ELLIPSIS AND SMALL CLAUSES
IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN

Vera Vujević[i]
University of East Sarajevo,
Faculty of Philosophy Pale,
Bosnia & Herzegovina

Abstract:

The paper examines the relationship between ellipsis and small clauses in the selected corpus of the Serbian and English languages from a syntactic-semantic point of view. The functional potential of both structures is realized in the informative complexity of the sentence without its syntactic expansion, which is again a common feature for both languages and is systemic in character. The 'unspoken' predication in small clauses is actually reminiscent of the implied character of omitted structures in elliptical constructions, and this is where we find the similarities between these two linguistic mechanisms analyzed in this paper. From a terminological point of view, small clauses do not fall under the category of elliptical constructions, so the subject of our research is also aimed at determining the degree of compatibility and distinction between the two constructions.

Keywords: ellipsis, small clause, secondary predication, omission, English language, Serbian language

1. Introduction

Every natural language allows gaps that speakers use and interpret, most often unconsciously and without analysis in everyday communication, but sometimes for a purposeful stylistic effect. Often, we find ourselves in a dilemma as to whether we can leave out some parts of the sentence or whether they must be pronounced in order to satisfy the grammatical rule. A large range of seemingly different properties plays the role of ellipsis, but we must note that some omitted elements, such as abbreviated forms can hardly be characterized as *ellipsis*. Such elements are not of great importance, but they raise the question of what kind of gaps can be considered elliptical, and what kind of spaces cannot, in English and Serbian. On the other hand, *small clauses* also show a certain degree of unspoken, tacit, or implied in both languages. The traditional understanding of a clause based on a predication consisting of a verb in a finite or non-finite form – is violated here. These clauses are primarily characterized by inexplicit predication, or more precisely, the clauses do not contain a verb within the predication, which means that our established definition of a clause must be much more flexible. With them, as

---

[i] Correspondence: email vera.vujevic@ff.ues.rs.ba

with elliptical sentences, the grammaticalized language pattern form/meaning does not work, because the structures, rules, and restrictions that allow us to map sounds and gestures onto the corresponding meaning in explicit constructions do not apply to ellipsis and small clauses. It is precisely this semantic, not syntactic plan of interpretation of the 'tacit' material in the two structures that will be the subject of this research in English and Serbian. Unspoken predication in small clauses overlaps with the domain of implied and omitted in elliptical constructions, and we will try to shed light on this interrelationship between these phenomena. From a terminological and categorical point of view, an ellipsis does not include small clauses, so we will try to determine the degree of compatibility, similarity and difference between the two constructions within our research. Functional realization of both constructions is reflected in the informative expansion of the sentence without its syntactic complexity, which is their common meeting point in both English and Serbian. It could also be said that in human nature, that is, in the wealth of man's intuitive knowledge of the language and communicative experience, lies the possibility of understanding: a gap in language, an incomplete sentence, an incomplete thought, and the reconstruction of omitted elements in the formation of a uniquely meaningful and expressive whole. In a broader sense, the term *ellipsis* refers to a large spectrum of reduced language units and structures – from those in which words only seem to be missing to a much narrower set of special constructions. The very name *small clause* is used in the English language to denote a series of constituents NP2 XP in the sentence model NP1 VP NP2 XP[ii], among which the relation of copulative predication prevails, with the fact that instead of a finite verb, a noun, adjective, prepositional phrase or non-finite verb form appears in place of XP. Small clauses are most often characterized by the presence of secondary, inexplicit predication between two non-verbal elements. In addition to the head predication with the verb in the finite form, in a simple sentence, one can find another semantic, reduced copulative predicate whose noun part has the role of complement or adjunct. The types of constructions that are considered to be *small clauses* today are much more numerous than in 1975, when Williams introduced the concept of small clauses. Seen from the perspective of generative grammar, there are three conceptually different theoretical approaches to these constructions, which will be discussed later.

2. Objectives of the Research

The paper investigates those syntactic constructions that are of a systemic nature in almost every natural language, and their common functional feature which is reflected in the informative complexity of the sentence without its syntactic expansion. In the simplest terms, what is common to both languages and what is characteristic of both linguistic phenomena is that we have meaning without form. Predicative sequences (NP XP) in constructions (V NP XP) are interesting for our research, which are known as small clauses in English, while in Serbian they are treated in different ways. When it comes to elliptical constructions, we will

---

[ii] The following English abbreviations were used in the paper: NP – noun phrase; VP – verb phrase; XP – nominal part of unexpressed copulative predication, where X can be realized as N – noun, A – adjective, P – preposition and V – verb.

try to present how these gaps in the language are formed and understood, and how omitted elements are reconstructed. The main goal of the research is twofold: first – to present, through a contrastive analysis, the types of constructions of ellipsis and small clauses in English and Serbian, and second – to show that defective sequences in both linguistic phenomena express the full subject/predicate relationship and form an integral part of the sentence construction, and can safely be described as structures with full syntactic and semantic function despite the omitted material. To achieve this goal, both syntactic and semantic evidence will be used.

