

Dejan M. Karavesović¹
University of Kragujevac
Faculty of Philology and Arts
English Department

ON THE CONSTITUENT STATUS OF INFINITIVAL COMPLEMENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN

The paper investigates the constituent status of infinitival complement constructions in the contemporary English language and their infinitival counterparts in the Serbian language. The motivation for this type of research has been found in the observation that the infinitival complements in both languages are either described by the term 'clause' or there is no terminological specification indicating their constituent status. As this may possibly lead to inconsistencies in the treatment of infinitival complements in terms of their grammatical description, this paper attempts to determine the nature of the constituent status of infinitival complements by the use of syntactic and semantic criteria presented in Dixon (2006). Drawing from the data collected from the sources on the topic belonging to both English and Serbian linguistic traditions, the analysis has revealed that when analysed at the level of surface-syntax the infinitival constructions in English indeed represent clausal constructions both in the structural and semantic sense, while the analysis of their analogue counterparts in Serbian goes in favour of grammatically treating infinitival complements as phrasal units, while acknowledging that traces of clausality exist at the semantic level of analysis. Given the crosslinguistic nature of the research, the obtained results may serve as a contribution to the grammatical descriptions of both analysed languages, but can also be of interest to the considerations of complement constructions within typological and contrastive studies in a general sense.

Keywords: infinitival complements, English, Serbian, syntactic constituency, verb phrase, clause

1. INTRODUCTION

As a complex and diverse phenomenon, verb complementation² has been investigated from various theoretical and applied perspectives, becoming one of the most explored areas of syntactic research. Although numerous typological and descriptive studies have shed considerable light on the phenomenon, it has been duly observed that there are still some issues that remain unresolved, such as its structural and categorial character or the nature of the relations and

1 karavesovic@filum.kg.ac.rs

2 The term verbal here applies to both the verb as the governing element of the complement construction and the complement itself which contains the verbal element. Hence, the complementation involving nominal or adjectival types has been excluded from the analysis.

grammatical specification between the respective units constituting the complex predicate (see Bergs 2021: 145). The versatility of coverage has undoubtedly resulted in a thorough treatment of the topic, yet it has also led to certain discrepancies, especially when complementation is treated within different linguistic traditions, disciplines or theoretical frameworks. One such issue is the subject matter of this paper and it concerns the structural specification of the English and Serbian³ infinitival complement constructions (henceforth ICCs) with regard to the type of their grammatical constituency. More specifically, it investigates whether ICCs represent clausal or phrasal grammatical units, an issue to be expounded in more detail in the following sections.

The interest in this topic arose from the fact that grammatical literature recognises that both E and S contain structures which can be identified as infinitival complements to the verbs, yet without devoting much attention to the elaboration of the precise constituent status of the said constructions or the properties that qualify them as such.⁴ It is therefore the aim of this research to try to specify the grammatical status of ICCs in E and S by applying a set of tests for syntactic clausality, taking into account their relevant syntactic and semantic properties. Leaving the methodological aspects until the next section, a brief exposition concerning the notions of complementation and clausality in E and S is in order.

In terms of syntactic material that serves as an extension of the verbal part of the predicate, two different phenomena are typically distinguished: complements and adjuncts. Since verbal complements are as a rule grammatically bound constituents, they invariably represent dependent constructions governed by the matrix verbs. While adjuncts are typically considered to be optional elements functioning as syntactic modifiers, complements are considered to be obligatory arguments of verbs. They complete the underspecified semantics of the governing verb, thus generally falling within the realm of the grammatical category of transitivity (Alanović 2019: 35; Crystal 2008: 92; Piper et al. 2005: 299; Quirk et al. 1985: 54). Additionally, complements tend to be distributionally inflexible, while most adjuncts allow for the change of the syntactic position although this is by no means a universal feature. Complement constructions are structurally and semantically quite diverse, leading some of the authors to colourfully characterize them “as intricate and varied as the patterns on a Persian tapestry” (Ransom 1986: 1).

