

The Non-verbal Type of Small Clauses in English and Lithuanian

The Non-verbal Type of Small Clauses
in English and Lithuanian

By

Judita Giparaitė

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

The Non-verbal Type of Small Clauses in English and Lithuanian, by Judita Giparaitė

This book first published 2010

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2010 by Judita Giparaitė

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-1723-6, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-1723-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	vii
Abbreviations and Symbols.....	ix
Chapter One.....	1
Introduction	
1.1 Goals and Objectives of the Study	
1.2 Subject and Methodology of the Study	
1.3 Analysis of Constructions V [NP XP]	
1.4 Scope of the Study	
1.5 Research Method and the Corpus	
1.6 Positions To Be Defended	
1.7 Theoretical and Practical Value of the Study	
1.8 Structure of the Work	
Chapter Two	27
Small Clause Analysis	
Chapter Three	39
Properties of Constructions V [NP XP]	
3.1 Syntactic Environments and the Internal Structure of the Constructions V [NP XP] in English and Lithuanian	
3.2 Characteristics of Verbs That Occur with the Sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] in English and Lithuanian	
3.3 Conclusions	
Chapter Four	79
Small Clause Analysis of the Constructions Representing the Subcategorization Frames V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP]	
4.1 Small Clause Subject vs. Genuine Object	
4.2 Predication in the Sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP]	
4.3 Predication as a Clausal Property in the Sequences V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP]	
4.4 Clausal Status of the Sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP]: Applicability of Constituency Tests to English and Lithuanian	
4.5 Conclusions	

Chapter Five	155
Conclusions	
Appendix A	161
Depictive and Resultative Complement Constructions and Depictive Adjunct Constructions	
1. Complement constructions	
2. Adjunct constructions	
3. Manifestation of NP1	
4. Expression of the predicative in Accusative Case: Construction V [NP _a AP _a]	
5. Expression of the predicative by gerundial form of the verb <i>to be</i> + NP	
6. Manifestation of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] by <i>as</i> -construction	
7. Manifestation of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] by <i>that</i> -clause	
8. Some possible correspondences of the English constructions V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP] in Lithuanian	
9. Word order variations	
10. Passive in the constructions V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP]	
11. AGR [+number] in the constructions V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP]	
12. AGR [-number] in the constructions V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP]	
13. Word negation in the constructions V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP]	
Appendix B.....	205
Resultative Adjunct Constructions	
1. Expression of the result in Lithuanian resultative constructions by a prefixed verb: English V [NP1 AP] sequences correspond to Lithuanian V NP1 structures	
2. Idiomatic translation of resultative constructions	
3. Correspondence of the resultative English sequences V [NP1 AP] to Lithuanian resultative sentences of the pattern V NP ADV	
4. English structures of the pattern V [NP1 AP]	
Appendix C.....	219
Results of the Survey	
Bibliography	231
Index.....	239

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to prof. Hans Ulrich Boas, my research supervisor, for the very great assistance he has given me at every stage of this work and for his patience, sensitivity, and consideration.

I am also very grateful to assoc. prof. Lionginas Pažūsis, and translator Arvydas Sabonis for their help with translations of the data used in this monograph.

I wish to thank prof. Edwin Williams, prof. Beth Levin, prof. Stephen D. Warner, prof. Axel Holvoet, prof. Vitas Labutis, prof. Albertas Rosinas, prof. Bonifacas Stundžia, prof. Sergej Temchin, assoc. prof. Artūras Judžentis, and lecturer Barbara Kuntze for their help and valuable advice.

I also wish to thank Mrs. Manuela Linde, Director of the International Office at Erfurt University, who helped to arrange my study visits at Erfurt University.

Last but not least, my gratitude is due to prof. Aušra Kubilius for her help with translations, valuable advice, and copy-editing the text of this monograph.