3. Methods and Corpus

Within the contrastive-descriptive model, the analogies, similarities, and differences between ellipsis and small clauses in English and Serbian are defined by applying qualitative analysis. It is generally known that all contrastive research starts from the assumption that two language systems have a certain common constant on the basis of which it is possible to identify variables, because differences are reflected as relevant only in relation to equality (Ђорђевић 2002: 54). Using the method of contrastive analysis, we will provide an overview of the syntactic and semantic characteristics of verbless small clauses and ellipsis in English and Serbian. We will try to expose what these mechanisms have in common, namely the semantic and grammatical gaps in their linguistic structures. By examining selected examples, we will try to show and establish their common points in which the omitted structures can be fully understood even though they are left unsaid. The following corpus and abbreviations were used in the paper:

М. Селимовић, *Тврђава* – Т;

И. Андрић, *На Дрини Ћуприја* – НДЋ and in English *The bridge on the Drina* – BOD;

Ф. С. Фицџералд, *Блага је ноћ* – БН and in English *Tender is the Night* – TN;

E. Hemingway, *Farewell to Arms* – FA;

W. Vlautin, *The Motel Life* – ML; and few examples from the online issues of the newspapers: *Блиц* and *The Independent*.

4. Relationship Between Ellipsis and Small Clauses in English and Serbian

4.1 Ellipsis

A grammatical ellipsis is a linguistic tool for achieving language economy in order to avoid repetition of the same forms on the surface structure, and only such constructions can be marked as elliptical in English and Serbian:

(1) I thought she was probably <u>a little crazy</u>. It was all right if she was []. (FA, 29) [↔ a little crazy]

(2) He still looked <u>alive when I went to him</u> but, Jesus, he wasn't []. (ML, 5) [↔ alive when I went to him]

(3) I don't <u>trust people</u>, you'd be crazy to []. (ML, 18) [↔ trust people]

The ellipsis represents structural gaps that can be linked to omitted elements recoverable from linguistic or situational context. This approach puts the aspect of contextual reversibility in the first place, because the largest number of examples of grammatical ellipsis fall precisely into this category, although they can appear in a slightly different morphological form:

(4) Local media quoted military officials saying that two <u>bombs</u> attached to the bus's exterior exploded killing and injuring several people while a third [] fell to the ground and was later dismantled. (*The Independent*, 21 October 2021) [↔ bomb]

(5) I <u>stopped</u> as fast as I could []. (ML, 4) [↔ stop]

Very often it is not easy to identify a structure as elliptical, so the most appropriate solution is to establish degrees of strength in the identification of an ellipsis. For a construction to be characterized as a strict ellipse, it should meet certain criteria. We will highlight here the list of criteria stated by Quirk (1985: 884) in the grammar of the English language: a) elided words can be literally reconstructed; b) elliptical constructions are grammatically defective; c) inserting the missing words must result in a grammatical sentence (and with the same meaning as the original sentence); d) the missing words are recoverable from the text and are present in the text in exactly the same form.

Let us first consider the example that we selected to illustrate the rules formulated in this way through translation equivalents:

(6) 'And I did it pretty well, didn't I?' 'You were pretty drunk,' said Abe bluntly. 'No, I wasn't' 'All right, then, you weren't' (TN, 124)
И добро сам се држао, зар не? – Били сте прилично пијани – рекао је Абе грубо. – Не, нисам. – Добро, онда, нисте. (БН, 109)

The first mentioned criterion, to which all the others follow, implies that in the context where there is no referential ambiguity, it is clearly determined which words should be reconstructed. The elided material can be supplemented and interpreted based on the context, i.e. adjacent text in (6): *No, I wasn't pretty drunk / All right, then, you weren't pretty drunk*. After omitting, usually identical structure and already known information, the elliptical sentences really remain structurally truncated and defective: *I wasn't / you weren't/ Нисам / Нисте*, because such isolated elliptical sentences are ambiguous without a corresponding contextual reference. Although some structures are clearly defective, they do not meet the criteria of being accurately reconstructed. We must keep in mind that what guarantees an ellipsis is the possibility of its reconstruction from the adjacent text. Without the text, there is always room for discussion and speculation as to which structure has been elipted:

(7) 'Why don't you get in bed? I got the electric blanket going.' 'Let me just stand here for a second then I will [] .' (ML, 5) [↔ get in bed]

(8) I pulled the car over to the side of the road and got out as fast as I could []. (ML, 11)[↔ get out]