The second major notion relevant for this study concerns the concept of the *clause*, as opposed to the hierarchically lower unit, the *phrase*. The criteria of ‘clausehood’ and ‘phrasehood’ are not universally agreed upon, but a majority of sources links the phrase with the concept of the syntactic head, around which accompanying dependents cluster, while clauses are mostly associated

3 These two languages and their corresponding adjectives will respectively be labelled E and S in the remainder of the text. Also, in the provided examples the ICCs will be marked by underlining, while for the governing VPs *italic* script will be used.

4 The treatment of infinitival complements as clausal structures has been most elaborately developed at the level of D (or deep) structure within the earlier generative linguistic tradition.

with the realisation of a subject and a predicate (Huddleston, Pullum 2002: 44; Quirk et al. 1985: 50). Additionally, taking into account its semantic character, a clause can be described as the smallest grammatical unit that can express a complete proposition. Although English ICCs are almost invariably characterized as clausal units in the literature (Aarts 2001; Bergs 2021; Cristofaro 2003; Dixon 2006; Egan 2008; Mair 1987; Ransom 1986), Serbian ICCs are generally not considered so, but explicit designation as phrasal constructions are rare (see Alanović 2019: 92). For our purposes, the phrase will structurally be identified as the syntactic constituent containing a categorial head which can further be expanded by means of modifiers or complements. Also, the clause will structurally be seen as the combination of a subject and predicate, which in turn semantically denotes a situation consisting of participants and the realisation of the situation in question.⁵

2. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The investigation in the present paper is based on the contrastive analysis of the main features of ICCs in E and S. Since the contrastive analysis is heavily supported by the material found in the relevant literature predominantly treating the explored phenomena independently from the other linguistic tradition, the languages included in the analysis have the same status in terms of the direction of comparison. The analysis has been conducted by having recourse to several tests presented below, which are commonly associated with the structural specification of the type of the considered constituents. Furthermore, under the assumption that language phenomena need not operate within strict and impermeable limits, it is posited that the broad generalizations drawn from the results of this type of research bear validity despite the existence of certain cases where some of the observed behaviour cannot be readily accounted for. It should be noted that one of the principles used as the indicator of a certain ICC's property is the potential of a specific feature to be realised. In other words, if an occurrence of a feature can be registered, it is taken to be an attested property of the analysed structure, which in certain circumstances may or may not be realised, depending on the linguistic nature of the governing verb and its complement.

The analysis is based on the grammatical criteria for identifying complement clauses presented in Dixon (2006: 15). Dixon observes that clausal complements can be recognised as such if they satisfy the following conditions:

- a) they “must have the internal constituent structure of a clause, at least as far as the core arguments are concerned”;

5 Piper and Klajn (2013: 454) point to the fact that Serbian literature tends to use the term *klauza* to refer to a subordinate sentential construction, but at the same time they acknowledge that the term can also have the same meaning as the one used in this paper, referring to the combination of a predicate and its accompanying principal arguments in general. Since a terminological distinction between the ‘clause’ and ‘sentence’ in the previously mentioned general sense is immaterial for the discussion at hand, the former term will be used throughout the paper, denoting the largest unit of syntax elaborated in the text above.

- b) they “function as a core argument of a higher clause”;
- c) they “always describe propositions” and
- d) “they function as a core argument [...] for verbs with meanings such as ‘see’, ‘hear’, ‘know’, ‘believe’, and ‘like’.”⁶

As this type of research does not presume to be comprehensive, it is also assumed that even partial coverage of ICCs can serve as a representative indicator of the character of the analysed structures. The methodological principle adhered to here is that the investigated properties can be considered valid if they exhibit a systemic character, meaning that they can in some way be attributed to the entire verbal system of any of the investigated languages, either by their presence or absence.

