



The Semantic Functions of the Word *Market* in English and Lithuanian

Solveiga SUŠINSKIENĖ
Šiauliai University

Keywords: *market, process, function, role, participant.*

Introduction and Basic Concepts

The idea of markets in general, the marketplace in history, its imagination and metaphor is the argument of many writers, philosophers, painters and historians. For all of mankind history, markets have been the central spaces for cultural interactions. Thus within the theoretical framework of Hallidayan *Functional Grammar* (1994), an attempt is made to analyze the words *market* and *turgus* in English and Lithuanian, i.e. what semantic functions (roles) they perform in the deep structure of a sentence (clause). Semantic roles are said to exist for every language and have been used both in formal and functional approaches to linguistics. Semantic roles are a means to represent sentence meaning in logical terms. Semantic roles are assigned to nouns and NPs according to the relation they hold with the verb. The semantic nature of verbs determines to a large extent the semantic roles of its complements.

The semantic functions have been extensively analyzed by Halliday (1994), Van Valin and Lapolla (2002), Dowty (1991, 547–619) to mention a few. In Lithuanian linguistics this phenomenon have been investigated by Ambrazas (1986, 27), Jakaitienė (1988, 64), Sližienė (1994; 1998), Krinickaitė (2003, 53–61), Drukteinis (2007, 7–35; 2009, 24–41), Baranauskienė (2004, 109–114; 2006, 5–11). Despite detailed studies on the semantic diversity of syntactic roles there are very few substantial empirical studies that have taken up the contrastive investigations in cross-linguistic perspective. Thus the aim of the present study is to describe and contrast semantic functions of the words *market* in English and *turgus* in Lithuanian. This study considers the mapping of semantic functions to syntactic functions in English and Lithuanian. The following objectives have been set up to substantiate the aim:

1. To define the basic concepts of semantic functions (roles).
2. To describe and compare the semantic functions of the above mentioned word in English and Lithuanian.
3. To define the syntactic positions in which the mentioned words occur.

In accordance with the objectives, the following working hypothesis has been formulated: English and Lithuanian do not essentially differ with respect to the scope of semantic functions of the words *market* and *turgus*.

Data sources and research methods

The data for the present investigation have been drawn from two corpora. The examples in order to illustrate the English part have been chosen from British National Corpus (henceforth BNC) offered through the site of Variation in English Words and Phrases (VIEW), developed by Mark Davies at Brigham Young University (available at <http://view.byu.edu/>) and the examples to illustrate the Lithuanian part have been drawn from Lithuanian Corpus Donelaitis (henceforth D) (available at <http://donelaitis.vdu.lt>). Before the search was carried out, the setting was set to search for the keyword 'market' with the meaning "an event or occasion, usually held at regular intervals, at which people meet for the purpose of buying and selling merchandise" (*Collins English Dictionary* 2007, 997). The Lithuanian concept 'turgus' was searched with its all possible inflections, i.e. *turgus*, *turgaus*, *turgu*, etc. The analysis of these two sets of data involved three steps. Firstly, all instances were extracted from the corpora. Secondly, once all the instances in both corpora were analyzed, the instances were categorized according to the syntactic positions of the concept *market* and *turgus*. Thirdly, the instances were ascribed to their semantic functions.

As already mentioned, the study is contrastive thus the research was carried out within the framework of the contrastive method. The research is based on the evidence of the comparison of semantic functions in English and Lithuanian. The use of two corpora made it possible to determine the incidence rate of the semantic roles used by the two languages.

Similar to all lexical elements (i.e. words), the proposition can be viewed as consisting of semantic elements, or components, such as Processes, Participants and Circumstances. Thus the use of the method of componential analysis made it possible to establish the meaning of the proposition which is constituted by respective semantic elements.