The elided material in a sentence (7) is an exact copy of the antecedent – *get in bed*, while in sentence (8) the elided verb is morphologically somewhat different from its antecedent – *got out/get out*. Although, technically speaking, the missing words and the words in the non-ellipted sentence are not present in the text in exactly the same form as in the previous example, it is important to point out that sentences (7) and (8) illustrate the same type of ellipsis according to most grammatical criteria, because it is clear that the omitted parts of the verb phrase from these examples can be reconstructed. This explanation puts the aspect of contextual reversibility in the first place, because the largest number of examples of grammatical ellipsis falls precisely into this category. In the Serbian language, verbs are the most common of all word classes in the position of the reduced sentence constituents. From the simplest types of elliptical constructions, we will first single out those with unpronounced forms of the auxiliary verbs *jesam* and *biti* (to be), full or enclitic. The number of such examples that we observed in the corpus confirms that this type of ellipsis is the most frequent in the Serbian language when we talk about verbal ellipsis in general. In such examples, there is no structural and semantic shift.

(9) (…) а онда је ушла у стају, не гледајући нас, дубље забрађена, да сакрије крваве печате, помузла [] краву, и млијеко [] однијела у кућу. (Т, 24) [↔је]

(10) Обишао сам кућу и стог шаше, ушао [] у стају. (Т, 23) [↔сам]

(11) Све [] необично, све [] како не треба. (Т, 27) [↔је било][iii]

In Serbo-Croatian literature, the ellipsis is referred to as the omission of one or more main parts of a sentence (subject or predicate) or secondary parts (clauses or complements) that can be unambiguously detected and replaced. First, let us look at a few illustrative examples of ellipsis in the Serbian language; in what constructions they appear, in which position in the sentence, and which parts of the sentence they include:

(12) Двојица синова бербера Салиха с Алифаковца хтјели су да побјегну од берберског заната, иако је један од њих, старији, понио бритву из очеве радње, али је бријао само себе, <u>ни за живу главу [] никога другога</u>. (Т, 21) [↔ није бријао]

(13) Из тог чуда што се зове рат, запамтио сам безброј ситница и само два догађаја, <u>и причам о њима не зато што су тежи од осталих []</u> већ што их никако не заборављам. <u>Први []</u> се тиче једне битке, међу многима. (Т, 19/20) [↔ догађаја/догађај]

[iii] Some of the examples in Serbian are translated by the author of this paper so that those who do not speak Serbian could follow the text easier.
(11) Everything [] unusual, everything [] not right. (T, 27) [↔was]

(14) Усамљеност рађа мисао, <u>мисао [] незадовољство, незадовољство [] побуну</u>. (Т, 34) [↔ рађа]ⁱᵛ

(15) И да ли би срећније живјели? <u>Не би [], нимало</u>. (Т, 22) [↔ срећније живјели]

(16) Неко је на војну дошао зато што је хтио, <u>неко [] зато што је морао</u>. (Т, 20) [↔ је на војну дошао]

(17) Ја сам ту жену најтеже повриједио, <u>теже [] него сви остали</u>. (Т, 23) [↔ сам ту жену повриједио]

The underlined structures in the examples above are elliptical. Relying on the context we can make a full sentence, as is given in the angular brackets. The neighbouring part of the text allows us to expand the elliptical sentence, with great certainty, into a full one. Despite the fact that the omission of elided structures is due to their communicative redundancy, example (18) shows that the ellipsis is not always stylistically neutral and that the omitted material is not always possible to reconstruct from the adjacent part of the text:

(18) Мула Ибрахим ме упозорио, без икакве потребе, да не навикавам жену на скупе поклоне. (...) Ништа скупо! Већ нешто ситно а лијепо, струк цвијета, или нешто корисно, папуче, кад јој се старе подеру, шамију, ако нема у чему изаћи, и лијепу ријеч, то је највредније. (Т, 44)

Since the stylogenity and stylematisity of such constructions are not always of the same intensity, an important criterion for their identification, reconstruction and subsequent classification is the degree of the strength of the ellipsis. Example (18) shows that the reconstruction of the elided material is possible with certain modifications, since what was omitted cannot be found in the text in the same form. Possible full forms, which cannot be interpreted from the adjacent part of the text, would be: *Немој ништа скупо да јој купујеш! / Већ јој купи нешто ситно а да је лијепо, можда струк цивијета или јој кипи нешто корисно као што су папуче ... / Don't buy her anything expensive! / But buy her something small and nice, maybe a waistcoat or something useful for her like slippers...* This criterion, since it is necessarily related to the type and function of the ellipsis, is imposed as a starting point in determining the communicative, structural and the stylistic plan of the utterance.

