

SELECTED CONTRASTIVE FEATURES IN ENGLISH-POLISH
GRAMMAR OF TRANSITIVE VERBS

ZENON JARANOWSKI

University of Łódź

1.1. *Comparison of English and Polish Transitive Verbs within the Basic Set of Phrase-Structure Rules.*

The basic characteristic of either English or Polish transitive verbs is that they must be followed by various kinds of object complements. The complements should be either nouns or nominal phrases or clauses. In this paper, the verb-direct object syntactic connection is to serve as a model for the analytical procedure. To determine the position of the V_t class within the basic set of phrase-structure rules, the following base can be considered (Fowler 1971: 35; Polański 1966:109-122):

- (1) (i) $S \rightarrow NP + PredP$
(ii) $PredP \rightarrow Aux + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} V \\ VP \\ Adj \\ NP \end{array} \right\}$
(iii) $NP \rightarrow Det + N$
(iv) $VP \rightarrow V + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} NP \\ Adj \end{array} \right\}$

The set of these rules points out that V_t class is generated by PS-rules (ii) and (iv) respectively. This observation enables us to say that the transitivity of the verb is determined by the verb-phrase constituent of the Predicative Phrase:

- (2) $VP \rightarrow V + NP$ (iv)

The position of the V_t + object connection in the immediate-constituent analysis is as follows:

- (3) $((Det + N) + (Aux + (V + (Det + N))))$

The symbols exemplify the terminal string after a complete set of the basic PS-rules has been applied. The terminal string in view shows the underlying syntactic structure only in the most general terms and is, therefore, the string of utmost generality. This generality feature allows the insertion into the string (by means of substitution) of any lexical category or deictic feature regardless of whether the two latter ones are semantically motivated or not. In this way, the generation of both "grammatical" and "ungrammatical" sentences is possible. According to the criterion of syntactic function and category, all the following sentences are correct:

- (4) *Mary drank her mystification.
 Mary wypila swą mistyfikację
 *The soldiers eat the guns.
 Żołnierze jedzą karabiny.
 *The stone weighs its daughter.
 Kamień waży swą córkę.
 *Pens devour their antagonists.
 Pióra pożerają swych antagonistów.
 *Mary became a piece of cake.
 Mary stała się kawalkiem ciasta.

All the above examples may serve as a proof that the supergeneral speciality of the symbolic part of TG (the application of PS-rules) contains no blocking device for rejecting the generation of semantically deviant sentences. This deficiency spreads on both English and Polish respectively, and thus refers to the English and Polish verb-direct object phrase, too. All these observations lead to the following general conclusions:

1) the contrastive confrontation of the English and Polish verb-direct object connection shows no contrastive features on the level of PS-rules application. Both syntactic functions (subject, verb, object) and syntactic categories (e.g. NP, V, Adj) as abstract symbols or conventional generalizing terms are equivalently applicable with respect to the two analysed language systems with no contrastive differentiation;

2) the terminal string is identical for the both considered language systems with its characteristic ability to produce semantically deviant sentences.

1.2. Lexical Insertion and Its Influence on Contrastive Criterion of Generalization.

The abstract output of the PS-rules appearing in the form of the terminal string of syntactic categories serves as an input for lexical insertion. Only such an insertion is in power to narrow the generalization criterion as a result

of substitution of the abstract symbols by the lexical categories referring to various contextual situations. The lexical insertion, however, does not solve the problem of "grammaticality" vs. "ungrammaticality" of the derived sentences:

- (5) a. Det+John+Aux+drink+Det+coffee
 Det+John+Aux+pić+Det+kawa
 b. *Det+pens+Aux+devour+Det+antagonists
 Det+pióra+Aux+pożerać+Det+antagoniści

It should be mentioned now that if the terminal string (3) was the output of utmost generalization, the string (5) is not generalized *enough* to block the appearance of the semantically lar^o sentences. Again, from the point of view of syntactic functions and categories both the sentences (5a, b) are correct though only the former one, (5a), is semantically acceptable. Then there must be some intermediate-stage device to stop the derivation of those syntactically correct but semantically deviant sentences. This means that before any lexical categories are substituted for their parallel syntactic category symbols, they should be appreciated from the point of view of the *lexical features* they bear. This is as good as saying that a set of distinctive lexical features sufficient to specify the distinctive properties of a given lexical category should be applied as a checking semantic criterion so that no deviances can pass through the device. In our case, the application of lexical features is to clear the ground for the generation of both syntactically and semantically justified verb-direct object connections. The point is, however, that within the group of verbs taking a noun phrase after them, some form the verb-direct object connections and some do not do it at all. The verb *to weigh* may serve here as a well-known example:

- (6) a. This machine weighs two tons.
 Ta maszyna waży dwie tony.
 b. She weighs her husband.
 Ona waży swego męża.