Theoretical prerequisites

The study of language as a means of communication has become an important aspect in linguistics. To quote Van Valin and La Polla (2002, 82), "the communicative functions of language are central to the analysis of its structure, and one (but not the only) function of language is reference and predication, that is, representing things that happen in the world (or a possible fictional world) and the participants involved in those situations". Many investigators have recently turned to function which is a fundamental property of language Halliday (1994), Halliday and Hasan (1989), Valeika (1998; 2001). The functions of a language are expressed through the sentence. According to Halliday and Hasan (1989, 23), "Every sentence in a

text is multifunctional; but not in such a way that you can point to one particular constituent or segment and say this segment has just this function. The meanings are woven together in a very dense fabric in such a way that, to understand them, we do not look separately at its different parts; rather, we look at the whole thing simultaneously from a number of different angles, each perspective contributing towards the total interpretation. That is the essential nature of a functional approach". Thus the function is interpreted not just as the use of language but as a fundamental property of language. This is basic to the evolution of the semantic system.

The initiator of the semantic approach to the sentence was Fillmore. The scholar's *Case Grammar* (1968) appeared as a reaction against the traditional theory of the analysis of sentences. Focusing on semantic functions, the scholar noted that one and the same semantic function could be represented by more than one pattern. For instance, the *Instrumental* is represented in such a set of sentences as *The key opened the door; The door was opened by/with the key; The door opened; The man opened the door with a key.*

Elements of propositions (semantic functions) are realized morphologically as members of word-classes (nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs) together with their appropriate specifications and syntactically as sentence constituents. Consider: *Mother is baking a pie*, where the *Agent (Mother)* is the *Subject*; the *Process (is baking)* is the *Predicate* and the *Effected (a pie)* is the *Objective Complement*; *Peter watched his mother baking a pie*, where the proposition *Mother is baking a pie* is part of the sentence – the *Complex Objective Complement*; *The baking of a pie took half an hour*, where the same proposition functions as the *Subject*.

Participants involved in the propositional frame (i.e. 'semantic grid') are entities (i.e. things that have definite, individual existence in reality or in the mind). They may be persons and non-persons (animate and inanimate), concrete and abstract. Such participants have a number of labels in semantics, such as 'deep semantic cases' (Fillmore 1968), 'participant roles' (Allan 1986), 'thematic relations' (Jackendoff 1972; Gruber 1976), and 'thematic roles' (Dowty 1991; Saeeed 2000). Dowty (1991) proposes that we view the semantic functions not as discrete and bounded categories but instead as prototypes, where there may be different degrees of membership. Semantic functions present two categories: inherent and non-inherent. To inherent (i.e. essential, basic) functions belong *Agents, Affected Patients, Effected Patients, Recipients, Sensers, Phenomena, Carriers, Attributes, Sayers, Verbiage, Existents, Ranges*. To non-inherent functions belong *Circumstances: non-spatial (Instrumental, Accompaniment, Manner, Cause, Reason, Purpose, etc.) and spatial (temporal and non-temporal)*¹. All the mentioned participants "have roles in the states of affairs, much the same way actors and props have roles in a play" (Van Valin, La Polla 2002, 84).

The content of the communication is a situation, which does not refer directly to an extralinguistic reality which exists in the real world, but rather to the spea-

¹ The semantic functions distinguished for the present study were mostly drawn from Halliday (1985) and Downing and Locke (1992).

ker's conceptualization of it. The components of this conceptualization of reality are semantic roles: processes, participants and circumstances. The process is the basis for a proposition; the remaining components are the participants. The process is expressed by a verb. The following types of processes can be distinguished: material, happening (behavioural), mental, verbal, relational, and existential (Halliday 1994; Downing, Locke 1992; Gerot, Wignell 1994; Valeika 1998).

The words *market* and *turgus* embedded in the proposition acquire some metaphorical shading. As proposed by Martin (1992, 17), "the level of grammar can be used to provide an interpretation of the "literal" meaning of metaphorical structures and the meaning of congruent ones; the level of semantics can then be deployed to construct additional interpretations for metaphorical expressions (their "figurative" or "transferred" meaning)".