Having in mind that the consulted literature on the topic belongs to different linguistic traditions and that the used terminology significantly varies in this respect, the analysis will remain within the limits of surface syntax and the employed terminology adapted to suit this framework. The main reason behind this approach is to avoid the likely conflict between various, often opposing metalinguistic and theoretical milieus present in the consulted literature, which is why the analytical level of surface syntax, as arguably the most neutral analytical framework for the present purposes, has been adopted. Consequently, the applied analysis allows for only broad generalizations, which are still considered to be valid as they pave the way for future, more detailed investigations on the investigated phenomena. Unless otherwise indicated in the brackets, all the examples have been excerpted from electronic textual sources, namely *Dorotej* for the Serbian examples, and *COBUILD* for the English ones, in which the analysed structures are found in the contextualised, sentential environment, which is taken to reflect their use in the real world.⁷ As regards the organisational aspects of the paper, the remainder of the paper includes the sections in which the structural and semantic factors involved in determining the constituent type of ICCs are presented, followed by the concluding section in which the tests given above have been applied in accordance with the previously presented data and relevant conclusions have been drawn.

3. *STRUCTURAL FACTORS*

What the typological studies have shown (see Dixon 2006; Noonan 1985; Ransom 1986) is that certain formal and syntactic factors play an important role in determining the clausal constituent status. Some of the formal properties that can be taken into account here are the ones involved in the agreement

6 Dixon’s use of the term Extension (E) can roughly be associated with the more common notion of ditransitivity in E and S, while in languages with a different typological configuration of transitivity it may represent a sort of argument distinct from the direct or indirect object (cf. Dixon 2006: 8).

7 *Dorotej* is a part of the searchable online Anthology of Serbian Literature (available at: http://www.antologijasrpskeknjizevnosti.rs/ASK_EN_AzbucnikDela.aspx), while *COBUILD* represents a stand-alone electronic lexical repository.

between the subject and the verbal part of the predicate. The agreement is usually manifested through the occurrence of formal linguistic markers such as affixes, but the distribution of syntactic elements and the use of a specialised syntactic component that introduces complements should also be considered. Bearing this in mind, the analysis will begin by investigating the main forms of ICCs in E and S, inasmuch as these properties may be considered relevant for the elaboration in hand.

Canonical infinitives in E contain no inflectional or derivational elements showing their infinitival status, so their status is mainly indicated by their distribution.⁸ Yet, in their non-canonical forms, E infinitives can be marked for other verbal grammatical categories, namely progressive (1a) and perfect aspect (1b), as well as grammatical voice (1c), or some combinations of them (1d-e). No formal markers of the verbal categories of tense, mood, number and person can be found in the E infinitival constructions.

- a) The fire *is thought* to have been started in an upstairs room. *perfect*
 b) We're *supposed* to be running the business here. I've got work to do. *progressive*
 c) The information is there and *waiting* to be accessed by anyone with the *passive*
 wit to use it.
 d) The Council *is said* to have been overpaying for the repairs made by its *perfect progressive*
 housing department.
 e) The picture *is believed* to have been being painted for years.⁹ *perfect progressive*
passive

The Serbian infinitive, on the other hand, is morphologically marked by the suffix *-ti/-ći* and regularly classified in the Serbian linguistic literature as an invariable verb form since it cannot be conjugated in its canonical form (Ivić 1972; Mrazović; Vukadinović 2009; Piper et al. 2005).¹⁰ However, an often neglected property of S infinitives is their potential to be marked for passive voice (Piper, Klajn 2013: 184-185), which in turn indirectly extends the range of the grammatical categories potentially realised in the infinitives to the categories of number and gender, as in the example (2a-b).

- (1) a) Udobnost i komocija ne *smеju biti narušene*. (Dorotej) [*plural, feminine*]

8 The infinitival particle *to* is not taken here to represent a morphological marker of the infinitive, but a complementiser, since in many environments the use of *to* is conditioned by the governing element, such as modal or certain catenative verbs: The show must *go on*. / People heard him *sigh*. / She'll make you *apologize*. etc. Also, the sequence *to + infinitive* can be interrupted by a modifying segment, in the so-called 'split infinitives', as in a famous catch-phrase *to boldly go where no man has gone before*, which is morphologically highly problematic if the structure is to be treated as a single lexical unit.