4.2 Small Clauses

It is not easy to give an answer to the question of what are and what are not *small clauses* in these two languages. Small clauses in the English language represent one of the basic concepts of modern generative grammar and are characterized as minimal units of non-verbal

---

ⁱᵛ (14) Loneliness breeds thought, thought [] dissatisfaction, dissatisfaction [] rebellion. (T, 34) [↔ breeds]
(15) And would they live happier? I wouldn't [], not at all. (T, 22) [↔live happier]
(16) Some joined the army because they wanted to, some [] because they had to. (T, 20) [↔joined the army]
(17) I hurt that woman the hardest, [] harder than all the others. (T, 23) [↔ I hurt that woman]

predication, where the relationship of predication between subject and predicate is established in the absence of a finite verb form. In traditional grammars, small clauses are generally called secondary predicates, although the term small clause is a somewhat broader term. Small clauses appear in constructions of the type NP1 VP NP2 XP and refer to unexpressed copulative predication between two non-verb elements NP2 XP in the form of a clause. This sequence (NP2 XP) which is a separate constituent and occurs in the form of a clause is actually a small clause. X can be realized as a noun, adjective, preposition, or as a verb phrase with a non-finite verb form. In other words, in addition to the head predication with the verb in the finite form, in a simple sentence, one can find another semantic, reduced copulative predicate whose part has the role of complement or adjunct. Another important characteristic of this construction is its ability to express at least three different semantic meanings, which is illustrated by the examples given according to Green (Tošić-Lojanica, 2017 according to Green, 1970: 275–277):

(5a) John drank the coffee **hot.=** John drank the coffee. The coffee was hot.

(5б) *John* came home **happy**. = John came home. He was happy.

(6) The waitress wiped *the table* **clean.** = The waitress wiped the table. The table was clean (as a result).

(7) May considers *John* **a fool**/ **him silly.** = *May considers John. John is a fool. May considers (John a fool).

The first example illustrates small clauses that are called descriptive because XP, which refers to the object in (5a) and the subject in (5b), describes its state or appearance. The second given example (6) denotes resultative small clauses in which an outcome, consequence, or resultative state is realized with an adjective. And the third example (7) illustrates the construction that is called a qualifying small clause, because it determines in more detail, i.e. it qualifies the subject's relationship to the content expressed after the verb phrase. Some other criteria can be used to distinguish different types of small clauses, such as the semantic properties of these clauses and their predication, their syntactic function and relationship to other constituents in the sentence structure, their comparison with copular constructions, etc. Thus, for example, according to the categorical type of XP predicate, there are four different types of small clauses – nominal, adjectival, prepositional, and verbal (Habul-Šabanović 2019: 182). What characterizes all types of these constructions, regardless of the type of classification, is the simultaneous attachment of one sentence member to two other elements, one of which is a verb in the governing predicate. Such a double connection is a consequence of the presence of two predications in one simple sentence – one realized syntactically and the other semantically.

Although the term *small clause* itself is of relatively recent origin and has been mostly treated within the framework of generative theory, since it first appeared in the literature in Williams (1975) some authors (Arts 1992) claim that Otto Jespersen was actually the first

linguist who proposed the following – that the predicative sequence NP XP in the construction VP NP XP is analyzed as a separate constituent. He pointed out that the predicative sequence NP XP is an example of a syntactic unit that creates a subject-predicate relationship (Arts 1992). Arts points out an interesting fact that it took almost six decades from the beginning of the concept of the linguistic phenomenon of the small clause to full momentum in linguistic research and discussions about it (1992: 36). Small clauses are so often mentioned as a phenomenon of the 1980s, since a large number of linguists at that time began to show interest and elaborate this phenomenon in the language in more detail, to name only a few in the English literature (Green 1973, Chomsky 1981, Stowell 1983, Safir 1983, Wierzbicka 1988, Redford 1988, Arts 1992, Winkler 1997). Also, the greatest contribution to this topic in the English language was made within the framework of the generative theory. Small clauses have emerged as one of the basic concepts of modern generative grammar, which relies heavily on some of the most basic principles of Goverment and Binding Theory (Chomsky 1981). In the so-called Standard Theory, the treatment of the series VP NP HR is very uneven, both within the theory itself and in relation to other competing approaches (Arts 1992: 21). Accordingly, three different approaches were formed among generative grammar: predication theory, complex predicate theory, and small clause theory. Some of the most controversial questions about small clauses concern their sentence-level constituents, the empirical range of possible constructions that can be analyzed as small clauses, and their internal structure and category status. When it comes to the status of the XP element in the aforementioned theories, opposing views are represented, the focus of which is a different understanding of the concept of predication and its syntactic realization.