Results and discussion

Arguing for the words *market* and *turgus* in English and Lithuanian, in this section we focus on inherent (obligatory) semantic functions (roles) in the two languages. The semantic functions are a means to represent sentence meaning in logical terms. As it was already mentioned, semantic functions are assigned to nouns and noun phrases (NPs) in accordance to the relation they have with the process (verb).

Material processes or processes of 'doing' involve some physical action and show that something is going on in the external world. According to Halliday (1994, 110), "They express the notion that some entity 'does' something – which may be done 'to' some other entity". Material processes are carried out by a participant called the *Agent*, "a willful, purposeful instigator of an action or event" (Van Valin, Lapolla 2002, 85). Furthermore, material processes are causative processes and *Agents* could be referred to as *Causers*. *Agents* can be thought of as constituting two types: animate and inanimate. The term *Agent* will be reserved for an *Animate Causer* and the term *External Causer* will be reserved for an *Inanimate Causer*. An agentive participant is a participant exercising will and intention. The *External Causer* is a participant exercising no intention; it has the features of effectiveness and force, e.g. **John** went to the market vs. **The market** flourished.

Embedded in the clauses, the words *market* and *turgus* functioned as inanimate *Agents*, i.e. *External Causers*. In the surface structure of the sentence they typically functioned as *Subjects*. For example:

(1) "The game is over. **The market** *has won* the day." (BNC)

(2) On the other hand," he said, "**Smithfield market** *is beginning to stir* at four in the morning. (BNC)

The Lithuanian data manifest the same semantic function:

(3) *Ir vis dėlto turgus gyvena savo gyvenimą, nuo ryto skubėjo žmonės apsipirkti, kad turėtų maisto produktų, kad ramiai praleistų poilsio dienas.* (D)

(4) *Tik naujas turgus mus išlaisvins nuo šios pareigos*", – sakė A. Chmieliauskas. (D)

(5) *Ne mažesnis absurdas, kai jaunas mokslininkas iš anksto žino neturėsiąs darbo vietas, o juk **turgus** priimą ir be mokslo vardų ar laipsnių.* (D)

(6) *Šiais dalykais vienodai turi rūpintis ir **turgus**, ir rotušė.* (D)

The material process can involve two or more than two participants: *Affected Patient, Effected (Result), Recipient and Beneficiary*. The *Effected Patient* means one that 'suffers', or 'undergoes' the process. In the surface structure the *Affected Patient* corresponds to the *Subject* or the *Direct Object* in both languages English and Lithuanian. Consider:

(7) *It's all too much for one dealer yesterday as **the futures market** is hit with its busiest day.* (BNC)

(8) ***The betting market** was thrown into confusion, and the stewards announced an inquiry.* (BNC)

(9) ***The Saturday morning market** in the yard was taken from the pattern of the street market, where the clothes were laid out in heaps on the ground with a decent garment on the top of each pile to tempt the passer-by to look further.* (BNC)

(10) *Tokiu atveju **turgus** bus priverstas užsidaryti, nes naujajam savininkui būsime konkurentai*, – „Kauno dieniai“ pasakojo turguje dirbantys kauniečiai. (D)

(11) *Vėliau miestiečių mėgstamas ir populiarus **turgus** buvo nušluotas nuo žemės paviršiaus, aikštė sutvarkyta, o jos viduryje atsirado „geležinis Feliksas“ – pirmojo čekisto Felikso Dzeržinskio skulptūra.* (D)

(12) *Parlamentaras pažadėjo artimiausiame Kauno miesto tarybos posėdyje pateikti projektą, kuriuo stoties **turgus** būtų išbrauktas iš privatizuojamų objektų sąrašo.* (D)

(13) *Taigi ir **turgus** slegia tos pačios bėdos.* (D)

(14) *Sokrato gėda bematant prasismelkia pro gyvenamųjų namų sienas, įsime-ta į bankus ir kontorą, nusirita požeminėmis perėjomis, sukrečia parduotuves bei **turgus**, užmuodija fabrikus, akimirksniu užpildo radiją bei telefoną, <...>.* (D)

An *Effected* participant is what is called 'object of result', i.e. the result of the action of the verb. In the surface structure, the *Effected* is realized as the *Direct Objective Complement* in the active sentence and as the *Subject* in the passive sentence. For example:

(15) *That was some sort of night," continued Sheila "they actually **turned the market place** into a dance hall."* (BNC)

(16) *This little Hampshire **market** town had not been designed for crowds such as these, and everyone kept on getting in everyone else's way.* (BNC)

(17) *Pinigų mokykloms prasimanydavome **rengdami** loterijas- **turgus**, balius.* (D)

(18) *Tada Vilniuje prie „Kolūkio turgaus“, taip buvo **pakrikštytas Kalvarijų turgus**, buvo švarus bufetėlis, nors kartais labai įkaitindavęs kraują, bet vadina-mas „Šiaurine“.* (D)

(19) *Praėjusį šeštadienį Varėnoje **atidarytas gyvulių turgus**, į kurią prigužėjo nemažai žmonių: su paršeliais, veršeliais, ožkomis ir avimis.* (D)

(20) *Kai bus **pastatytas naujasis turgus**, savo egzistavimą baigs dabartinė tur-gavietė prie stoties.* (D)

One further participant, which may occur in a material process clause, is the *Beneficiary*, which is of two kinds: “a Recipient (the one to whom something is given), and a Client (the one for whom something is done)” (E g g i n s 1994, 233). Consider:

(21) *So if my company wishes to supply the domestic market of this large and expanding population.* (BNC)

(22) *We raised sheep, corn and crops for the local market and sold hunting rights to our neighbors.* (BNC)

However, in the Lithuanian corpus, the examples with the word *turgus* functioning as *Beneficiary* were not found. Thus the examples with the word *mugė* are presented below in order to illustrate the semantic function:

(23) *Mugės rengėjai, norėdami pasižvalgyti po Vidurio bei Rytų Europos knygų rinkas ir suteikti mugei bendraeuropietišką kontekstą, sumanė kasmet plačiau pristatyti kokios nors šalies knygas.* (D)

(24) *Įvairių šalių firmos pateikė mugei labai daug įvairiausios formos laiptų patalpoms, daugiausia iš klijuotos medienos, plieno arba iš medienos ir plieno.* (D)

In the surface structure of the sentence they functioned as *Indirect Objective Complements*.

Involved in the mental process sentences, the words *market* and *turgus* play the semantic function of the *Senser*, or the *Recipient Experiencer*, that perceives, knows, likes, etc. Both words carry out such rational functions as those of perception, judgment, decision taking, etc. The empirical evidence, especially of the Lithuanian part, for the use of this word abounds, as can be seen from the examples below where the processes mapped on the predicates denote the hallmarks of intelligent activity:

(25) *New council housing supremo Arnold Phillips admitted yesterday that the market is so depressed he can't even find a home for himself.* (BNC)

(26) *A new market initially needs three things: investment, faith and vision.* (BNC)

(27) *Beje, Marijampolės turgus daugiausia ir tikisi pirkėjų iš Rytų, nes jie, kaip sakyta, moka pinigų nesiderėdami.* (BNC)

(28) *Turgus išsigando „Vilniaus prekybos“.* (D)

(29) *Turgus nori, kad visi prekiautujo pavidijone.* (D)

(30) *Turgus nuo seno bene lanksčiausiai reaguoja į žmonių poreikius.* (D)

(31) *Turgus pasigenda valdžios dėmesio.* (D)

(32) *Ir turgus supranta reklamos svarbą.* (D)

(33) *Cukraus ir miltų stygiaus turgus taip pat nejaučia.* (D)

(34) *Turgus neketina nusileisti Pasak „Šilainių turgaus“ direktoriaus Algimanto Jakniūno, dėl šalia pradėjusios veikti „Maximos“ turgus ypatingų sunkumų nepatiria.* (D)

(35) *Prasidėjus reidui, po kelių minučių apie tai žino visas turgus, informacija sklinda akimirksniu.* (D)

(36) **Turgūs** *laukia* geresnių laikų. (D)

(37) *Žaibiškai reagavo* **turgūs**. (D)

