English translations of Norwegian infinitival complement constructions

Thomas Egan, Hedmark University College

Whereas English has two types of non-finite complement construction, one containing an infinitive, the other a gerund, Norwegian has just one, with an infinitive. Although there are differences in the semantics of English complement constructions containing the same matrix verb, such as *begin* and *like*, and different complement forms, these differences are often of little account in many communicative contexts (see Egan 2008). Given that the choice between an infinitive or gerund complement form will sometimes be of no great consequence, the question is which of the two the translator from Norwegian is likely to favour. In this paper I explore translations in the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus of non-finite complement constructions containing the Norwegian matrix verbs *begynne* (begin), *fortsette* (continue), *like* (like) and *elske* (love), all of which correspond to English verbs that occur with both infinitive and gerund complements. The choice of source constructions was dictated by their frequency in the corpus. In my presentation I explore the following hypotheses.

(1) The choice of an *–ing* complement rather than an infinitive is motivated by the semantics of the complement predications.

(2) There are likely to be more *to*-infinitive complements in the English target texts than in the English source texts in the ENPC.

(3) There are likely to be more *to*-infinitive complements in cases where the Norwegian infinitive marker is directly adjacent to the matrix verb.

(4) There are likely to be more *to*-infinitive complements in the case of constructions with cognate matrix verbs in the two languages (*begynne* and *like* as opposed to *fortsette* and *elske*).

(5) All other things being equal, there are likely to be differences between individual translators in the extent to which they choose the more congruent infinitive construction.

Reference

Egan, Thomas. 2008. *Non-finite complementation*: *a usage-based study of infinitive and –ing clauses in English.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

LOOKING FOR THE DIFFERENCE IN OUR SILENCES:
A corpus-based approach to object omission in English and Spanish
Tania de Dios, University of Santiago de Compostela

The fact that object omission is possible with certain English verbs while it does not seem viable with others has become a concern for linguists over the past few decades (cf. Groefsema 1995, Goldberg 2001, among others). Within this domain, special attention has been paid to those cases in which the semantic similarity between two given verbs is evident (cf. Fillmore 1986, Liu 2008), as happens with *eat* and *devour* (e.g. *She ate* vs. **She devoured*), which are often cited as prototypical examples of semantically related verbs showing different degrees of object elision admissibility. In a recent corpus-based study of the behaviour of these two verbs as attested in the *British National Corpus* (Author 2013), I examined the factors determining the degree of acceptance of elided objects displayed by each member of the pair. This survey revealed that the high rate of object omission with the verb *eat* seems to be deeply connected with the inferability of the complement with which it occurs. On the other hand, the lower incidence of objectless constructions with *devour* seems to be related to the existence of looser ties between the verb and a specific type of complement. These findings point at the possibility that the more entrenched a complement is, the more easily it can be left out by speakers.

However, according to Bosque and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2009: 363), the occurrence of implicit arguments may depend on the grammatical structure of a given language, which means that the way verbs like *eat* and *devour* operate in English might differ, to a greater or lesser extent, from the behaviour of their counterparts in another language. In view of this, the aim of the present paper is to explore the potential differences in object elision licensing in English and Spanish. With this purpose in mind, I will replicate the study carried out for English in my earlier work, this time performing a search of the Spanish equivalents *comer* and *devorar* in the *Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual* (CREA). The comparison of the data from both languages will allow me to (i) determine the omissibility rate of direct objects with each verb in the two languages; (ii) elucidate the factors that may favour or disfavour such elisions in each case; (iii) trace possible patterns of usage; and (iv) eventually come up with a preliminary description of how English and Spanish verbs differ in terms of object (in)omissibility.

REFERENCES

Author. 2013. 'What can we leave unsaid?: A corpus-based approach to object omission in Contemporary English'. Paper presented at the *37th AEDEAN Conference*. University of Oviedo, 13-15 November 2013.

Davies, Mark. (2004-) *BYU-BNC*. (Based on the British National Corpus from Oxford University Press). Available online at http://corpus.byu.edu/bnc/.

Bosque, Ignacio and Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach. 2009. *Fundamentos de sintaxis formal*. Madrid: Akal.

Fillmore, Charles. 1986. 'Pragmatically controlled zero anaphora'. *Proceedings of Berkeley Linguistics Society* 12: 95-107.

Goldberg, Adele. 2001. 'Patient arguments of causative verbs can be omitted: The role of information structure in argument distribution'. *Language Sciences* 23: 503-524.

Groefsema, Marjolein. 1995. 'Understood arguments: A semantic/pragmatic approach'. *Lingua* 96: 139-161.