9 Example (1e) was taken from <https://www.grammaring.com/the-forms-of-the-infinitive> [retrieved 11.9.2020]

10 In Serbian, the category of aspect is realised as the inherent property of the verb itself, where all lexical verbs manifest distinctions between the perfective/imperfective aspect, either overtly expressed by an affix, or covertly conveyed by the semantics of the verbal lexeme or other grammatical factors in the case of the so-called biaspectual verbs (Ser. *dvovidski glagoli*). However, a certain echo of the verbal distinction between the perfective and imperfective verbs can be found in deverbal nominals (cf. *čitanje/iščitavanje*), which are also quite commonly realised as verbal complements.

b) Možemo svi mi ovde odreda da izginemo, svi, koliko god nas je u Kuli, ali temelji crkve ne *smēju biti dirnuti*. (Dorotej) [*plural, masculine*]

As the examples above show, infinitivals in both languages can express grammatical features which go beyond the mere identification of the verb as a syntactic category. What is important here is the question whether these features play a part in the agreement between the subject and verbal part of the predicate, thus potentially signalling the clausal status of the ICCs.¹¹ E does not have a developed inflectional system, so few instances of agreement between the subject and VP occur, namely the singular NP and 3rd person singular present for lexical verbs, and the grammatical person and number distinctions of the verb *be* in the present and past forms with the corresponding singular or plural NP, neither of which is manifested in the E infinitives. Contrary to E, S verbal system manifests a fully developed inflectional paradigm, where the subject-VP agreement plays a significant role. However, the fact that S infinitives cannot express overt subjects cancels the need for establishing agreement, at least at the surface level of investigation.

Although formal factors can be associated with the notion of clausality, what is usually taken to be one of the primary criteria for establishing a clausal status of a verbal construction is its argument structure (Aarts 2001; Cristofaro 2003; Dixon 2006; Huddleston, Pullum 2002; Piper et al. 2005; Quirk et al. 1985). A subject is typically considered to be the principal, yet external argument of a VP. The predicate can contain another principal, but this time internal argument, that of the object. What sets the ICCs in E and S apart is the fact that the ICCs in E in some instance allow a subject to be expressed, while S infinitives, as a rule, cannot have overt subjects in any form, not only in complement positions, but in other uses as well (see example 2a-c). That being said, it must be noted that coreferentiality between the subject of the governing VP and the corresponding (un)realised external argument in the infinitival one is, however, possible in both languages. This can be shown if an attempt is made to promote the ICC into a finite clause, thus making the subject of ICC identical to the one of the governing VP (see Piper et al. 2005: 472). The coreferentiality of the governing VP subject and its unexpressed analogue in the ICC is the most frequent option in both languages (3a-b), but there are also non-coreferential instances (4a-b) (cf. Egan 2008: 20; Ivić 1972: 120; Mair 1990: 101; Piper et al. 2005: 550). The absence of an explicit subject can be attributed to the deletion of a specified subject, since in most instances it is fully retrievable (Ransom 1986: 29).¹²

(2) a) I_i *want* [PRO_i] to meet your friends. *Želim_i* [PRO_i?] *upoznati* tvoje prijatelje.

11 Vincent (1999: 335) observes that there are languages, such as Portuguese, in which infinitives can be the carriers of the agreement features, a characteristic which is excluded from all non-finite constructions in E or S.

12 In some generative frameworks, the status of the clausal subjects is regulated by the EPP (Extended Projection Principle), which formulates that a clause must require a syntactic subject, whether explicitly realised or realised as a phonologically null, empty category usually labelled PRO.

- b) I_i *want* John_j to meet your friends. *Želim_i Džon_j upoznati tvoje prijatelje.
 c) I_i *want* him_j to meet your friends. *Želim_i on_j/njega_j upoznati tvoje prijatelje.
- (3) a) The firm_i offered [PRO_i] to give her a reference. (COBUILD)
 b) On_i se ne da [PRO_i] uznemiravati. (Mrazović & Vukadinović 2009: 537)
- (4) a) I_i *ordered* the chauffeur_j to fetch the car. (Mair 1990: 134)
 b) *Naučio*_i ga_j je [PRO_i] pisati. (Piper et al. 2005: 550)