There is usually a second participant, the *Phenomenon*, which is perceived, known, looked, etc. The Phenomenon stands as a ‘consequence’ of the *Senser* (*Recipient Experiencer*). The words under investigation may fulfil this function as well in both languages. Consider:

(38) *As she speaks we see* a **Masai market**. (BNC)

(39) *I loved* **the market**. *I loved its moods*. (BNC)

(40) *My house is right in the middle of Stratford-upon-Avon, and I can watch* **the street market** *from my window*. (BNC)

(41) *Tebrise Markas pirmąkart pamatė didžiausią pasaulyje perlų* **turgų**. (D)

(42) *Esame girdėję ne tik iš savų šaltinių, bet ir miesto valdžios atstovų, kad* **turgumi** *susidomėjo „Vilniaus prekyba“*. (D)

(43) *Ar skubantys Šv. Gertrūdos gatve šiandien* **beprisimena**, *tarkim, abu senosius* **turgus**? (D)

A relational process does not involve an action or require some entity to act upon another. The central meaning of clauses of this type is that something *is* in English and *yra* in Lithuanian. Thomson (1996:86) claims that this process means a static relationship. It means being and expresses the relationship, which is set up between two things or concepts. Furthermore, this process expresses the notion of being something or somewhere. The participant involved in this process is called the *Carrier*. Consider:

(44) **The street market** *is* a real Aladdin’s cave of goodies where you can pick up anything from hand painted papyrus pictures or exquisite glassware to jewelry or fine rugs at ridiculous prices. (BNC)

(45) **The market** *was* in full swing as they made their way slowly round the piazza, <...>. (BNC)

(46) “What you also have to realize, Floyd, is that **markets** *have* a life cycle too. (BNC)

(47) **Turgus** – *tartum miesto veidrodīs*. (D)

(48) *O pokario* **turgus** *atrodė* *ispūdingai*. (D)

(49) *Jis sako, kad Papilėj* **turgus** *buvo ir bus*, – *paaiškina miestelio gudruolė*. (D)

(50) *Dabar ūkinis Molėtų miesto* **turgus** *yra* *prie gražaus Pastovio ežero*. (D)

The second participant involved in the relational process is called the *Attribute*, which usually functions as the predicative in both languages. There is an intensive relationship between *Carrier* and its *Attribute* and the function of the *Attribute* is to characterize the *Carrier*:

(51) *Evidently there was* **a market** *not far away, for there were plenty of housewives with shopping bags bulging with fresh vegetables and fruit, <...>*. (BNC)

(52) *That is* **the river market** *you see before you in the water*. (BNC)

(53) *Here on the Island we have* **a mature market**. (BNC)

(54) *Gerosė parduotuvėse gerai aptarnauja, o turgus visame pasaulyje yra* **turgus**. (D)

(55) *Visi gi žino, kad į Marijampolę, kur yra garsusis automobilių turgus, važiuojama ne tuščiomis.* (D)

(56) *Sutiktojo praevio paklausėme, kur čia yra turgus, kuriame būtų galima ne tik nusipirkti maisto, bet ir drabužių, kitokių prekių.* (D)

(57) *Gatvėje yra ir smulkmenų turgus, susiburia joje ir žaidėjai kortomis bei kauliukais.* (D)

The results in this part show that the relationship between the types of semantic functions and syntactic functions is inseparable. Furthermore, the personification takes place, i.e. *market* and *turgus* may appear in the personified position of the *Subject* or the *Object*.

Conclusions

A cross-linguistic analysis of *market* in English and *turgus* in Lithuanian has proved the raised hypothesis that in both languages the words under analysis play the same functions (roles), that is of *Agent*, *Affected Patient*, *Effected (Result)*, *Recipient*, *Beneficiary*, *Carrier*, *Attribute*, *Senser*, and *Phenomenon*. In the surface structure of a sentence they performed the syntactic functions of the *Subject*, the *Direct Objective Complement*, and the *Indirect Objective Complement*.