Liu, Dilin. 2008. 'Intransitive or object deleting?: Classifying English verbs used without an object'. *Journal of English Linguistics* 36(4): 289-313.

Real Academia Española: Banco de datos (CREA) [online]. *Corpus de referencia del español actual.* <http://www.rae.es>

Past-referring verb constructions in English, Norwegian and German: a contrastive look
Johan Elsness, University of Oslo

Like a large number of other languages, English, German and Norwegian all have two competing verb forms used to refer to past time: the periphrastic present perfect and the synthetic preterite. In German and Norwegian the former may take either of two auxiliary verbs, a HAVE or a BE verb, while in present-day English the only perfect auxiliary is HAVE. The functional distribution of the two verb forms is largely the same in English and Norwegian: The preterite is used to refer to situations determined as located wholly in the past, the present perfect to refer to situations which either themselves extend all the way up to the deictic zero-point or are located within such a time span, *i.e.* are not specified as located wholly in the past. In present-day German the rule blocking past-time specification of the present perfect is relaxed to such an extent as to be virtually non-existent; hence the acceptability difference between English *I've seen him yesterday*, Norwegian *?Jeg har sett ham i går* and German *Ich habe ihn gestern gesehen*. The purpose of the present paper is (i) to study how great the difference between the three languages is in actual language usage, also between English and Norwegian (it has sometimes been claimed, *e.g.* by Elsness 2000/2001, that the present perfect is used somewhat more widely in Norwegian), and (ii) to see how professional translators handle the choice between the two verb forms, *e.g.* to what extent transfer from L1 may have an impact on the choice of verb form in L2, by comparison of original and translated texts. The language material used consists of the three sections from the Oslo Multilingual Corpus made up of texts translated from each of the three languages into the other two. Random samples are used for the more detailed analysis. Also, certain high-frequency verbs are selected, aiming at a wide semantic spread for example in terms of expected aspectual character (*Aktionsarten*), as are certain adverbs assumed to be of particular relevance to the distinction between the two verb forms. Some of the points receiving special attention are: (i) the expression of unique past-time reference, in which case English has been claimed only to accept the preterite (Hamlet *was written by Shakespeare*); (ii) the inferential perfect, reported to occur in the Scandinavian languages but not in English (*Sigurd has probably come yesterday*, cf. Rothstein 2008: 163); and (iii) the borderline between the present perfect and the simple present: German (like Swedish) but not English and Norwegian may use the simple present rather than the present perfect with left-specified time adverbials as in *Ich bin seit 1990 Lehrer* (cf. Rothstein 2008: 163).

Some relevant literature which will be referred to:
Elsness, Johan (2000/2001), 'A contrastive look at the present perfect/preterite opposition in English and Norwegian', *Languages in Contrast* 3/1: 3-40
Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine (1994), 'Das dänische und norwegische Tempussystem im Vergleich mit dem deutschen', in Rolf Thieroff and Joachim Ballweg (eds.), *Tense systems in European languages* (Linguistische Arbeiten, 308). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer. Pp. 49-68
Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine (2003), 'Wessen Redehintergrund? Indirektheitskontexte aus kontrastiver Sicht (Deutsch–Norwegisch–Englisch)', in Oddleif Leirbukt (ed.), *Tempus/Temporalität und Modus/Modalität im Deutschen – auch aus kontrastiver Perspektive*. Tübingen: Stauffenberg. Pp. 119-155
Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine (2006), 'Das Verb', in *Duden: Die Grammatik* (7th ed.). Mannheim: Dudenverlag. Pp. 395-572
Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie and Kjell Ivar Vannebo (1997), *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget

Haugen, Einar (1972), 'The inferential perfect in Scandinavian: A problem of contrastive linguistics', *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 17/2: 132-139

Rothstein, Björn (2008), *The perfect time span. On the present perfect in German, Swedish and English.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Solfjeld, Kåre (2007), 'Zum Thema Tempus/Modus im indirekten Referat in Übersetzungen Deutsch-Norwegisch und Norwegisch-Deutsch.' Reports of the project Languages in Contrast (Språk i kontrast), http://www.hf.uio.no/forskningsprosjekter/sprik, No. 39

Solfjeld, Kåre (2008), 'Zum Thema (Indikativ) Präteritum und Präteritumperfekt im indirekten Referat – ein Vergleich Deutsch-Norwegisch.' Reports of the project Languages in Contrast (Språk i kontrast), http://www.hf.uio.no/forskningsprosjekter/sprik, No. 40

Zug, Jennifer (2011), 'The use of the preterite and the present perfect in English and German. A contrastive analysis'. MA thesis, University of Oslo