Though the terminal string resulting from the application of PS-rules is the same for both the sentences:

- (7) Det+N+Aux+V+Det+N

the lexical-features specification differs fundamentally:

- (8) {This machine weighs two tons.}
 {Ta maszyna waży dwie tony.}

Det+N+Aux+	+V + ____ NP + ____ [+Unit of weight] -Pass +[(±) Animate] ____ . . . +Fn	+Det+N
------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------

- (9) {Mary weighs her husband.}
 {Mary waży swego męża.}

Det+N+Aux+	+V + ____ NP + ____ [+Concrete] +Pass + [+Human] ____ . . . +Fn	Det+N
------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------

Though the above lexical information refers to only one of the items of the string, namely to the verb, the latter's neighbourhood has been predominated by the set of contextual features (Allen and Buren 1972: 54). The presentation of that kind shows at a glance all the basic lexical restrictions for each lexical item in the string. Such contextual feature as [+ ____ NP] is a basic one for the whole class of transitive verbs, eliminating at the same time the necessity of including a special "t" marker attached to the verb (V_t). As to the [(±) Pass] feature, it refers to the further division of the V_t class into its two major "allo" subclasses, that is, the "action" transitive verbs taking objects on the one hand, and the "description" transitive verbs on the other (Lester 1971: 86; Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968: 63). The latter ones may be followed by either adjective or predicate nominals, but this sort of joining never results in the verb-object syntactic relation (*weigh, cost, have*) (Gleason 1965: 307; Lester 1971: 87).

Thus, the most characteristic property of the lexical-features procedure is that, owing to the adequately distributed lexical features, all the post-verbal, non-objectival constituents are blocked so that only the verbs taking the object may participate in the verb-direct object connection. In this way, the analyses (8) and (9) form, in fact, a set of input-output lexical restrictional rules which may be applicable in a syntactic-classification process. Now, if

we refer the last mentioned observation to the whole set of PS-rules base, a simplified lexical specification within this basis will be as follows:

- (10) a. PS-rule (ii)

PredP → Aux+V	{Mary slept.} {Mary spała.}
VP	{This machine weighs two tons.} {Ta maszyna waży dwie tony.} {Mary weighs her husband.} {Mary waży swego męża.}
Adj	{Mary is pretty.} {Mary jest ładna.}
NP	{John is a teacher.} {John jest nauczycielem.}

- b. PS-rule (iv)

VP → V+NP	{This machine weighs two tons.} {Ta maszyna waży dwie tony.} {Mary weighs her husband.} {Mary waży swego męża.} {John became a teacher.} {John został nauczycielem.}
Adj	{John became rich.} {John stał się bogaty.}

- (11) PredP → Aux+V

{Mary slept.} {Mary spała.}	Det+N+Aux+	+V - ____ NP +[+Animate] ____ . . . +Fn
--------------------------------	------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

The existence of the feature [+ ____ NP] in (9) eliminates the possibility for the sub-type (11) to be inserted into the string (9)). The feature [+ [+Animate] ____], when referring to a preceding subject group, is superordinate to the feature [+ [+Human] ____] in (9):

- (12) {Mary weighs her husband.}
 {Mary waży swego męża.}
 *{A she-dog weighs her husband.}
 {Suka waży swego męża.}
 {Mary slept.}
 {Mary spała.}
 {A she-dog slept.}
 {Suka spała.}

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| (13) | { Mary is pretty. } | Det+N+Aux+Adj |
| | { Mary jest ładna. } | |
| | { John is a politician. } | Det+N+Aux+Det+N |
| | { John jest politykiem. } | |

In both examples the verb *to be* is semantically empty and its only function is to carry the surface representation of the tense (Aux).

Before presenting the set of lexical features for (13), I propose the deletion of [\pm Pass] feature (which was exemplified in (8), (9)) and an equivalent insertion of an utterly new [\pm Parallel] feature to be utilized from now on in this paper. The reason for this change is that the proposed [\pm Parallel] feature, being equally effective as a passivization/non-passivization blocker is, besides, in power to show some other vital syntactic functions at first glance, which the [\pm Pass] feature fails to do. In (13):

- (13) John is a politician.

the lexical specification might be as follows:

- (14) Det+N+ $\left[\begin{array}{l} +\emptyset \\ +\text{---NP} \\ -\text{Pass} \end{array} \right] +\text{Det+N}$

or:

- Det+N+ $\left[\begin{array}{l} +\emptyset \\ +\text{---NP} \\ +\text{Parallel} \end{array} \right] +\text{Det+N}$

The feature [-Pass] shows that the sentence in view cannot be transformed into the passive voice. The [+Parallel] feature does not only indicate that the sentence cannot be passivized, but also that both the pre-verbal and post-verbal constituents are coreferential. As a result, the [\pm Parallel] feature throws very explicit and "observable" light on the question of noun or verb complementation. To add, when [\pm Pass] refers strictly to the process of passivization, [\pm Parallel] joins at least two important and interdependent functions, namely passivization and coreferentiality of pre- and post-verbal constituents. Therefore, since now on, the appearance/non-appearance of passivization will be presented by the [\pm Parallel] feature in this work. Thus, the sentence (13) may be considered as follows:

- (15) Det+N+Aux+ $\left[\begin{array}{l} +\emptyset \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Adj} \\ \text{NP} \end{array} \right\} \\ +\text{---} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{NP} \\ \text{Adj} \end{array} \right\} \\ +\text{Parallel} \\ +\text{---} +\text{Nc} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ +\text{Fn} \end{array} \right] +\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Det+N} \\ \text{Adj} \end{array} \right\}$

The second new feature which has been inserted into the matrix (15) is the contextual feature [$\text{---} +\text{Nc}$]. The symbol of the feature means the case of the post-verbal constituent. Since the case of the post-verbal nominals is governed by the verb in a contrastive way in Polish with reference to English, the case specification must be part of the matrix characterizing that verb:

- (16) { John is a politician. } (Nominative)
 { John jest politykiem. } (Instrumental)

The next structural constituent of the PS-rules base (10b) is the pair:

- (17) { John became a teacher. } Det+N+Aux+V+{Det+N}
 { John został nauczycielem. } {Adj}
 { John became rich. }
 { John stał się bogaty. }