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

Acc.	Accusative case
Adv	Adverbial
AGR/Agr	Agreement
AGRP	Agreement Phrase
AP	Adjectival predicative element
C	Complementiser
Conj	Conjunction
Crd	Coordinating conjunction
Dat.	Dative case
Dem	Demonstrative
f	Feminine gender
INFL/Infl	Inflection
Instr.	Instrumental case
M	Modal verb
m	Masculine gender
neg	Negative particle
NP	Postverbal Noun Phrase
NP1	Noun Phrase denoting the Subject of the Clause
NP2	Noun Phrase denoting the Verbal element of the Clause
NPa	Noun Phrase in the Accusative case
NPd	Noun Phrase in the Dative case
NPg	Noun Phrase in the Genitive case
NPi	Noun Phrase in the Instrumental case
NPn	Noun Phrase in the Nominative case
pass	Passive Voice
pl	Plural
PP	Prepositional Phrase
PRO	Pronominal element
PrP	Predicate Phrase
S	Subject
S-Adv	Sentence adverbial
SC	Small clause
sg	Singular
t	Trace
V	Verb

Vfin	Finite form of the verb
Vnonfin	Nonfinite form of the verb
VP	Verb Phrase
VP-Adv	Verb Phrase adverbial
XP	Predicative element
“ ”	Intonation break
“:”	Punctuation mark used to separate the Subordinate Clause from the Main Clause in Asyndetic Clauses
“, -“	Punctuation mark that indicates the separation of direct and indirect speech
BNC	British National Corpus
CGEL	Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language (Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik J., 1991)
CBE	COBUILD Bank of English
CPF	Complex Predicate analysis
DLKG	Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika (Ambrazas V. (ed.), 1996)
GB	Government and Binding
LG	Lithuanian Grammar (Amrazas V. (ed.), 1997)
LKE	Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija (Ambrazas V. (ed.), 1999)
LKG	Lietuvių kalbos gramatika (Ulvydas K. (ed.), 1971, 1976)
LLC	Corpus of the Contemporary Lithuanian Language
PT	Predication Theory
SFID	Scott, Foresman Intermediate Dictionary (Thorndike C., Barnhart L. (eds.), 1988)
UG	Universal Grammar

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Goals and Objectives of the Study

The current research is carried out in the framework of generative-transformational grammar and studies the constructions that have been analyzed in this framework¹ as Small Clauses (henceforth: SC). The term Small Clauses refers to constructions [NP XP] (where XP = N(oun)P, A(djective)P or P(reposition)P) which lack any verb forms, but “have clausal characteristics in that they contain a subject phrase and a predicate phrase” (Aarts, 1992: 21).

The present study deals with the sequences [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP]² in English, where they are known as SCs, and in Lithuanian, where these sequences have been treated in different ways.

The main goal of the research is twofold: first, to present a contrastive analysis of the construction types like V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP] in English and Lithuanian; second, to show that the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] in Lithuanian express a subject-predicate relationship and form a constituent and can be described as having the syntactic function of a clause. Both syntactic and semantic evidence³ will be used to achieve this goal.

The author sets herself the following objectives:

¹ In Government and Binding (henceforth: GB) model (cf. Chomsky, 1981a).

² In the strings V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP], where V stands for a verb, NP1 for a postverbal Noun Phrase, NP2 for a nominal predicative element, AP for an adjectival predicative element.

³ Though “Chomsky rejects the assumption that syntax is totally determined by the structure of meaning”, in GB theory “despite a rather rudimentary conception of the semantic theory behind theta-roles, great reliance is increasingly placed on the θ -Criterion and the Projection Principle of Chomsky (1981) <...> for determining analyses of syntactic structure” (Jackendoff, 1990: 3). The importance of interaction between structural and semantic factors is also emphasized by Pollard and Sag (1994) (cf. Garcia, 1997: 108, 109).

1. to describe syntactic environments and the internal structure of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] in English and Lithuanian;
2. to present structural, syntactic and semantic characteristics of the verbs that occur with the structures [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] in English and Lithuanian;
3. to demonstrate the predication relationship in the sequences [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] on the basis of the presence of a node AGR, theta role assignment, and word order;
4. to show the clausal status of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] in English and Lithuanian applying sentence constituency tests.