Crosslinguistic Perspectives on the Verbs of Putting in English and Swedish: contrasts in construction and semantic composition

Åke Viberg, Uppsala University

According to Talmy's (1985, 2000) typological division into verb-framed and satellite-framed languages, languages of the first type tend to encode path in the verb, whereas the second type of languages encode manner in the verb and path in satellites of the verb such as verbal particles, adpositions and cases. Recent studies have shown that most languages have at least some characteristics that cut across Talmy's division (for an overview, see Beavers at al 2010). For that reason, it is fruitful to look in detail at the structure of sub-fields within the large semantic field of motion verbs such as vehicle verbs (Viberg 2013). Another sub-field is represented by the verbs of putting which were contrastively compared in English and Swedish in Viberg (1998a) based on an early, incomplete version of the English Swedish Parallel Corpus. Recently verbs of putting have been studied from a wide number of different perspectives: typologically (Kopecka & Narasimhan 2012), in first language acquisition (Slobin et al 2011), in second language acquisition (Viberg 1985, 1998b) and the encoding of placement in gestures (Gullberg 2010). Pauwels (2000) detailed study of English placement verbs includes a diachronic perspective. The present study incorporates results from the recent studies and is based on two parallel corpora: The complete English Swedish Parallel Corpus (ESPC, Altenberg & Aijmer 2000) and The Multilingual Parallel Corpus (MPC), which is being compiled by the author consisting of Swedish original texts (around 700 000 words) and their translations into English, German, French and Finnish. Verbs of putting contrast along two dimensions: the semantic composition of the verb (e.g. the encoding og Posture) and the syntactic frames (constructions) that encode path in various kinds of sattelites. All occurrences in the ESPC of *put*, *lay*, *set* and *place* and of Swedish *sätta*, *lägga* and *ställa* together with their translations into the other language have been coded and analyzed with respect to semantic composition, polysemy and construction. The inclusion of data from the complete ESPC makes it possible to extend the semantic analysis in Viberg (1998a). Data from the MPC in addition to data from other studies makes it possible to situate English and Swedish into a broader framework. All Germanic and Slavic languages encode Posture (LAY, STAND, SET) to some extent in their verbs of putting. English primarily uses a general verb (*put*) but to a certain extent also *lay* (LAY) whereas *set* primarily is used with an extended, abstract meaning (e.g. *set in motion*). Polish has LAY and STAND but has extended the use of LAY to a great extent. Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian have extended STAND (i.e. a verb originally meaning 'put in a standing position').

The construction of the verbs of putting was not treated in Viberg (1998a) but contrasts in an interesting way both language-internally (compared to other motion verbs) and across languages as illustrated in a simple example from the MPC corpus in (1).

(1) Jag lade dem *i* tvättmaskinen. HN   i 'in'/Prep
     I put them *in* the washing machine.
     Die habe ich *in die* Waschmaschine gesteckt.   in 'in'/Prep + Accusative
     Je les ai mis *dans* la machine à laver.   'in'/Prep
     Panin ne pesukonee*seen*.   Illative ('into')

In (1), direction is expressed exclusively in the verb in Swedish, English and French, whereas Finnish uses a directional case and German uses accusative on the noun after the preposition *in* to mark direction. (1) shows the spatial markers that minimally have to be used. English has the compound directional prepositions *into* and *onto*, which do not have any direct equivalent in Swedish. In Swedish, on the other hand, directional verbal particles are relatively frequently used, even if they are optional after the verbs of putting:

Agent	PUT	Trajectory	Figure	Locative relation	Ground
NP	Verb	(Particle)	NP	Prep-loc	NP
Peter	la laid	(upp) up	böckerna the books	på on	bordet the table
Peter	ställde stood	(ut) out	väskan the suitcase	i in	garaget the garage

In intransitive clauses referring to subject-centered motion, the corresponding particles are more or less obligatory as in *Katten hoppade upp på bordet* 'The cat jumped up onto the table'. Verbs of putting also are used in specialized constructions such as Dressing/Undressing *(put on-take off/sätta på sig/ ta av sig)*. Placement verbs can also be used in more or less idiomatic constructions with implicit Figure and/or Ground: *Peter la på / Peter hung up* (the receiver on the telephone). *Peter packade* (*väskan*)/*Peter packed* (*the suitcase*). *Peter dukade/ Peter laid the table* (put the cloth, plates etc. on a table, ready for a meal).

References

Altenberg, Bengt & Aijmer, Karin. 2000. The English-Swedish Parallel Corpus: A resource for contrastive research and translation studies, in: Christian Mair and Marianne Hundt (eds) *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*. Rodopi, Amsterdam – Atlanta/GA, 15-33.