Considering the mappings of semantic functions to syntactic functions in the two languages, it is possible to state that that syntax has the influence in determining the semantic functions used in both languages.

The present study has been limited to a fairly small scope. However, the analysis of the words *market* and *turgus* in the two languages has provided new possibilities for investigating the meaning extensions (like in English *bazaar*, *market-place*, *stalls*, etc.; in Lithuanian *turgelis*, *jomarkas*, *kermošius*, etc.) from a cross-linguistic perspective.

References

- Allan 1986 – Keith Allan, *Linguistic Meaning*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ambrasas 1986 – Vytautas Ambrazas, „Lietuvių kalbos sakinio sintaksinės ir semantinės struktūros vienetai“, *Lietuvių kalbos sintaksės tyrinėjimai. Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai*, Vilnius: Mokslas, 25, 4–44.
- Baranauskienė 2004 – Rita Baranauskienė, „Agento semantinės funkcijos prie veiksmažodžio samprata“, *Tiltai*, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla, 1, 109–114.
- Baranauskienė 2006 – Rita Baranauskienė, „Veiksmažodžių numatoma linksnių patiento funkcija ir jos atmainos“, *Kalbų vienetų semantika ir struktūra*, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla, 5–11.
- Downing, Locke 1992 – Angela Downing and Philip Locke, *A University Course in English Grammar*, London: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Dowty 1991 – David Dowty, “Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection”, *Language*, 67(3), 547–619.
- Drukteinis 2007 – Albinas Drukteinis, „Sakinio semantinių struktūrų ryšiai ir semantinių funkcijų hierarchija“, *Res Humanitariae II*, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla, 7–35.

- Drukteinis 2009 – Albinas Drukteinis, „Semantinės sakinių struktūros su sinkretinės reikšmės predikatais“, *Res Humanitariae*, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla, 24–41.
- Fillmore 1968 – Charles Fillmore, “The Case for Case”, *Universals in Linguistic Theory*, (eds. Bach, E. and Horns, R. T.), New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc. 1–88.
- Gerot, Wignell 1994 – Linda Gerot, Peter Wignell, *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*, Cammeray: Antipodean Educational Enterprises.
- Gruber 1976 – Jeffrey Gruber, *Lexical Structure in Syntax and Semantics*, Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Halliday 1984 – Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday, *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, Hasan 1989 – Michael Alexander Kirkwood Halliday, Ruqaiya Hasan, *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackendoff 1972 – Ray Jackendoff, *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Jakaitienė 1988 – Evalda Jakaitienė, *Leksinė semantika*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Krinickaitė 2003 – Stasė Krinickaitė, „Lietuvių kalbos objektinių veiksmažodžių semantika“, *Lituanistica*, 1, 53–61.
- Martin 1992 – James Martin, *English Text: System and Structure*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Saeed 2000 – John Saeed, *Semantics*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, Ltd.
- Sližienė 1994 – Nijolė Sližienė, *Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių junglumo žodynas*, t. 1, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.
- Valeika 1998 – Laimutis Valeika, *An Introductory Course in Semantic Syntax*, Vilnius: Vilnius University Press.
- Van Valin, LaPolla 2002 – Robert Van Valin and Randy LaPolla, *Syntax. Structure, Meaning and Function*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sources

- British National Corpus Online service (<http://sara.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/>): the site of Variation in English Words and Phrases (View), developed by Mark Davies at Brigham Young University (<http://view.byu.edu/>).
- The corpus compiled by the Computational Linguistics Centre in Kaunas Vytautas Magnus University (<http://donelaitis.vdu.lt>).