Its realization on the level of terminal string serving as the output for lexical insertion does not differ from that of the "object" type. The lexical analysis for this structure, when completed according to the demands and scope of the present paper, is as follows:

- (18) Det+N+Aux+ $\left[\begin{array}{l} +V \\ +\text{---} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{NP} \\ \text{Adj} \end{array} \right\} \\ +\text{Parallel} \\ +\text{---} +\text{Nc} \\ +[+\text{Human}] \text{---} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ +\text{Fn} \end{array} \right] +\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Det+N} \\ \text{Adj} \end{array} \right\}$

From the point of view of subcategorization, the [+Parallel] feature shows that the NP following the verb *to become* is of the predicate-nominal character. The selectional feature [+Human] referring to the preceding subject element imposes its semantic range on the post-verbal element, too. The existence of the [+Parallel] feature in the above structure differentiates the latter from that of the verb-object type (9) in which no [+Parallel] feature exists unless the verb-object relation is of the verb-reflexive pronoun type:

- (19) John cut himself.
 John zaciął się.
 $\left[\begin{array}{l} +V \\ +\text{Parallel Refl.} \end{array} \right]$

On the basis of the consideration thus far presented, it may be noticed that the verb-class differentiation within the range of PS-rules base is mainly

conditioned by the application of the set of the *strict subcategorization rules*, e.g. ____ NP, ____ Adj, Parallel, etc. (Allen and Buren 1972: 55).

The discrimination within the range of one verb-class, e.g., that of taking the direct object, is conditioned mainly by the insertion of a set of *selectional rules* (for a detailed description see Stockwell, Bowen and Martin 1969: 64-104 and Fowler 1971: chapter 6). Accordingly, such verbs as e.g. *to weigh*, *to notice*, *to surprise* belong to the same verb-direct object class as bearing the same subcategorization characteristics, such as [+ ____ NP] and [-Parallel]. Their contextual pre- and postverbal freedom, is both conditioned and limited by *selectional syntactic features* "attached" to each of the left-side and right-side constituents of the verb:

(20) Mary weighs her { husband
jewel
*experience }

Mary waży { swego męża
swój klejnot
*swe doświadczenie }

John noticed { a man
a stone
the/ø milk
*ø love }

John spostrzegł { mężczyznę
kamień
mleko
*miłość }

The/a { girl } surprised { Mary
dog } us }

This { tree } surprised { *a stone
rock } *ø love }

His { love } surprised {
passion }

(Ta) dziewczyna zaskoczyła { Marię
(Ten) pies zaskoczył nas
(To) drzewo zaskoczyło *kamień
(Ta) skała zaskoczyła *miłość }

Jego miłość zaskoczyła
Jego namiętność zaskoczyła

The specification just presented allows us to arrange three separate lexical-features samples for each of the discussed verb-direct object sub-type:

(21) a. *weigh* e.g. a husband
ważyć męża

[+V
+ ____ NP
-Parallel
+Parallel Refl.
+ ____ +Nc
+ ____ [+Concrete]
+[+Human] ____
.
.
.
+Fn]

b. *notice*
zauważyć

[+V
+ ____ NP
-Parallel
-Parallel Refl.
+ ____ +Nc
+ ____ [+Concrete]
+[+Animate] ____
.
.
.
+Fn]

c. *surprise*

zdziwić (się), zaskoczyć

[+V
+ ____ NP
-Parallel
+Parallel Refl.
____ ÷ Nc
+ ____ [+Human]
+ + [+Concrete]
+ [+Abstract] ____
.
.
.
+Fn]

As the three above verbs form one superordinate class, that is, that taking the object, they follow the same strict subcategorization rules. It is their selectional features that make them differ as the sub-types. All the three samples mentioned support the claim that:

a. though the three presented verbs play the same syntactic function, which is that of domination over the direct object, and in this respect form one superordinate class, they stand for three different sub-types as a result of bearing at least one distinct selectional feature;

b. the lexical part of the verb-direct object grammar refers exchangeably to both English and Polish lexical categories. This assumption indicates that the process of lexical-features insertion is parallel in two languages under consideration.

1.3. Deixis as a Contrastive Criterion in English-Polish Transitive Verb Analysis.

The application of PS-rules, lexical insertion, and lexical-features specification, that is, the procedures which have been considered here up to now, have shown no substantial contrastive features between the two analysed languages. On the levels in question, then, two languages share the identical "la langue" properties.

The situation changes radically on the level of deictic features which show a far-reaching contrastive variety when referred to English and Polish. It should be stipulated, however, that the contrasts in view go hand in hand with similarities. It ought to be mentioned, too, that, first of all all, the deictic qualities of a sentence point to its location in relation to a spatio-temporal-personal context, and, as such give, the listener of a given sentence a spatio-temporal-personal orientation. Both in English and Polish deictic information and associated meanings, such as e.g. definiteness, aspect, mood, etc., are conveyed by a large variety and quantity of morphemes and morpheme-sequences, all of them in the surface structure of the two languages. It is surface structure which stands for the very ground of the application of the performance (speaker's) grammar, and where different language systems reveal their contrastive features.

