness*

c) *He is wealthy at present → his (present) wealth*

d) *The police were brutal to black people in Notting Hill → the police brutality (to black people in Notting Hill)*

e) *He is fit for military service → his fitness for military service*

f) *He is dependent on her → his dependence on her*

g) *The Home Secretary is responsible for the well-being of every citizen → the Home Secretary's responsibility for the well-being of every citizen*

Our analysis would suggest that any sentence containing a predicative adjective can be so nominalised. On closer examination, however, we find that in reality this is not so. To be nominalised, the kernel must contain a non-temporal adjective.

Cf. 1. a) *Berniukas yra geras → berniuko gerumas*

b) *Berniukui (yra) gera ↮*

2. a) *The boy is lively → the liveliness of the boy*

b) *The boy is alive ↮*

So far we have been concerned with nominal predicative post-determiners expressed by nouns and adjectives. Lithuanian and English dispose of kernels with obligatory post-determiners expressed by the finitive. E. g. *Jonui lengva įtikti John is easy to please.*

It will be clear that such kernels cannot undergo the transformation. In explaining the impossibility of **John's easiness to please*, N. Chomsky refers to the productiveness of respective derived nominals (*easiness, difficulty, certainty, likelihood*). Indeed, as compared to other types of nominalisations, these nominalisations are less productive. Practically they are restricted to the denotation of physical and mental states or (in the cases of *certainty* or *likelihood*) to qualities of events (*certainty* of an event, not of John, etc.). Another explanation of this has been presented by Ivan Poldauf[11]. According to the scholar, the sentences *John is easy to please* and *John is difficult to please* are transforms of simpler sentences, i.e. they are not deep sentences. The underlying structures of the above sentences must be *To please John is easy* and *To please John is difficult*, respectively. Being derivatives, the sentences cannot serve as a basis for the transformation **John's easiness to*

---

[11] I. Poldauf, Semantics, Lexicology and Generative Grammar, — Philologica Pragensia, 1(1970), p. 69.

46

please. In other words, there is no discernible semantic connection between *John is easy to please* and *John's easiness as*, for instance, between *The easiness (ease) of pleasing John*. Accepting this view, we can understand why *John's eagerness (reluctance) to please* is an acceptable phrase. As regards Lithuanian, the impossibility of the nominalisation **Jono sunkumas įtikti* may be explained in terms of the general restrictions imposed on 'neuter' adjectives.

The last point to be discussed here is the arrangement of the constituents within the nominalisations. When nominalised, the constituents of the kernels may be used in pre-head and post-head position. The statement concerns both Lithuanian and English. Consider a few examples:

Jis yra populiarus tarp studentų → jo populiarumas tarp studentų; jo studentiškas populiarumas

He is popular with the students → his popularity with the students; his student popularity

Yet, this is a rather general approach. A more detailed analysis would reveal that not all nominalisations behave so. For instance, kernels, containing objective determiners are invariably nominalised into constructions with postposed determiners. This is to say that the word-order in the kernel sentence and the order of the constituents in the corresponding nominalisation is the same, e.g. *Jis yra geras man → jo gerumas man : He is kind to me → his kindness to me.*

2.4. Synonymy of Deadjectival Noun Constructions

In Lithuanian, and, to a lesser degree, in English, kernels with predicative adjective can derive more than one construction with the head-noun expressed by a deadjectival noun: *Mergina yra graži → merginos gražumas; merginos grožis; merginos grožybė; He is safe → his safeness; his safety.*

In Lithuanian, synonymous constructions include the following pairs:

1. Constructions with the head-noun formed by the suffixes *-umas* and *-is*, *-a*, e. g. *Mergina yra graži → merginos gražumas, merginos grožis; Bėgikas yra greitas → bėgiko greitumas, bėgiko greitis; Karys yra drąsus → kario drąsumas, kario drąsa*

2. Constructions with the head-noun formed by the suffixes *-umas* and *-ovė*, e.g. *Vaikinas yra doras → vaikino dorumas, vaikino dorovė; Daiktai yra įvairūs → daiktų įvairumas, daiktų įvairovė*

3. Constructions with the head-noun formed by the suffixes *-umas* and *-ybė*, e.g. *Obuolys yra aitrus → obuolio aitrumas, obuolio aitrybė; Šuo yra piktas → šuns piktumas, šuns piktybė*

In English, we can establish three classes of synonymous constructions as well:

1. Constructions with the head-noun formed by the suffixes *-ness* and *-(e) ty*,
   e.g. *The situation is clear* → *the clearness of the situation; the clarity of the situation*
   He is safe → *his safeness; his safety*
   The case is fatal → *the fatalness of the case; the fatality of the case*
   The girl is sincere → *the sincereness of the girl; the sincerity of the girl*

2. Constructions with the head-noun formed by the suffixes *-ness* and *-hood*,
   e.g. *The statement is false* → *the falseness of the statement; the falsehood of the stamement*

3. Constructions with the head-noun formed by the suffixes *-ableness* and *-ability*, e.g. *John is suitable for the job* → *the suitableness of John for the job; the suitability of John for the job*
   He is agreeable → *his agreeableness; his agreeability*
   He is honourable → *his honourableness; his honourability*

As regards the suffix *-ability*, it is today practically restricted to the formation of nouns from deverbal adjectives with a passive meaning; for others the corresponding noun is in *-ableness*[12]. This suggests that practically we have very few synonymous constructions derived from kernels with a predicative adjective in *-able*. According to Hans Marchand, the noun in *-ableness* is the regular one, while the noun in *-ability* is rare and less common. But the following pairs seem to be equally common: *amiableness : amiability; amicableness : amicability*[13].

As can be seen from the examples, synonymous pairs in Lithuanian and English are built on the suffixes *-umas* and *-ness* respectively. These are the basic or primary suffixes. Nouns built on the suffixes are the most abstract in meaning, whereas nouns built on the other suffixes are less abstract. In other words, the link between nouns in *-umas, -ness* and the predicative adjective is more direct, than the link between nouns in the other suffixes and the predicative adjectives. This suggests that from a generative point of view, derivations of the two types should be given two descriptions.

As compared to English, synonymous derivations in Lithuanian are more varied both structurally and semantically (e.g. *drąsumas : drąsa; gražumas : grožis : grožybė*). In English, synonymous constructions are less common. This does not mean, however, that in this respect English is a less valuable tool of communi-

---

[12] See Hans Marchand, op. cit., p. 313—314.
[13] Ibid., p. 314.

cation. It only goes to say that English, as compared to Lithuanian, is a more homonymous language: if in Lithuanian we have two distinct constructions for two distinct meanings, in English we have one construction for two meanings.

Vilniaus V. Kapsuko universitetas
  Anglų filologijos katedra
Vilniaus Valstybinis pedagoginis
     institutas
  Anglų kalbos katedra

SAKINIŲ SU PREDIKATINIU DAIKTAVARDŽIU IR BŪDVARDŽIU NOMINALIZACIJA

Reziumė

Pagal generacinį metodą visi sakiniai kalboje skirstomi į branduolinius ir jų transformas. Transformomis gali būti tiek sakiniai, tiek ir žodžių junginiai. Straipsnyje bandoma aprašyti ryšį tarp branduolinio sakinio ir žodžių junginio.

Branduolinių sakinių su predikatiniu daiktavardžiu (pvz., *Mes esame žmonės; Jis yra Anglijos pilietis*) nominalizavimo galimybės priklauso nuo tų sakinių semantikos. Antai esyviniai branduoliniai sakiniai (t. y. sakiniai, nerodantys agento perėjimo į kitą būvį), o taip pat ir lokatyviniai (t. y. sakiniai, kalbantys apie agento buvimą kurioje nors vietoje) teikia mažiau junginių su abstrakčiu daiktavardžiu. Didesnėmis galimybėmis pasižymi translatyviniai sakiniai (t. y. sakiniai, kurie reiškia agento perėjimą į kitą būvį).

Sakinių su predikatiniu būdvardžiu nominalizavimo galimybės daugiausia sąlygojamos būdvardžio sintaksinio paslankumo. Branduoliniai sakiniai su predikatiniu būdvardžiu, galinčiu užimti ir atributyvinę poziciją, nominalizuojami be esminių apribojimų. (Plg. *Berniukas yra nuoširdus*: *The boy is sincere→nuoširdus berniukas: a sincere boy; berniuko nuoširdumas: the sincerity of the boy* ir *Žmogui yra gera→*žmogaus gerumas*; *The man is alive→*an alive man, *the aliveness of the man.*)

Sakinių su predikatiniu daiktavardžiu ir būdvardžiu nominalizavimo požiūriu lietuvių ir anglų kalbos yra panašios. Skirtumai nėra esminiai, jie pasireiškia dažniausiai detalėse. Žymesnių skirtumų pastebime, nagrinėdami sinoniminių junginių generaciją. Lietuvių kalboje sinoniminių junginių yra išvedama daugiau; be to, jie yra labiau diferencijuoti savo reikšme, negu anglų kalboje.