Beavers, John, Levin, Beth & Wei Tham, Shiao. 2010. The typology of motion expressions revisited. *Journal of Linguistics 46*: 331-377.

Bohnemeyer, Jürgen & Pederson, Eric (eds) *Event representation in language and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gullberg, Marianne 2011. Language-specific encoding of placement events in gestures. In Bohnemeyer & Pederson (eds), 166-188.

Kopecka, Anetta and Narasimhan, Bhuvana (eds) 2012. *Events of Putting and Taking* . Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pauwels, Paul. 2000. *Put, set, lay and place: A cognitive approach to verbal meaning*. München: Lincom Europa.

Slobin, Dan I., Bowerman, Melissa, Brown, Penelope, Eisenbeiss, Sonja & Narasimhan, Bhuvana. 2011. Putting things in places. In: Jürgen Bohnemeyer & Eric Pederson (eds), 134-165.

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms. In *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol. 3, Timothy Shopen (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57-149.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics. Vol. I. Concept structuring systems*. Cambridge/Ma.: MIT Press.

Viberg, Åke. 1985. Lexikal andraspråksinlärning. In: *SUM-rapport 2*. Centre for Research on Bilingualism, Stockholm University.

Viberg, Åke. 1998a. Contrasts in polysemy and differentiation: Running and putting in English and Swedish. In: Johansson, Stig & Oksefjell, Signe (eds), *Corpora and Cross-linguistic Research* . Amsterdam: Rodopi, 343- 376.

Viberg, Åke. 1998b. Crosslinguistic perspectives on lexical acquisition: the case of language-specific semantic differentiation. In: Haastrup, Kirsten & Viberg, Åke (eds) *Perspectives on lexical acquisition in a second language*. [Travaux de l'institut de linguistique de Lund 38] Lund: Lund University Press, 175-208.

Viberg, Åke. 2013. Seeing the lexical profile of Swedish through multilingual corpora. The case of Swedish *åka* and other vehicle verbs. In: Aijmer, Karin and Altenberg, Bengt (eds), *Advances in corpus-based contrastive linguistics. Studies in honour of Stig Johansson*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 25-56.

Evidential passive constructions in English and their equivalents in Lithuanian

Anna Ruskan, Vilnius University

Similarly to other European languages, in English and Lithuanian, evidential meanings are frequently expressed by lexical means, such as adjectives, sentence adverbs, complement taking predicates (CTPs), etc. (Simon-Vandenbergen, Aijmer 2007; Lampert, Lampert 2010; Usonienė 2003, 2004; Wiemer 2007, 2010; Ruskan 2013). However, the two languages also display specific realizations of evidentiality, which will be explored in the present paper. The focus will be on the evidential constructions in English which consist of the passivized communication, perception or cognition verb taking the infinitival complement (Noël 2002) and their functional equivalents in Lithuanian based on participial CTPs, as in the examples below:

(1) *He is Gary Johns, 27, who **is known to** visit north and east London, where he has friends and relatives.* (BNC)

(2) ***Žinoma**, kad žmogaus organizme yra apie 1014 ląstelių.*
    'It is **known** that a human body is made up of about 1014 cells.' (CorALit)

The aim of the study is to compare functional distribution of the verbal markers under study in English and Lithuanian academic and journalistic discourse. The main parameters for analysis are syntactic properties, evidential functions and frequency of the markers. The study is corpus-based and the data have been collected from the sub-corpora of academic and newspaper registers in the British National Corpus (BNC), the Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language (CCLL), the Corpus of Academic Lithuanian (CorALit) and the multilingual corpus *Europarl*.

The preliminary results of the study show that in terms of functional distribution, the verbal constructions in the two languages may express reports or inferences drawn from conceptual or perceptual evidence. However, in Lithuanian, individual participle-based CTPs show traces of adverbialization, reflected by complementizer omission, syntactic mobility, meaning of secondary predication and acquisition of pragmatic functions (Usonienė 2012; Usonienė, forthcoming). In English, the evidential passive constructions are also discursively secondary (Noël 2002), which is supported by the Lithuanian translations in the *Europarl* corpus, but they are not prone to functional extensions. These cross-linguistic functional differences may be motivated by the structural features of the markers. The evidential passive constructions in English represent "auxiliary-like function words" (Noël 2002, 141-146), while the Lithuanian participle-based CTPs take on the properties of sentence adverbials (Usonienė, forthcoming). Thus this study foregrounds language specific realizations of evidential content and their possibilities of functional extension.