The two obligatory representatives of deictic system, both in English and Polish, are *Det* and *Aux*. In our terminal verb-direct object string (plus lexical insertion) their positional status is as follows:

$$(22) \text{ Det + Mary + Aux + } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{notice} \\ \text{zobaczyć} \end{array} \right\} + \text{ Det + } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{devil} \\ \text{diabel} \end{array} \right\}$$

+N	+V	+N
.	+ _____ NP	.
.	- Parallel	.
.	+ _____ +Nc	.
+Fn	+ _____ [+Concrete]	+Fn
	+ [+Animate] _____	
	.	
	.	
	.	
	+Fn	

As follows from the above presented sample, both the obligatory deictic formatives participate in forming the verb-direct object class and, as such, cannot escape contrastive specification. A detailed analysis of this sort, however, reaches far beyond the scope of the present paper. For these reasons only a generalized specification of the Det and Aux formatives is to follow

The specification is to be presented as a process resulting from the application of special deictic-transformational rules:

$$(23) \text{ x + Aux } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{Tense} \\ \text{Aspect} \\ \text{Mood} \\ \text{Voice} \end{array} \right] + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{notice} \\ \text{zobaczyć} \end{array} \right\} + \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{Det} \\ \text{Number} \\ \text{Universality} \end{array} \right] + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{devil} \\ \text{diabel} \end{array} \right\}$$

+V	+N
+ _____ NP	+Count
- Parallel	.
+ _____ +Nc	.
+ _____ [+Concrete]	.
+ [+Animate] _____	+Fn
.	
.	
.	
+Fn	

a. x +	[Past Momentary Indicative Active]	+	[+V + _____ NP - Parallel + _____ +Nc + _____ [+Count] + [+Animate] _____]	+	[Number Universality]	+	[+N +Count . . . +Fn]
b. x +	[Past Momentary Indicative Active]	+	[+V + _____ NP - Parallel + _____ +Nc . . +Fn]	+	[-Pl -Universality]	+	[+N +Count . . +Fn]
c. x +	[+Past Momentary Indicative Active]	+	[+V + _____ NP - Parallel + _____ +Nc . . +Fn]	+	[-Pl -Universality]	+	[+N +Count . . +Fn]
d. x +	[+Past Momentary Indicative Active]	+	[+V + _____ NP - Parallel + _____ +Nc . . +Fn]	+	[-Pl -Def]	+	[+N +Count . . +Fn]

String d. is a detailed symbolization of the sentence *Mary noticed a devil* in terms of both syntactic and semantic features (as the subject group has not been analysed here because it is irrelevant for the verb-direct object

connection, it has been replaced by a generalizing symbol "x"). The *Det* features presented above are not complete. In fact, obligatory features such as *Number* and *Universality* are often accompanied by a set of optional ones, such as *Cardinal*, *Ordinal* and *Quant*. Altogether, both *Det* and *Aux* are generalized symbols covering complex sets of obligatory and optional discriminating features. As there is no established or regular correspondence between the English surface-structure representation of these features and the Polish one, each of the features, in fact, might stand for a separate target of contrastive researches on the surface-structure level. It is not the aim of the present paper, however, to present the deictic features of the two considered language systems in details (for a detailed description cf. Fowler 1971:chapter 6). For this reason, an unspecified demonstration of the features under consideration will do. It is enough to show, in accordance with the aim of the work, this level of grammar realization as standing for a rich source of contrastive phenomena. A detailed analysis will be done with reference to the feature which, in majority of cases, has not been formally exemplified in the TG procedure for all its qualities as a contrastive factor. The feature in view is that of *case*.

1.4. Contrastive Value of Case in Contrastive Analysis of English-Polish Verb-Direct Object Class.

In English, the case feature is of minor importance as a syntactic factor. It has not been inserted as a functional formative to the TG system at all by some authors (Chomsky; Lester 1971: 49). Some other linguists (e.g. Fowler 1971: 112-113; Jacobs and Rosenbaum 1968: 221) insert the optional +Acc/ -Acc marker with reference to the specification of Pro-forms. It happens so though other noun features such as e.g. *Number* (see deixis, pp. 14-15) are fully recognized on various levels of TG realization. To comment on this situation is to say that the negligence of the recognition of the case feature within the system of TG referring to English is fully justified by the system itself. Indeed, the speciality of this system is that the case distinction may be observed with reference to pronouns exclusively. As to the nouns, there is no morphological case distinction characteristic of this lexical category and, therefore, no special rules are necessary within the TG procedure. In other words, the lack of case affixation in English nouns makes the case a syntactically empty feature (with reference to nouns, of course, and not to pronouns) and thus deprives the verb of its overt governing power. This situation leads to a limitation of word-order freedom so that once established linear sequence of sentence elements must be respected in majority of cases unless the grammaticality of the sentence itself is broken. It is especially well recognizable in our verb-direct object connection:

- (24) a. I saw *Mary*. but: **Mary* I saw.
 a table. **A table* I saw.
 b. *Mary* has passed her exam.
 The table is large.

The same happens when a noun phrase taking the direct-object position consists of a head and its modifier because, in English, the latter one is usually deprived of any distinguishing case morphemes, either:

- (25) a. I saw *a table*.
 A table is made of wood.
 b. I saw *a pretty* table.
 This pretty table is made of wood.

In Polish, the counterpart verb-direct object connection is of much greater complexity than in English. First, the majority though not all Polish nouns have their separate subject-direct object suffixation:

- (26) a. Widziałem *Mari-ę*.
 Maria poszła do lasu.
but: b. Widziałem *liść*.
 Liść spadł z drzewa.

Second, the noun modifiers in noun phrases have their own subject-direct object case-suffixation quite often, but again not always:

- (27) a. Widziałem *piękn-ą* *Marię*.
 Piękna *Maria* poszła do lasu.
but: b. Podziwialiśmy *piękny* zamek.
 Piękny zamek stał na zboczu.