The term *small clause* is not used in the Serbian language and is not even precisely defined, so it is used in different terms. In the grammars of the Serbian language, the term small clause corresponds to the concepts of *secondary predication* and *attributive predicate*. In Serbian literature, we found the term small clauses in the work of Milka Ivić (2005), who gives the following examples of a complex simple sentence that follows the same pattern as in English: *He died young*, *She married quite young*, *Cabbage is eaten pickled*, *Coffee is hot* (*Он је умро млад*, *Она се сасвим млада удала*, *Купус се једе укисељен*, *Кафа се пије врућа*) (2005: 9). In Croatian descriptive grammars, we find a different approach in treating the same type of constructions that are considered to be small clauses in English. Silić and Pranjković (2005: 290–291) also offer a chapter on the semi-copulative predicate, which is composed of a semi-copulative verb and a complementary nominal element, e.g. *They became unreasonable; He was called the president* (*Постали су неразумни; Називао се предсједником*)(with a noun suffix in the nominative or instrumental with intransitive semi-copulative verbs), and e.g. *They consider him an impostor; They portrayed him as honest* (*Сматрају га варалицом*; *Њега су приказали поштеним*) (with a nominal complement in the instrumental case with transitive semi-copulative verbs). In addition, Barić et al. (1995: 403-404) use a term that we often find in Croatian grammars – predicate extension – and states that it is an addition to verbs of incomplete meaning and is realized by a predicate noun in the instrumental, accusative case, or as an expression with a preposition: *And then they chose him for the national representative, He stared at the sky and pretended to be unskilled./ И онда га изабраше за народног заступника, Зурио је у небо и правио се невјешт.*

How to determine the existence of small clauses, in general, is the question that linguists are most concerned with within the study of this linguistic phenomenon. One of the solutions that are most often offered in English literature is the application of syntactic constituent tests (Redford 1988, Arts 1992). There are different tests such as the test of movement, coordination, proforms, then the test of meaning, passive, cleft sentences, and many others. Given that these tests are primarily intended for the English language and are not intended for Serbian at their full potential, we will try a few of them by contrasting selected examples. The most commonly used tests are: coordination test, independent use of the NP2 XP sequence; adverbial modification of the predicative sequence NP2 XP, and nominalization. For the illustrative examples that we will subject to the mentioned tests, we have taken one example from the corpus:

Descriptive small clauses – I said my helloes *to the ones awake* and sat down in a chair next to my brother. (ML, 98).

Resultative small clauses – Worried if I *cleaned a table right*, smiled right to a customer. (ML, 88).

Qualifying small clauses – Trying to *make him mean*. (ML, 92).

I said my helloes to *the ones awake* and sat down in a chair next to my brother. / Рекао сам здраво *оним буднима* и сјео на столицу поред брата.

1. I said my helloes to **the ones awake and those asleep** and sat down in a chair next to my brother. / Рекао сам здраво **оним буднима и оним успаваним** и сјео на столицу поред брата.
2. I said my helloes to *the ones* **actually** *awake* and sat down in a chair next to my brother. / Рекао сам здраво *оним* **заиста** *буднима* и сјео на столицу поред брата.
3. I said my helloes to *the ones awake* and sat down in a chair next to my brother. **The ones awake**?! I thought they were all fast asleep. / **Оним буднима**?! Мислио сам да су сви већ заспали.
4. **Her saying hello to the ones awake** made him worried. / * **Њено говорење здраво** оним буднима га је забринуло.

Worried if I *cleaned a table right*, smiled right to a customer. / Бринући се *да ли сам очистила сто правилно* или се правилно насмијала муштерији.

1. Worried if I **cleaned a table right or smiled right to a customer**. / Бринући се да ли **сам очистила сто правилно или се правилно насмијала муштерији**.
2. Worried if I **really** *cleaned a table right*, smiled right to a customer. / Бринући се да ли *сам* **заиста** *очистила сто правилно* или се правилно насмијала муштерији.
3. The waiter actually cleaned a table right and smiled right to a customer.

Cleaned a table right? Finally, it took him some time to do it properly. / Конобар је заправо очистио сто правилно, и правилно се насмијао муштерији. *Очистио сто правилно*!? Коначно, требало му је доста да научи.

4. *His cleaning of a table right* is amazing. / *Његово чишћење стола правилно је запањујуће.

Trying to *make him mean*. / Трудимо се *да га учинимо злим*.

1. Trying to *make him mean and miserable.* / Трудимо се *да га учинимо злим и јадним.*
2. Trying *to make him **extremely** mean*. / Трудимо се да га учинимо крајње злим.
3. What are doing? We are trying to make him mean. *Him mean*! That's impossible. / Шта то радите? Трудимо се да га учинимо злим. *Њега злим*! Па то је немогуће.
4. *Their trying to make him mean* is ridiculous. / *Њихов труд да га учине злим* је смијешан.