References

Lampert, Günther, Martina Lampert. 2010. Where does evidentiality reside? Notes on (alleged) limiting cases: *seem* and *be like*. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 63 (4), 308–321.

Noël, Dirk. 2002. *Believe-type matrix verbs and their complements: Corpus-based investigations of their functions in discourse* [PhD dissertation]. Gent University.

Ruskan, Anna. 2013. *Nemorfologinio evidencialumo raiška ir turinys lietuvių kalboje: bevardės giminės būdvardžiai ir prieveiksmiai* [PhD dissertation]. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.

Simon-Vandenbergen, Anne-Marie, Karin Aijmer. 2007. *The semantic field of modal certainty. A corpus-based study of English adverbs.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Usonienė, Aurelija. 2003. Extension of meaning: Verbs of perception in English and Lithuanian. *Meaning through language contrast.* Jaszczolt, Katarzyna M., Ken Turner, eds. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 193–220.

Usonienė, Aurelija. 2004. *Modalumas anglų ir lietuvių kalbose: forma ir reikšmė.* Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leidykla.

Usonienė, Aurelija. 2012. Komplementiniai predikatai ir jų multifunkcionalumas. *Darbai ir Dienos* (58), 223–232.

Usonienė, Aurelija [forthcoming]. Non-morphological realizations of evidentiality: the case of parenthetical elements in Lithuanian. *Contemporary approaches to Baltic linguistics.* Arkadiev, Peter, Axel Holvoet, Björn Wiemer, eds. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wiemer, Björn. 2007. Lexical markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Rivista di Linguistica* 19 (1), 173-208.

Wiemer, Björn. 2010a. Lithuanian *esą* − a heterosemic reportive marker in its contemporary stage. *Baltic Linguistics* 1, 245–308.

Come running: the construction 'lexical verb + *-ing* participle' in a contrastive perspective

Markéta Malá, Charles University in Prague

The concatenation of motion verbs, such as *come running*, has traditionally been described as a lexical verb modified by a participial adjunct clause. The translation correspondences of such constructions, however, do not appear to support this. The Czech counterparts are typically univerbal, comprising motion verbs with the direction of the motion indicated by a prefix, which supports rather the catenative reading of the '*come* V-*ing*' type of constructions.

This paper explores first the position of the '*come* V-*ing*' construction among the complementation patterns of the verb *come*. The translation correspondences in Czech, a synthetic language with lexicogrammatical modification of the verb indicated usually by affixes, can highlight the differences in the functions of *come* depending on the type of complementation. The dominant translation counterparts of the lexical verb *come* are *přijít* and *přijet*, where the prefix *při-* indicates direction towards the deictic centre, and the stem the mode of coming – walking or riding/driving, respectively. The same prefix recurs in the one-word Czech correspondences of the '*come + -ing* participle of a motion verb' construction: *come running – přiběhnout*, *come galloping/trotting – přiklusat,* etc. Other directional prefixes may occur if the construction comprises a space adverbial. Another catenative use of *come*, viz. '*come +to*-infinitive', also tends to be translated by a single verb but the Czech prefixes indicate a change in state here, e.g. *come to love – zamilovat se*. The counterparts make it possible to distinguish between the 'inchoative' and full lexical uses of *come + to*-infinitive, e.g. *come to demolish the house – přijít zbourat dům*. The inchoative translations link the '*come + to*-infinitive' construction with the copular uses of *come*, e.g. *come alive – ožít*. The Czech correspondences suggest that, except for its lexical uses, *come* is a semantically weak verb indicating a direction of motion or a change towards a resultant state.

The construction 'lexical verb + *-ing* participle' is not restricted to the verb *come*. The ten verbs occurring most frequently in this construction in our corpus[1] include four intransitive verbs, which allow either the verb + adjunct interpretation or the catenative one: *come*, *go*, *stand*, and *sit*. They tend to merge with the *–ing* participle in the correspondences (*go striding – odkráčet*). Moreover, *stand* and *sit* often 'disappear' in the translation, their durative meaning being rendered by the imperfective aspect of the Czech verbal counterpart, e.g. *stand hesitating – váhat* ('hesitate'), *sit waiting/idling – čekat* ('wait').

The Czech correspondences of the construction 'V + V-*ing*' suggest that what is constructed syntactically as the main verb is actually a semantically weak catenative component, conveying directional or aspectual meanings, while the formally dependent participle constitutes the semantic core of the construction. More generally, these constructions can be considered a manifestation of the analytic trend within the English verb phrase, brought to the fore through comparison with a synthetic language.

---

[1] *InterCorp*: Český národní korpus – InterCorp. Ústav Českého národního korpusu FF UK, Praha. <http://www.korpus.cz>