1.2 Subject and Methodology of the Study

The term Small Clause⁴ was introduced by Williams in the article “Small Clauses in English” (1975). In this article Williams analyses three instances of clauses in English whose verbs end in *-ing*: the relative clause participle (a), the adverbial participle (b), and the gerund (c) (cf. Williams, 1975: 249):⁵

- (1.1) a. *The man **driving the bus** is Norton’s best friend.*
 b. *John decided to leave, **thinking the party was over**.*
 c. *John’s **evading his taxes** infuriates me.*

In recent generative-transformational models the term refers to constructions [V NP XP], expressing a subject-predicate relation (cf. Aarts, 1992: 1, 21; Cardinaletti & Guasti, 1995: 2):

⁴ In Lithuanian the term *nepilnieji sakiniai* (small clauses) was introduced by Balkevičius to refer to sentences which lack a subject or a predicate, or both; however, such a subject or a predicate can implicitly be understood from the context: e.g., (*Ir apie žmones ji parašys.*) *Apie puikius žmones, su kuriais dirba, kurie padeda jai* “(And she will write about people.) About wonderful people whom she works with and who help her (lit.)” (1963: 70, 153, 154). In this work the term is used to describe a clause which lacks any verb forms, but has a propositional interpretation.

⁵ The examples presented below refer to the reference followed by a colon unless indicated otherwise.

- (1.2) a. *Anna seems* [_{SC} *happy*].
 b. *Mike considers* [_{SC} *Sue intelligent*].
 c. *I declared* [_{SC} *Joe the winner*].
 d. *I want* [_{SC} *the dog out of my house*]. (Aarts, 1992: 21)

For more than 15 years small clauses were “black holes of syntactic theory” (Stowell, 1995: 271). Most of the discussion about them was devoted to the question of whether they existed, and only with the appearance of Government and Binding theory (Chomsky, 1981a), has “small clause theory <...> taken on a life of its own” (Stowell, 1995: 271).

The Standard Theory (cf. Newmeyer, 1986: 39) and the Extended Standard Theory (cf. Newmeyer, 1986: 139) paid very little attention to the small clause constructions.

There is some discussion in Chomsky’s earliest work where it is suggested that in, for example, [V NP AP] strings the verb and adjective in some sense form a complex unit. (Aarts, 1992: 9)

In the early days of generative-transformational grammar, there were only two types of transformations: deletion transformations and structure building transformations. At that time SCs were not basic units, they were derived structures, i.e., they were a result of a number of transformations. The development of generative-transformational grammar towards greater syntactic complexity, the shift of focus from rule-systems to systems of principles and other modifications made it possible to treat SCs as basic units, proving the presence of a predication relation within small clause constructions as well as demonstrating their syntactic unity (cf. Newmeyer, 1986: 198; Lyons, 1991: 199).

One of the main tendencies of the development of generative-transformational grammar is the reduction of the power and diversity of transformational rules. In the Standard Theory transformations play a very important role and are described as meaning preserving⁶ and having a filtering function⁷ (cf. Boas H. U., 1992: 84; Lyons, 1991: 95; Newmeyer, 1986: 69, 78). In the Extended Standard Theory the meaning preserving is weakened, which results from the fact that “semantic interpretation is held to be determined by the pair deep structure – surface structure, rather than by deep structure alone” (Boas H. U., 1992: 85). The reduction of the role of transformations is achieved not only by increasing the importance of the

⁶ Semantic interpretation of a sentence depends only on Deep Structure.