Being inextricably associated with the category of grammatical transitivity, the notion of argument structure is also linked with the mechanism of passivisation. It has been widely held that passivisation is an operation associated with the whole clause, as it involves not just the VP in hand, but also both primary arguments, i.e. the subject and object of the active construction. As the verbal complementation involves two VPs interacting to form a complex predicate, both VPs may potentially be subject to passivisation, especially if one is to assume that they represent two separate clausal constituents.¹³

Starting with the first possibility, we can see that in the E examples in (5) the entire ICC serves as the indirect object of the higher active clause (5a), while the examples (5b-c) illustrate their passive counterparts, with the ICC syntactically promoted into the subject position in (5b). However, the grammaticality of Serbian ICCs in the role of a subject of a passive construction is rather dubious (6a), and in a majority of cases in S they appear to be fully unacceptable (see 7b), unlike their status as syntactic objects.

- (5) a) Although they have eight children, they do not *recommend* other couples to have families of this size. (COBUILD)
 b) Although they have eight children, to have families of this size is not *recommended* to other couples.
 c) Although they have eight children, other couples *are* not *recommended* to have families of this size.
- (6) a) *Zabranili su* mi dolaziti kasno. [ICC as the object of the active sentence]
 b)?Dolaziti kasno (mi) *je zabranjeno*. [ICC as the subject of the passive sentence]
 c) Dolaženje kasno mi *je zabranjeno*. [Deverbal noun as a subject of the passive sentence]
 d) Da dolazim kasno mi *je zabranjeno*. [Finite clause as the subject of the passive sentence]
- (7) a) *Voleli su* dolaziti na livadu. [ICC as the object of the active sentence]
 b) *Dolaziti na livadu (im) *je voljeno*. [ICC as the subject of the passive sentence]

¹³ Mair (1990: 98), however, notes that passivisation cannot be a sole criterion for the classification of infinitival complements due to various syntactic and semantic relations achieved between the structures involved in the ICCs.

Another factor to be taken into account is the possibility of the passivisation test to only apply to the complement structure, as in (8), where the E versions clearly allow for the entire right-hand argument to be subjected to passivisation, while that is not the case with the S counterpart because the resulting construction renders the ungrammatical construction:

- (8) a) John wanted to drink wine_(active) : John wanted wine to be drank_(passive)
 b) Jovan htede piti vina_(active) : *Jovan htede vino biti pijeno_(passive)

The final syntactic criterion of the clausal status to be investigated in the predicates containing ICCs concerns the presence of the so-called *complementiser*, the lexical element introducing the complement clause.¹⁴ When it comes to ICCs, E is characterised by the use of two principal complementisers in declarative contexts – *to* and *for*¹⁵ – along with *whether* in reported interrogatives. Again, their use varies from one ICC to another, in terms of their obligatoriness, selection of a finite or non-finite structure, as well as whether they require an explicit subject or not.¹⁶ Contrary to the situation in E, no ICC in S can be introduced by a complementiser, which serves as a clear indicator of their limited potential to represent a clausal unit.

4. SEMANTIC FACTORS

As R. M. Dixon (2006: 16) explains, “[a] complement clause will always describe a proposition; this can be a fact, an activity, or a potential state,” thus formulating the main semantic factor involved in the identification of the clausal status of a complement. What Dixon designates as the proposition¹⁷ is “something involving at least one participant who is involved in an activity or state” (Dixon 2006: 19). In line with this, yet formulated in a somewhat more specific linguistic fashion, the proposition will for the present purposes be viewed as the semantic content conveyed by the verbal part of the predicate and its associated arguments.¹⁸ Essentially, it represents a description of an extralinguistic event, formally corresponding to a declarative clause, which

14 Brought into the limelight within the domain of generative syntax, the term has now been widely used in other, non-generative theoretical frameworks as well (cf. Egan 2008; Mair 1990; Moskovljević 2004).

15 It is generally agreed that both *to* and *for* manifest traces of their prepositional origin (Egan 2008: 95), evidenced in contemporary English by the capacity of *for* to assign the accusative case, much like prepositions, and unlike conjunctions, which typically do not assign case.

16 Vincent (1999: 355), for example, observes that *for* represents an element “whose only role is to licence the expression of the subject” in a predicate with the ICC.