As a result it may happen that the overtness of the verb-direct object government may be predominated by the modifier of a given noun phrase and not by its head noun:

- (28) a. Stary pies zjadł *duż-ą* *kość*.
 b. *Duża* *kość* leży na ziemi.

We may conclude now that, in Polish, whenever either the head of a noun phrase taking the direct object position or its modifier or both of them have at their command their distinct direct-object case-morphemes, they let the noun phrases of this kind undergo an overt government. Whenever it happens, the verbs may loosen their arrangement regime so that, for example, the following sentences are both grammatical and non-deviant:

- (29) a. Widziałem *Marię*.
 b. *Marię* widziałem.

The differences presented above, however, are by no means all that exist in this field. Let us confront the following Polish-English sentences:

- (30) a. (Ja) bronię sprawiedliwości — czego?
I defend justice-ø — what?
(Ja) nie mam paczki — czego? { Genitive
"dopełn. dopełniaczowe"
Common Case
I have not a parcel-ø — what?
- b. John wziął paczkę — co? { Accusative
"dopełn. biernikowe"
Common Case
John took a parcel-ø — what?
- c. Mary pogardza Jankiem — kim? { Instrumental
"dopełn. narzędnikowe"
Common Case
Mary despises John-ø — who/m?

With reference to Polish verb counterparts, according to Z. Klemensiewicz (1963:40-43), all these sub-types of verbs belong to the objectival superordinate group when being specified as "dopełnienie dopełniaczowe", "dopełnienie biernikowe", "dopełnienie narzędnikowe". In fact, the above parallel Polish-English verb sub-types exhibit the following similarities and differences:

a. all the English sub-types of verbs dominate the same case, which is the *Common Case*. Their Polish counterparts have special sets of case-suffixes different for each sub-type;

b. both English and Polish counterparts share an equivalent differentiation into active and middle verbs resulting from the fact that the former ones may be turned into the passive voice while the latter ones cannot, e.g.:

- (31) a. I have not a parcel ⇒ *A parcel is not had by me.
(Ja) nie mam paczki ⇒ *Paczka nie jest przeze mnie miana.
- b. John took a parcel ⇒ A parcel was taken by John.
John wziął paczkę ⇒ Paczka została wzięta przez Johna.

Notwithstanding the claims of some authors that all the subtypes under consideration take objects differentiated according to the case which the verbs impose on them, it should be stressed that only the verbs bearing the [-Parallel]/[+Pass] feature, that is, those imposing the Accusative/Common Case on the following constituent, may take *genuine* verb-object connections. The middle verbs cannot belong to this genuine verb-object sub-class formally because their post-verbal constituents corefer to the Subject of a sentence:

- (32) a. John weighs two tons.
Mary has three children.
This book costs 6 shillings.
- b. John saw Mary.

In (32a) *two tons* is a quality of John, *three children* belong to Mary, and *six shillings* is the value of the book. In (32b) John can by no means be identi-

fied with Mary. Thus the [+Parallel] feature may be, in this sense, applied to all middle verbs, too. This means that the feature holds equally good as a discriminating device for the verb transitivity/intransitivity, on the one hand, and its further specification within the transitive superordinate class into verb-object/verb-non-object sub-class, on the other. This universality of the [(±) Parallel] feature makes it of *at least* equal discriminating quality with that of [(±) Pass].

To come back to our discussion now, it should be noticed that, first, from the point of view of case government all the English representatives of the above mentioned sub-types share the identical *Common Case* standing thus in a striking contrast with their Polish inflectionally diversified equivalents. Second, from the point of their sharing the "transitivity" feature, they may be in the present analysis regarded as the "allo" classes of the superordinate verb-transitive class. The last but not least is that, in our opinion, the mid-verb sub-class should not have its separate status in the present contrastive English-Polish evaluation. Otherwise, taking into account the variety of Polish verb-noun phrase relations, the confrontation of the two systems would be hardly possible with respect to this part of grammar. Any consequent contrastive analysis of the two language systems during the process of their simultaneous generation within the TG system may be performed effectively only on condition that a mutual, parallel basis is formed to let all the contrastive but equivalent features of both languages be compared and confronted at the same time. This process should not be accompanied by any violation of the unity of TG system.

On the basis of what has just been said, we can come to the following conclusions:

1. in contrastive English-Polish analysis, the importance of the case feature grows violently in comparison to when English alone was taken into account;

2. the above mentioned "unification" principle, i.e., the contrastive evaluation of the two languages during the process of TG application, may be carried out only on condition that some additional contrastive case features are inserted in the English TG system, so that a simultaneous, counterpart generation of equivalent structures may be done regardless of all morphological contrasts of the case. The model for realization of these additional syntactic arrangements is presented below:

- (33) a. English:
NP → { PRO_D + PRO_A }
 { Det + N + No }
b. English + Polish:
NP → { PRO_D + PRO_N + Ne }
 { Det + N + No }

in which, as has already been mentioned on page 279, *Ne* is a new element inserted in the grammar system to specify the contrastive verb-direct object-government specialities on the basis of obligatory rules. To make this general rule operational, however, its further specification should follow:

(34) English:

a. heads of the direct object noun phrases (without modifiers):

1. $Ne \rightarrow Acc \begin{cases} [\emptyset] & \text{-- where } Acc = Nom \text{ -- covert gov. (o)} \\ [Acc] & \text{-- where } Acc \neq Nom \text{ -- overt gov. (+)} \end{cases}$

b. noun-phrase modifiers:

1. $Ne \rightarrow \begin{cases} Gen = [Gen] & \text{-- where } Gen \neq Nom \\ Acc \begin{cases} [\emptyset] & \text{-- where } Acc = Nom \\ [Acc] & \text{-- where } Acc \neq Nom \end{cases} \end{cases} (-) = \text{no influence of modifiers on the gov. of the NP}$

Polish:

a. nouns appearing alone in the direct object position:

1. $Ne \rightarrow \begin{cases} Gen = [Gen] & \text{-- where } Gen \neq Nom \text{ -- overt gov. (+)} \\ Acc \begin{cases} [\emptyset] & \text{-- where } Acc = Nom \text{ -- covert gov. (o)} \\ [Acc] & \text{-- where } Acc \neq Nom \text{ -- overt gov. (+)} \end{cases} \\ Instr = [Instr] & \text{-- where } Instr \neq Nom \text{ -- overt gov. (+)} \end{cases}$

b. pronouns appearing alone in the direct object-position and taking the function of nouns:

1. $Ne \rightarrow \begin{cases} Gen = [Gen] & \text{-- where } Gen \neq Nom \text{ -- overt gov. (+)} \\ Acc \begin{cases} [\emptyset] & \text{-- where } Acc = Nom \text{ -- covert gov. (o)} \\ [Acc] & \text{-- where } Acc \neq Nom \text{ -- overt gov. (+)} \end{cases} \\ Instr = [Instr] & \text{-- where } Instr \neq Nom \text{ -- overt gov. (+)} \end{cases}$

c. noun phrase modifiers:

1. $Ne \rightarrow \begin{cases} Gen \begin{cases} [Gen_0] & \text{-- where } Gen \neq Nom \text{ -- no influence on the overtness of the whole NP } (-) \\ [Gen_1] & \text{-- where } Gen \neq Nom \text{ -- the modifier co-operates in making the gov. overt } (+) \end{cases} \\ Acc \begin{cases} [Acc_0] & \text{-- where } Acc = Nom \text{ -- the modifier co-operates in making the gov. covert } (o) \\ [Acc_1] & \text{-- where } Acc \neq Nom \text{ -- the modifier co-operates in making the gov. overt } (+) \\ [Acc_2] & \text{-- where } Acc \neq Nom \text{ -- the modifier determines the overtness of the whole NP } (+) \end{cases} \\ Instr = [Instr] & \text{-- where } Instr \neq Nom \text{ -- overt gov. (+)} \end{cases}$

Examples for English — a. (nouns without modifiers):

1. $Acc = [\emptyset]$ -- the nouns not accompanied by modifiers, with the case characteristics: $Acc = Nom$ (Common Case):

A boy saw me.
I saw *a boy*.

2. $Acc = [Acc]$ -- mainly the personal pronouns (except: *it, you*), owing to their direct-object position being formally distinguished:

me us
him them
her

and the reflexive pronouns, because they cannot take the subject pre-verbal place and, thus, have their distinct object form:

He washed *himself*.
**Himself* went to meet Mary.

Examples for English-b. (noun phrase modifiers):

1. $Gen = [Gen]$ -- where $Gen \neq Nom$

Mary took John's umbrella as it started to rain.

John's umbrella was worth for nothing.

We met a friend of ours.

A friend of ours gave us a book.

We met the boy whose mother had bought a new house.

The boy whose mother had bought a new house last year joined us at last.

2. $Acc = [\emptyset]$ -- where $Acc = Nom$

I saw a pretty girl.

A pretty girl smiled at Tom.

We observed three old ladies.

Three old ladies liked drinking strong whiskey.

They took a boxer dog with them.

A boxer dog is very watchful.

3. $Acc = [Acc]$ -- where $Acc \neq Nom$

We saw the man whom my father had sent off to Africa
several years before.

The man whom my father had sent off to Africa several
years before came back yesterday.

As all these examples indicate, the overtness or covertness of government in English depends on the head of a given noun phrase taking the post-verbal, objectival position, and not on the morphological characteristics of its modifier(s).

(35) Examples for Polish — a. (nouns without modifiers):

1. Gen=[Gen] — where Gen≠Nom

Nie miałem *pióra*.
Nie oglądałem *filmu*. Dopelnienie dopełniaczowe.
Unikam *dziewczyń*.
Dziewczyny patrzają na nich.

2. Acc=[ø] — where Acc=Nom

Widziałem wczoraj *film*.
Film robi wrażenie na widzu. Dopelnienie biernikowe.
Kupiłem wczoraj *pióro*.
Pióro leżało na stole.

3. Acc=[Acc] — where Acc≠Nom

Zaprosiliśmy *ulana*.
Ulan był przystojny.
Widzieliśmy *dziewczynę*. Dopelnienie biernikowe.
Dziewczyna poszła do lasu.

4. Instr=[Instr] — where Instr≠Nom

Rozporządzał *funduszami*.
Fundusze były znaczne.
Wiadomość wstrząsnęła *Jankiem*. Dopelnienie narzędnikowe.
Janek był wstrząśnięty wiadomością.

Examples for Polish — b. (pronouns functioning as noun equivalents):

1. Gen=[Gen] — where Gen≠Nom

Nie widziałem *jej* przez wieki.

Ona musi przyjechać natychmiast.
Dowodzilem *tego* zapamiętałem.
*Dowodzilem *to* zapamiętałem.
Nie ma *ich* w domu.
*Nie ma *oni* w domu.
Nie wiem *czego* się lękasz.
*Nie wiem *co* się lękasz.