Coordination tests and independent use of the NP2 XP sequence are equally achievable in Serbian as in English. The use of adverbials within the sequence NP2 XP showed that such examples are also possible in the Serbian language, though such modification is possible only at this level but not at the sentence level. Nominalization, on the other hand, is only typical of the English language given that it is associated with a set of rules within the generative grammar. Such examples could be conditionally acceptable only at the structural level depending on the type of lexeme, while the semantic component could also be satisfied if the place of an intransitive verb was taken by another transitive one. In all the examples subjected to these tests, it was shown that the sequence NP2 XP can function as a separate constituent, that is, as a small clause. Also, it is clear that here we used the simplest examples and the most representative tests and that the outcome would certainly be different, if we chose to show a larger scope of tests and examples. Despite this, these tests also lead to a better understanding of the overall construction in both languages. Therefore, in this paper, we analysed the clausal status of the XP element as semantic predication with inexplicit copula, which expresses a certain propositional meaning, and which only in some situations is expressed as a syntactically independent unit that resembles a reduced clause.

Further on, in this subchapter, the three most common types of small clauses are presented: descriptive, resultative, and qualifying. From the syntactic aspect, descriptive small clauses are realized through addition that is syntactically coordinated to the primary predicate with a temporal overlap of the verb action expressed by that predicate. The communicative function in these clauses is realized through the information that reflects some characteristic of the subject or object. Generally, these clauses must share common constituents between syntactic and secondary semantic predication. When we talk about semantics, certain types of verbs (e.g. dynamic and stative verbs) are more frequent than others, but these are the most productive small clauses in both languages, as shown by the number of examples:

(1) Тијана ме дочекала *будна* ... (Т, 68)

(2) Укочила се у вратима, *пренеражена од страха*. (Т, 68)

(3) Стајала је крај врата, *збуњена и постиђена*. (Т, 73)[v]

(4) Наранџе смо појели, *полутруле*. (Т, 78)

(5)… кад смо га разнијели топовима и главама, застао сам, *уморан*: какав бесмисао. (Т, 20)

(6) Остали су сједили *укочени, без ријечи*. (Т, 24)

(7) Устала је и пошла према вратима, па се предомислила, узела пексимит и изашла, *оборене главе*. (Т, 23)

These examples show almost complete compatibility regarding descriptive meaning of the small clause in English and Serbian. The formal and semantic characteristics of descriptive small clauses are almost identical in both languages, except when we talk about their use and the nominal constituent to which they are attached:

(8) Не само да распознаје тај глас него и види оца јасно како седи и пуши, *расањен и мучен кашљем*. (НДЋ, 395)
She heard the sound and could see her father clearly, almost as if he were there before her, as he sat and smoked, *sleepless and tormented by his cough*. (BOD, 164)

(9) Алихоџа је још *млад човек, жив, насмејан и пунокрван*. (НДЋ, 400)
Alihodža himself was still *a young man, lively, healthy and smiling*. (BOD, 172)

(10) Кад и то би готово Цигани се измакоше подаље и придружише сејменима, а на оном празном простору остаде сам, *издигнут за читава два аршина, усправан, испршен и го до паса*, човек на коцу. (НДЋ, 49)
When that too had been done, the gipsies climbed down and joined the guards, and on that open space, *raised a full eight feet upright, stiff and bare to the waist*, the man on the stake remained alone. (BOD, 77)

(11) Међу њима је Радисав *бос и гологлав; брз и погнут као увек*, (…) (НДЋ, 45)
Between them was Radisav, *barefooted and bareheaded, alert and stooping as ever*, (…) (BOD, 72)

---

[v] (1) Tijana met me *awake* …
(2) She froze in the doorway, *overwhelmed with fear*.
(3) She stood by the door, *confused and embarrassed*.
(4) We ate oranges, *half-rotten*.

(12) (...) далеко од Стамбола, негде у прогонству, у мрачној провинцији, *заборављен, излишан, смешан, бедан*. (НДЋ, 40)

(...) far from Stambul, somewhere in the obscure provinces, *forgotten, superfluous, ridiculous, wretched.* (BOD, 65)

On the other hand, resultative small clauses are very common in English and very rare in Serbian. The resulting construction, which is very often an optional sentence constituent, is most often an adjective that communicates some property of the object. In the place of a resultative, an adjective and less often a prepositional phrase appears. When we talk about the constituent to which they are attached it is most often a direct object in the role of the patient, realized in the position of the subject:

(13) I shook *Jerry Lee awake* as the train arrived … (ML, 72)

(14) He's always drinking soda, *always has one open*. (ML, 71)

(15) Tommy came running to me saying that Jerry Lee had gotten *his leg cut off.* (ML, 72)

(16) Worried if I *cleaned a table right, smiled right to a customer*. (ML, 88)

(17) Once he had to *chop this dead tree down*. (ML, 91)