17 The *proposition* is a term widely employed, both in the domain of linguistics (chiefly semantics and pragmatics) and philosophy. It is a complex phenomenon subject to various interpretations, but the designation provided above will suffice for the present purposes.

18 Some languages do not necessitate the verb to be overtly present for a full proposition to be realised, as is the case with Russian copular constructions: e.g. *окно разбило* = the window [is] broken. A similar case can be found in the so-called *small clauses*, which are often verbless constructions in which the predication is achieved by means of their potential for the missing verbal component to be mentally reconstructed (e.g. *The teacher believes him smart*. → *The teacher believes him [to be] smart*).

can also include all modal elements contributing to the definitive interpretation of linguistic construction.

Since the semantic content of the proposition can be associated with the notions of predication and argumenthood, which are analogous to the syntactic properties of a clause, the test involved in the determination of the propositionality also necessitates that the complement structure includes the semantic entity representing the subject and the one denoting a predicate. In light of this, it can be concluded that complement clauses are also propositional in nature, which is formally reflected in the fact that all complement clauses are declarative constructions (Crystal 2008: 392; Piper et al. 2005: 27). However, the declarative form of the verbal complement does not necessarily presuppose its use as a mere descriptor of situations realised as statements, but as directives or interrogatives as well. With this in mind, what serves as an additional factor in deciding whether the ICCs in E and S represent clausal elements is their potential to express different types of illocutionary force. In E, the illocutionary force in predicates containing ICCs can be signalled by the meaning of the governing verb itself (9), but also by the complementisers, where the complementiser *for* marks a construction acting as a statement (10), while *whether* introduces interrogative structures (11).

- (9) He *instructed* switchboard staff to divert all Laura's calls for him. (COBUILD)
- (10) The man *signaled for* me to gather the children together. (COBUILD)
- (11) At the telephone table he paused, *wondering whether* to ring the local station. (COBUILD)

As mentioned before, ICCs in S are not accompanied by complementisers, which in S are reserved for finite complements, so the potential illocution of the ICCs can be inferred only when the main part of the predicate is the bearer of the distinct illocutionary force, as in (12) and (13).

- (12) Potvrdila je kada *želi doći*. [reported statement]
- (13) Pitala me je kada *želim doći*. [reported interrogative]

The final factor to be included in the analysis concerns the semantic type of the governing verb taking the ICCs in E and C. Numerous studies have attempted to tackle this issue, providing various classifications based on semantic grounds, yet the multitude and diversity of the verbs taking ICCs seem to hamper their universal classification. However, certain classes tend to be recurrently mentioned in E and S publications on the complementation, and by extension ICCs as well. These include semantic classes which can be subsumed under the notions of perception, mental processes, attitudes, causation, communication, etc., with varying degrees of propensity to combine with ICCs in the investigated languages (cf. Alanović 2019; Dixon 2006; Egan 2008; Mair 1990; Mrazović, Vukadinović 2009; Piper et al. 2005; Ransom 1986).

5. CONCLUSION

With respect to the properties presented in the elaboration above, the investigation has shown that ICCs in E and S differ in terms of their structural status as constituents. For the ease of the reader, the relevant differences are summarised in the table below, taking into account the capacity of the presented properties to systemically occur in E and S predicates containing ICCs:

Table 1: Comparison of the main syntactic and semantic properties of ICCs in E and S

<i>Factor</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Serbian</i>
MORPHOLOGICAL MARKEDNESS	No marker	Inflectional suffix (- <i>ti/-ći</i>)
GRAMMATICAL EXPANSION	Perfect, progressive and passive forms	Passive forms
ARGUMENT STRUCTURE	Overt subject and object	Overt object
SUBJECT EXPRESSION	Possible	None
FRONTING IN PASSIVISATION (MATRIX CLAUSE/ICC)	The entire ICC/ Object of the ICC	- / Object of the ICC
USE OF A COMPLEMENTISER	<i>to/for/whether</i>	Unrealised
PROPOSITIONALITY	Fully realised	Partially realised