Solveiga Sušinskienė

Žodžio *turgus* semantinės funkcijos anglų ir lietuvių kalbose

S a n t r a u k a

Pagrindinės sąvokos: *turgus, procesas, funkcija, vaidmuo.*

Šiame straipsnyje, remiantis M. A. K. Halidėjaus *Funkcine gramatika* (1994), siekiama aptarti ir sugretinti su *turgaus* (angl. *market*) žodžiu lietuvių ir anglų kalbose siejamas ir sakinio struktūrą atspindinčias semantines funkcijas (vaidmenis). Apie jų įvairovę nemažai rašyta, tačiau nėra tokių tyrimų, kuriuose būtų gretinama dviejų kalbų medžiaga. Semantinės funkcijos priklauso nuo daiktavardžių ar daiktavardinių frazių santykio su veiksmažodžiu. Šiame darbe semantinės funkcijos sakinio struktūroje yra siejamos su paviršinei sakinio struktūrai būdingomis sintaksinėmis funkcijomis. Keliama hipotezė, kad lietuvių ir anglų kalbose su *turgaus* (angl. *market*) žodžiu siejami semantiniai vaidmenys iš esmės nesiskiria.

Straipsnio teiginius iliustruojantys pavyzdžiai rinkti iš *Britų nacionalinio tekstyno* ir *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos tekstyno*. Darbe pasitelkiami gretinamasis, kontrastinis ir komponentinės analizės metodai.

Gretinamoji žodžio *turgus* (angl. *market*) analizė atskleidė, kad abiejose kalbose su šiuo žodžiu siejami tie patys semantiniai vaidmenys: agento, patiento, rezultato, recipiento, beneficento, veiksmo atlikėjo, atributyvo, patyrėjo ir fenomeno. Paviršinėje sakinio struktūroje tai atitinka veiksnio, tiesioginio papildinio ir netiesioginio papildinio funkcijas.

Atsižvelgiant į tai, kad semantinės funkcijos priklauso nuo sintaksinių funkcijų, galima teigti, kad abiejose kalbose paviršinė sakinio struktūra yra susijusi su gilumine sakinio struktūra.

Solveiga Sušinskienė

The Semantic Functions of the Word *Market* in English and Lithuanian

S u m m a r y

Keywords: *market, process, function, role.*

Within the theoretical framework of Hallidayan *Functional Grammar* (1994), an attempt is made to analyze the words *market* and *turgus* in English and Lithuanian, i.e. what semantic functions (roles) they perform in the deep structure of a sentence (clause). Semantic roles are assigned to nouns and NPs according to the relation they hold with the verb. Despite detailed studies on the semantic diversity of syntactic roles, there are very few substantial empirical studies that have taken up the contrastive investigations in cross-linguistic perspective. Thus the aim of the present study is to describe and contrast semantic functions of the words *market* in English and *turgus* in Lithuanian. This study considers the mapping of semantic functions to syntactic functions in English and Lithuanian. The

following working hypothesis has been formed: English and Lithuanian do not essentially differ with respect to the scope of semantic functions of the words *market* and *turgus*.

The corpus citations are taken from the two largest general reference corpora available in the languages under study, namely the British National Corpus and DONELAITIS compiled by the Computational Linguistics Centre in Kaunas Vytautas Magnus University. The study is contrastive, thus the research was carried out within the framework of the contrastive method. Similar to all lexical elements (i.e. words), the proposition can be viewed as consisting of semantic elements, or components, such as Processes, Participants and Circumstances. Thus the use of the method of componential analysis made it possible to establish the meaning of the proposition, which is constituted by respective semantic elements.

A cross-linguistic analysis of *market* in English and *turgus* in Lithuanian has proved the raised hypothesis that in both languages the words under analysis play the same roles, that is of *Agent*, *Affected Patient*, *Effected (Result)*, *Recipient*, *Beneficiary*, *Carrier*, *Attribute*, *Senser*, and *Phenomenon*. In the surface structure of a sentence they performed the syntactic functions of the *Subject*, the *Direct Objective Complement*, and the *Indirect Objective Complement*.

Considering the semantic diversity of semantic subjects and objects in English and Lithuanian and the mappings of semantic functions to syntactic functions in the two languages, it is possible to state that that syntax has an influence in determining the semantic functions used in both languages.

Solveiga SUŠINSKIENĖ
Anglų filologijos katedra
Šiaulių universitetas
P. Višinskio g. 38
LT-76352 Šiauliai
[Solveigas@gmail.com]