(18) Finally, they *broke the door down*. (ML, 92)

(19) Maybe Claire *needs a room painted*, something like that. (ML, 114)

(20) His dad would hit him, *give him a black eye*, *bruise his ribs*, things like that. (ML, 70)

Examples of such clauses are very rare in Serbian, because the resultative meaning is not expressed by the form NP1 VP NP2 XP as in English, as we can see from the examples above. It is known that this syntactic form for expressing results is very common in Germanic languages, while in Serbian we managed to find such examples mostly in the press, therefore we cannot talk about strict compatibility here as in the case of descriptive clauses:

(21) Претходно је портал „Моја Херцеговина" пренео да је медвед Грковићу избио секирицу из руке, а да је човек потом *голим рукама задавио звер*. (*Блиц*, 25. 5. 2013.)

(22) Двојица синова оптужени су да су *мајку насмрт претукли пајсером*, након чега су побегли, али их је полиција пронашла и ухапсила. (*Блиц*, 2. 5. 2021.)

(23) Наиме, ово обележје се налази на зеленој површини на Аутокоманди, ... а вандализовано је током викенда, након што је *аутолаком префарбано у црне и сиве нијансе*. (*Блиц*, 27. 3. 2017.)

Qualifying small clauses with semi-copulative verbs have the same syntactic-semantic properties in both languages, with the fact that they most often appear with verbs of the following meanings: *сматрати, прогласити, направити, учинити, начинити, узети (consider, declare, make, do, make, take)* in English and in Serbian.

(24) I had to *make myself get up, get dressed, and leave the room*. (ML, 86)

(25) I once *saw him fight* when he was maybe thirteen. (ML, 90)

(26) Wanting to *make a person mean*. (ML, 91)

(27) … and people *calling him a wimp at school*. (ML, 91)

(28) *Да је Зафранија направио од мене будалу*? (Т, 65)

(29) Али зашто су направили *авет од мене*, ...(Т, 93)

(30) *Сматрали смо га за хероја, па прогласили за издајицу* и све то за недељу дана... (*Блиц*, 20. 6. 2021.)

When we contrast Serbian and English, these structures are equally achievable in both languages, without major structural-semantic shifts:

(31) – Ја сам вас, Федуне – говорио је Крчмар немачки – *сматрао озбиљним младићем, свесним својих дужности и свога животног циља*, ... (НДЂ, 441)
'I *had* always *considered you*, Fedun,' Krčmar said in German, '*a serious young man, conscious of your duties and your aim in life*,…' (BOD, 252)

(32) А већ за жене није смео нико ни да пита, јер би *то сматрали крвавом увредом*. (НДЂ, 432)
And as for women no one even dared to ask about them, for *that would have been considered a deadly insult*. (BOD, 235)

(33) 'I think Americans take *their manner rather seriously*,' said the elder Englishman. (TN, 225)
– Мислим да Американци узимају *своје понашање мало превише озбиљно* – рекао је старији Енглез. (БН, 191)

(34) In that light, Dick <u>found</u> *the girl devitalized and uninteresting*. (TN, 226)
У том свјет*лу*, *дјевојка* <u>се</u> Дику <u>учинила</u> *незанимљивом и лишеном живота*. (БН, 192)

We can conclude that all small clauses are indeed elliptical because, viewed as separate constituents, they are truncated without sentence parts. What is characteristic of both phenomena is the identical informative effect, which is reflected in the fact that we have an extension of the informative function without syntactic change in a sentence. Therefore, in both cases, we really understand more than what is written or said, because they are two types of the same syntactic phenomenon in a deep sentence structure. What is different, although not completely diametrically opposed, and where these phenomena can be demarcated to some extent, is the criterion of omitted material recoverability. The interpretation of elided structures is quite simple: either it is reconstructed from the neighboring text, or from the situational or structural context. With small clauses, on the other hand, the omitted elements can be recalled in our thoughts or drawn from our knowledge of grammar, but they are not always present in the text in the same or similar form. The interpretation first of all depends on the context, that is, the narrower semantic environment and the interaction of the element within the small clause with the governing verb, and the grammatical properties of the entire structure. They are rather the result of thinking about what the outcome, description, or qualification of the proposition from the sequence NP1 VP transferred to the construction of the small clause. With this transformation, the predicate of one sentence in the deep structure is included in the surface structure along with the predicate of the second sentence as a secondary predicate. In other words, a relationship between two coordinated predicates is established between them in a complex sentence structure. Since they represent two semantic predicates in the composition of one and the same grammatical predicate which is considered primary, these clauses are characterized by a simultaneous connection with the verb action, on the one hand, and the notion in the subject or object, on the other.