Taking into account the presented properties, the following conclusions can be drawn in line with the Dixon's criteria, respectively:

- a) ICCs in E fully conform to the criterion connected to the internal constituent structure of a clause since they can have distinct nominalisations in both argument positions, i.e. the subject and the object, where the subject of the ICC can in some instances be overtly expressed, while the possibility of using a complementiser adds additional weight to the claim that English ICCs represent clausal structures. On the other hand, Serbian ICCs can only realise one argument, that of the object, with no possibility of being accompanied by a complementiser, thus indicating that their clausality cannot be accounted for by this criterion; also, the mechanism of syntactic agreement between the (notional) subject and the predicate has not proved to constitute the basis for the grammatical agreement in both languages, so it has not been considered as the relevant indicator of the ICC's clausehood.
- b) when it comes to the criterion of functioning as a core argument of a higher clause, ICCs in both languages are typically classified as objects, which, along with the subject, represent one of the principal grammatical functions in a clause. However, they manifest different degrees of the potential for passivisation, with the English ICC being much more flexible to become the subject of the passive structure than the Serbian ICC, which suggests that ICCs in E are more likely to be characterised as canonical objects than their S counterparts.

- c) propositionality of the ICCs in E is attested by their ability to establish a full subject-predicate relation and the capacity of different complementisers to introduce ICCs with different illocutionary force; when compared to the ICCs in S, it can be seen that illocutionary interpretation of ICCs in S is highly dependent on the semantics of the governing verbs, while ICCs in E can utilise additional, syntactic means of marking declarative, interrogative and directive ICCs.
- d) in both investigated languages the complement ICCs can be combined with verbs belonging to certain semantic sets of prototypical complement-taking verbs, corresponding to the ones given in Dixon (2006: 15); yet, the consulted literature seems to support the assumption that ICCs in E are combined with a larger number of governing verbs (see Egan 2008: 405–424) than those occurring in S (cf. Alanović 2019: 186), hence indicating a greater capacity for the ICCs in E to be used in various semantic configurations.

With all the above considered, the analysis goes strongly in favour of treating the English ICC as a clausal constituent, while Serbian ICCs predominantly manifest features of phrases, where the subjects of the ICCs can be treated solely as notional categories, without any means of formal syntactic realisation. These findings are mostly of import to the linguistic accounts operating within the domain of surface-syntax, suggesting that structural specification and the treatment of ICCs in different analytical and (meta)linguistic environments should be approached with due care. Undoubtedly, the investigated topic merits a more detailed account, both in the context of investigating individual properties of ICCs and their relation to other types of complementation, but the paper's main contribution should primarily be sought within the domains of typological and general contrastive studies, as well as the description of the individual languages which were the subject matter of the research.

SOURCES

Dorotej: D. Nenadić, *Dorotej*. [Retrieved on 5 May 2020 from Antologija srpske književnosti: http://www.antologijasrpskeknjizevnosti.rs/ASK_EN_AzbucnikDela.aspx]

COBUILD: *Collins COBUILD Resource Pack – Lexicon*, Lingea® 2002, ver. 4.11

REFERENCES

- Aarts 2001: B. Aarts, *English Syntax and Argumentation* (2. ed.), Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Alanović 2018: M. Alanović, Zavisnosložene rečenice, in: P. Piper et al., *Sintaksa složene rečenice u savremenom srpskom jeziku*, Novi Sad/Beograd: Matica srpska/Institut za srpski jezik SANU, 91–197.