2. Acc=[ø] — where Acc=Nom

Co robiłeś wczoraj?
Co jest lepsze, zupa czy drugie danie?

3. Acc=[Acc] — where Acc≠Nom

Spotkałem *go* na stacji.
On był na stacji.
Kogo widziałeś na stacji?
Kto jest na stacji?
Zmuszę *ich*.
Oni mają rację.

4. Instr=[Instr] — where Instr≠Nom

Guardzisz *nią* z całej duszy.
**Nią* kieruje się złymi zasadami.
Kierował *nimi* mądrze.
Oni są kierowani mądrze.

Examples for Polish — c. (noun phrase modifiers):

1. Gen=[Gen₀] — where Gen≠Nom, but there is no influence on the covertness/overtness of the whole noun phrase.

Podziwialiśmy samochód Janka.
Samochód Janka stał na ulicy.
Oglądałem jej płaszcz.
Jej płaszcz jest trochę za krótki.

2. Gen=[Gen₁] — where Gen≠Nom, and it participates in making government of the noun phrase overt

Nie znam tej piosenki.
Ta piosenka jest ładna.

Unikaliśmy tego głośnego hałasu.

Ten głośny hałas nas denerwuje.

Dostaliśmy ostrych dreszczy.

Ostre dreszcze dają się we znaki.

Zachciało mu się cudzej żony.

Cudza żona zabrała głos.

Żądam dwóch dni.

Dwa dni to za mało.

3. Acc=[AccØ] — where Acc=Nom, and it participates in making the government of a given NP covert

Podziwialiśmy wesoły spektakl.

Wesoły spektakl wprawia widzów w dobry nastrój.

Wspominaliśmy ten kamień koło drogi.

Ten kamień koło drogi ma swą długą historię.

Badał to dziecko przez okrągły rok.

To dziecko nie potrafi jeszcze mówić.

4. Acc=[Acc₁] — where Acc≠Nom, and it participates in making the government of a given NP overt

Zaprosiliśmy tego przystojnego ulana na przyjęcie.

Ten przystojny ulan jest przez nas mile widziany.

Uczyłem cudzego syna bo swego nie miałem.

Cudzy syn jest podatny na choroby.

Spotkałem tego faceta w Montrealu.

Ten facet przyjechał do Montrealu.

5. Acc=[Acc₂] — where Acc≠Nom, and it determines the overtiness of the whole noun phrase

Zauważyłem białą kość na pustyni.

Biała kość leżała w piasku.

Zajęli cichą wieś na zboczu góry.

Cicha wieś to me marzenie.

Kupiliśmy białą łódź by wyruszyć w świat.

Biała łódź kołysze się na fali.

6. Instr=[Instr] — where Instr≠Nom

Odznaczał się tanim gestem.

Tani gest nie robi na mnie wrażenia.

Popędzał swymi ludźmi bez litości.

The reader should notice now that owing to the complexity of Polish morphological system of case, the overtiness of government, in contradistinction to English, does not always depend on the head of a given noun phrase solely. It may happen that the morphological quality of the head claims a covert government (Acc-Nom) but, at the same time, the modifier of this very head has its morphological form characteristic for the overt government. In such arrangements the whole phrase is governed in an overt way, which means that the modifier's case suffixation determines the form of government. It is clearly observable in the following examples:

(36) a. Pies zjadł grubą kość

Gruba kość leży na ulicy.

but: b. Obejrzałem dobry film.

Dobry film robi wrażenie na widzu.

Now, consequently, let us come back to the string (23d) which, as we remember, was the output of successive grammatical and lexical rules. The matrix sentence involved was *Mary noticed a devil* / *Mary zobaczyła diabła*. The output string was as follows:

$$x + \begin{bmatrix} +\text{Past} \\ \text{Momentary} \\ \text{Indicative} \\ \text{Active} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} +\text{V} \\ \cdot \text{--- NP} \\ -\text{Parallel} \\ +\text{---} +\text{Nc} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ +\text{Fn} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} -\text{Pl} \\ -\text{Def} \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} +\text{N} \\ +\text{Count} \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ +\text{Fn} \end{bmatrix}$$

To prove the applicability of the model which has just been suggested, the successive application of the realization rules is to follow with respect to the newly introduced case features (again, the subject element has been presented in the form of a generalizing symbol "x"):

$$(37) \quad x + [+Past] + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{notice} \\ \text{zobaczyć} \end{array} \right\} + \left[\begin{array}{l} -Pl \\ -Def \end{array} \right] + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{devil} \\ \text{diabel} \end{array} \right\} + \left[\begin{array}{l} E: \emptyset \\ P: Acc \end{array} \right]$$

$$x + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -ed \\ -ła \\ -ł \\ -ło \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{notice} \\ \text{zobaczyć} \end{array} \right\} + \left[\begin{array}{l} -Pl \\ -Def \end{array} \right] + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{devil} \\ \text{diabel} \end{array} \right\} + \left[\begin{array}{l} E: \emptyset \\ P: Acc \end{array} \right]$$

$$x + Af + V + Y \Rightarrow x + V + Af + Y$$

$$x + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{notice} \\ \text{zobaczyć} \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -d \\ -ła \\ -ł \\ -ło \end{array} \right\} + \left[\begin{array}{l} -Pl \\ -Def \end{array} \right] + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{devil} \\ \text{diabel} \end{array} \right\} + \left[\begin{array}{l} E: \emptyset \\ P: Acc \end{array} \right]$$