5. Conclusion

Many questions about ellipsis and small clauses have been addressed by numerous contemporary linguists, but without reaching a single consensus in finding appropriate and final solutions. Some of the most controversial questions about them are related to their sentence-level constituents, the empirical range of possible constructions to be analyzed as small clauses, as well as their internal structure and categorical status. In this paper, we tried to offer a preliminary contrastive analysis of ellipsis and small clauses in English and Serbian through translation equivalents based on the most common and simple types of these constructions. This paper also offers a brief insight into the literature related to the Serbo-Croatian linguistic context in order to examine whether and how the same or similar constructions of the two structures in English are treated by local linguists. Moreover, we applied several standard constituent tests from the English language in order to determine whether there is a possibility that the constructions that are called small clauses in English can also be realized as separate sentence constituents in Serbian. The main goal of this short contrastive analysis of ellipsis and small clauses in English and Serbian is to identify some

possible similarities and differences between the two linguistic phenomena when it comes to the use of such and similar constructions in both languages, as well as to provide some new insights and different perspectives in describing these linguistic phenomena in both languages.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The author declares no conflicts of interest.

About the Author
Vera Vujević, born on 4 May 1980 in Sarajevo, is an associate professor at the Department of English, Faculty of Philosophy University of East Sarajevo. She is engaged in undergraduate and postgraduate study programmes, where she teaches English Syntax, Semantics, Contemporary English, and Contrastive Linguistics – English and Serbian. Her research field is the linguistics of the modern English language, the syntactic forms of reduced and elliptical constructions which are the subject of her papers, as well as the published monographs *Ellipsis in Serbian and English (2017) and Cohesion and Ellipsis (2022)*. She was the editorial secretary for the philological volume (book 1) in the *Faculty of Philosophy Collection of Papers*, and reviewed papers for the *Proceedings* from the scientific conferences. She served in the role of vice-dean of scientific research for a three-year period beginning in 2013 to 2015 at the same faculty and participated in several projects as a member of the project team of the University of East Sarajevo.

References

Aarts B, 1992. *Small clauses in English: the nonverbal types*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Barić E et al, 1995. *Hrvatska gramatika*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Chomsky N, 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Chomsky N, 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht: Foris

Đorđević R, 2002. *Uvod u kontrastriranje jezika, 5. izdanje.* Beograd: Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu.

Green G, 1970. "How abstract is surface structure?", *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. CLS* 6, 270-281.

Habul-Šabanović I, 2019. Small Clauses in English and Bosnian, Croatian and Serbain, *Književni jezik 30*, 181-208. doi: 10.33669/KJ2019-30-06

Ivić, M, 2005. „O „malim klauzama" i sličnim sintaksičkim konstrukcijama", Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku 48, 1, Novi Sad, 7-11.

Quirk R, Greenbaum S, Leech G, Svartvik J, 1985. *A Comprehensive grammar of the English language.* London: Longman.

Kristal D, 1987. Kembrička enciklopedija jezika, Beograd: Nolit.

Kristal D, 1985. Enciklopedijski rečnik moderne lingvistike, Beograd: Nolit.

Radford A, 1988. Transformational Grammar, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Safir K, 1983: "On Small Clauses as Constituents", *Linguistic Inquiry* 14/4, MIT Press, 730–735.

Silić J, Pranjković I, 2005. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Stowell T, 1983. "Subjects across categories," *The Linguistic Review 2*, Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 285-312.

Tošić-Lojanica, T, 2017. Male klauze u engleskom i srpskom jeziku, doktorska disertacija, Kragujevac.

Williams E, 1975. "Small clauses in English", John P. Kimball (Ed.) *Syntax and Semantics vol. 4*, 249–273.

Winkler S, 1997. *Focus and Secondary Predication*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Winkler S, 2005. *Ellipsis and Focus in Generative Grammar*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Wierzbicka A, 1988. *The semantics of grammar*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Examples Sources

Andrić I, 2014. *Na Drini Ćuprija*, Laguna: Beograd. / translation into English Lovet F.Edwards, *The Bridge on the Drina*, Beograd: Dereta, 2011.

Andrić I, 2014. *Prokleta Avlija*, Laguna: Beograd

Fitzgerald F S, 1997. *Tender is the Night*, UK: Penguin Books. / Translation into Serbo-Croatian Antun Šoljan, *Blaga je noć*, Zagreb: Sveučilišna naklada, 1978.

Hemingway E, 2004. *Farewell to Arms*, UK: Arrow Books.

McEwan I, 2002. *Atonement*, London: Vintage Random House.

Selimović M, 1980. *Tvrđava*, Sarajevo: Svjetlost

Soyinka W, 1971. *Madmen and Specialists*, Great Britain: Cox & Wyman Ltd, Reading.

Vlautin W, 2007. *The Motel Life*, USA: Harper Perennial.

Blic – https://www.blic.rs

The Independent – https://www.independent.co.uk