- Alanović 2019: M. Alanović, *O dopunama i dopunjavanju u srpskom jeziku*, Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.
- Bergs 2021: A. Bergs, Complements and adjuncts, in: B. Aarts et al., *The Handbook of English Linguistics* (2. ed.). Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons Ltd, 145–162.
- Cristofaro 2003: S. Cristofaro, *Subordination*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal 2008: D. Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.), Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Dalmi 2005: G. Dalmi, *The Role of Agreement in Non-Finite Predication*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Dixon 2006: R. M. Dixon, Complement Clauses and Complementation Strategies in Typological Perspective, in: R. M. Dixon, & A. Y. Aikhenvald, *Complementation: A Cross-Linguistic Typology*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1–48.
- Egan 2008: T. Egan, *Non-finite Complementation: A usage-based study of infinitive and -ing clauses in English*, Amsterdam/New York: Rodopi.
- Huddleston, Pullum 2002: R. Huddleston, G. K. Pullum, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivić 1972: M. Ivić, Problematika srpskohrvatskog infinitiva, *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku*, 15(2), 115–138.
- Mair 1987: C. Mair, For/To-Infinitival clauses in contemporary British English - a study based on the material collected in the survey of English usage, University College London, *English Studies*, 68(6), 545–559. doi:10.1080/00138388708598544
- Mair 1990: C. Mair, *Infinitival complement clauses in English: a study of syntax in discourse*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Melvinger 1986: J. Melvinger, Infinitivna kondenzacija finalne zavisne klauze u suvremenom hrvatskom ili srpskom, Beograd: Međunarodni slavistički centar/Filološki fakultet u Beogradu.
- Moskovljević 2004: J. Moskovljević, O distribuciji komplementizatora u savremenom srpskom jeziku, *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 60, 57–65.
- Mrazović, Vukadinović 2009: P. Mrazović, Z. Vukadinović, *Gramatika srpskog jezika za strance*, Sremski Karlovci – Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.
- Noonan 1985: M. Noonan, Complementation, in: T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol II*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 42–140.
- Piper, Klajn 2013: P. Piper, I. Klajn, *Normativna gramatika srpskog jezika*, Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Piper et al. 2005: P. Piper, I. Antonić, V. Ružić, S. Tanasić, Lj. Popović, B. Tošović, *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika. Prosta rečenica*, Beograd/Novi Sad: Institut za srpski jezik SANU/Beogradska knjiga/Matica srpska.
- Quirk et al. 1985: R. G. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Ransom 1986: E. N. Ransom, *Complementation: its meanings and forms*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Vincent 1999: N. Vincent, Subordination and Complementation, in: K. Brown & J. Miller (eds), *Concise encyclopedia of grammatical categories*, Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd., 352–363.

Дејан М. Каравесовић
О КОНСТИТУЕНТСКОМ СТАТУСУ ИНФИНИТИВНИХ
ДОПУНСКИХ КОНСТРУКЦИЈА У ЕНГЛЕСКОМ И СРПСКОМ
ЈЕЗИКУ

Резиме

У раду се испитује конституентска вредност инфинитивне глаголске допуне у савременом енглеском језику и њихових инфинитивних пандана у српском језику. Мотив за истраживање је проистекао из тога што се инфинитивна допуна у оба језика по правилу без темељнијег образложења подводи под клаузалне конституентске јединице или се пак њена конституентска вредност не прецизира. Како ово може довести до извесних недоследности у аналитичком погледу, а самим тим и неадекватног описа природе инфинитивне комплементације, у раду се настоји утврдити њихов конституентски статус у језицима који су предмет испитивања на основу синтаксичких и семантичких критеријума наведених у Диксон (2006). Анализа је спроведена на подацима прикупљеним из релевантне литературе како из англистичког, тако и србистичког лингвистичког миљеа, не излазећи из оквира анализе на нивоу површинске синтаксичке структуре, како би се у највећој могућој мери премостиле термилошко-теоријске разлике везане за разнородне лингвистичке моделе који се овом тематиком баве. Истраживање је показало да енглеске инфинитивне допуне заиста представљају клаузалне конституенте, како на структурном, тако и на садржинском плану, док се српске инфинитивне допуне граматички пре могу посматрати као фразне јединице, које се у семантичком погледу тек на плану дискурсно реконструисаног садржаја могу препознати као обриси клаузалних формација. Имајући у виду међујезички карактер анализе, резултати спроведеног истраживања своје место могу наћи пре свега у типолошком и контрастивним оквирима, али такође и у описима појединачних анализираних језика.

Кључне речи: инфинитивна допуна, енглески језик, српски језик, синтаксичка конституентност, глаголска фраза, клауза

Submitted: 1 October 2020

Accepted: 1 March 2021