$$x + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{notice} \\ \text{zobaczyć} \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -d \\ -ła \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a + \emptyset \\ \emptyset + \emptyset \end{array} \right\} - \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{devil} \\ \text{diabel} \end{array} \right\} - \left[\begin{array}{l} E: \emptyset \\ P: Acc \end{array} \right]$$

$$x + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{notice} \\ \text{zobaczyć} \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -d \\ -ła \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a + \emptyset \\ \emptyset + \emptyset \end{array} \right\} - \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{devil} \\ \text{diabel} \end{array} \right\} - \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\emptyset \\ -ła \end{array} \right\}$$

$$(Mary) + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{noticed} \\ \text{zobaczyła} \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a \\ \emptyset \end{array} \right\} + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{devil} \\ \text{diabła} \end{array} \right\}$$

The following procedure shows, in turn, that the other subtypes mentioned above may be placed as the constituents with the same result, which is the generation of grammatically recognized strings. This refers to the both basic sub-types, i.e., the first bearing the [+Pass]/[-Parallel] feature and the second deprived of it:

$$(38) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Mary despises John.} \\ \text{Mary pogardza Jankiem.} \end{array} \right\}$$

$$x + Aux + V + Det + N$$

$$x + Aux + \left[\begin{array}{l} +V \\ + \text{---} NP \\ + \text{---} + Ne \\ \text{Parallel} \\ + \text{---} \left[\begin{array}{l} \{+\} \text{Concrete} \\ \{+\} \text{Abstract} \end{array} \right] \\ + \text{---} Human \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ +Fn \end{array} \right] + Det + N$$

$$x + Aux + \left[\begin{array}{l} +V \\ + \text{---} NP \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ +Fn \end{array} \right] + Det + \left[\begin{array}{l} +N \\ +Human \end{array} \right] + Ne$$

$$x + \left[\begin{array}{l} -Past \\ \text{Habitual} \\ \text{Indicative} \\ \text{Active} \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} +V \\ + \text{---} NP \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{Number} \\ \text{Univers.} \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} +N \\ +Human \\ +Name \end{array} \right] + Ne$$

$$x + \left[\begin{array}{l} -Past \\ \text{Habitual} \\ \text{Indicative} \\ \text{Active} \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} +V \\ + \text{---} NP \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} -Pl \\ -Univers. \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} +N \\ +Human \\ +Name \end{array} \right] + Ne$$

$$x + \left[\begin{array}{l} -Past \\ \text{Habitual} \\ \text{Indicative} \\ \text{Active} \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} +V \\ + \text{---} NP \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} -Pl \\ -Univers. \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} +N \\ +Name \end{array} \right] + \left[\begin{array}{l} E: \emptyset \\ P: Instr. \end{array} \right]$$

The application of realization rules would bring out any example of the sub-type both in English and Polish. Its semantic shape would depend on our lexical selection:

- (39) Mary despises John.
 He despises *Mary*.
 On pogardza *Marią*.
 Ten człowiek gardzi *pieniężmi*.
 On gardzi *miłością*.
 He governs his *soldiers* well.
 (On) dobrze rządzi *swymi żołnierzami*.
swym krajem.

To conclude, it should be mentioned that the reliability of the case-feature insertion and the need for such an insertion in contrastive analysis have been confirmed by the above empirical procedure.

1.5. A Few Final Remarks.

To end the paper, let us recall again its original aim. First of all, the author's desire was to show *some* of the contrastive English-Polish features referring to the superordinate transitive-verb class with a view of analysing *some* of the dissimilarities existing between the two languages respectively. Its ul-

imate aim, however, was to show not only the above mentioned features but also, as far as the scope of the work allowed, to place them as counterpart, operational constituents within the basis of TG system, and, the last but not least, to specify the levels of the TG successive realization according to which of these levels are abounding in contrastive features.

REFERENCES

- Ilson, J. P. B. and P. Van Buren. (eds). 1972. *Chomsky: selected readings*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bach, E. and R. T. Harms. (eds). 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Fillmore, Ch. J. 1968. "The case for case". In Bach, E. and R. T. Harms. (eds). 1968. 1-88.
- Fodor, J. A. and J. J. Katz. 1964. *The structure of language*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Fowler, R. 1971. *An introduction to transformational grammar*. New York: Barnes and Noble.
- Gleason, H. A. Jr. 1965. *Linguistics and English grammar*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jacobs, R. A. and P. S. Rosenbaum. 1968. *English transformational grammar*. Waltham, Mass.: Blaisdell Publishing Co.
- Karolak, S. 1972. *Zagadnienia składni ogólnej*. Warszawa: PWN
- Klemensiewicz, Z. 1963. *Zarys składni polskiej*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Lester, M. 1971. *Introductory transformational grammar of English*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Polański, K. 1966. "Gramatyki generatywne a metoda transformacyjna". *BPTJ* 24. 109-122.
- Polański, K. 1967. "Pojęcie struktur wyjściowych i ich rola w składni". *Biuletyn fonograficzny* 8. 95-104.
- Schlauch, M. 1967. *Language and the study of languages today*. Warszawa: PWN; London: Oxford University Press.
- Steinberg, D. D. and L. A. Jakobovits. (eds). 1971. *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stockwell, R. P., Bowen, J. D. and J. W. Martin. 1969. *The grammatical structures in English and Spanish*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Szober, S. 1962. *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Warszawa: PWN.