⁷ Filters are “devices used by Chomsky to prevent overgeneration by the base rules and transformations” (Radford, 1981: 283).

level of Surface Structure, but also by the enriching lexicon: “a rich set of rules applied in the lexicon to relate constructions that had previously been related transformationally” (Newmeyer, 1986: 139). In addition, transformations lose their filtering function: Chomsky and his associates in the 1970s proposed a rich set of surface filters (cf. Newmeyer, 1986: 156, 191). In GB theory a further reduction of the role of transformational rules takes place: now there exists only one transformational rule which is referred to as “Move alpha”⁸ where alpha is any category (cf. Lyons, 1991: 174, 175; Newmeyer, 1986: 157). The changes in the scope of transformational rules cause modifications in the interaction between the Deep Structure and the Surface Structure: the Surface Structure becomes more abstract, and the Deep Structure, in turn, becomes shallower, i.e., closer to the surface. Thus “there exists no single level <...> at which the grammaticality of generated structures can be observed” (Boas H. U., 1992: 87).

The reduction of transformational rules is closely related to the shift of focus from rule systems to systems of principles or modules which “largely serve to restrict and control the one remaining transformational rule and thus eliminate the need for other transformational rules” (Lyons, 1991: 205). Describing the change towards modular grammar structure Newmeyer claims:

The central guiding principle of GB is that the internal structure of the grammar is modular⁹ as well. That is, syntactic complexity results from the interaction of grammatical subsystems¹⁰, each characterizable in terms of

⁸ “Move alpha” is a general term; here alpha “is understood to be a variable over syntactic categories, and the fundamental idea is that a structure may be altered in any way by ‘moving anything anywhere’; independent principles will dictate just what can move and where it can move to” (Sells, 1985: 21). The types of movements are differentiated on the basis of the element which is moved (e.g., NP-movement, verb movement, etc.), and on the basis of the position to which an element moves (e.g., leftward movement, etc.) (cf. Haegeman, 1994: 306).

⁹ Modular means containing individual autonomous components of a larger system. “For example, a grammar might be said to contain a *case module* – i.e., a component which accounts for the case properties of relevant constituents” (Radford, 1997: 265). However, the individual autonomous components are integrated into the system by the Projection Principle “which requires lexical properties to be projected to all levels of syntactic representation” (Horrocks, 1987: 99).

¹⁰ Syntactic complexity results from the interaction of the following grammatical subsystems: *bounding theory* poses locality conditions on certain processes and related items, *government theory* shows the relation between the head of the construction and categories dependent on it, *theta-theory* is concerned with the

its own set of general principles. The central goal of syntactic theory thus becomes to identify such systems and characterize the degree to which they may vary from language to language.

Most early work in generative syntax was rather nonmodular in character. Essentially, each construction had its own associated rule: passives were derived by the Passive transformation, subject-raised sentences by the Raising transformation, and so on. But as the work on constraints on rules accelerated throughout the 1970s, it became clear that at least some of the complexities of particular constructions could be attributed to general principles, rather than having to be stated ad hoc in particular rules. (1986: 198)

In addition to the shift of the focus from rule systems to systems of principles, GB brings one more change into generative-transformational grammar—a shift in focus in the study of language; “the focus of attention was shifted from ‘language’ to ‘grammar’” (Chomsky, 1981b: 4). Under the influence of cognitive psychology, Chomsky (cf. 1981b: 3, 5) adopts the hypothesis that all human beings are equipped with inborn *knowledge of grammar*, not *knowledge of language* as was claimed in his earlier work (cf. Chomsky, 1965: 4). The *knowledge of grammar* or Universal Grammar (henceforth: UG) is a system of principles that are common to all human languages and available to individuals prior to experience.

The principles of universal grammar may be thought of in part as a system that enters into the construction of experience and in part as a function that maps experience into grammar. (Chomsky, 1981b: 7, 8)

Thus, we can assume that UG is only the basis for acquiring language, i.e., it is not sufficient to enable us to speak a language. It must be combined with experience which would allow the attainment of knowledge by setting certain parameters that could be defined as “dimensions of grammatical variation between different languages or different varieties of the same language” (Radford, 1997: 267). Such experience permits the extension of UG. Thus, GB theory introduces one more modification, namely, incorporation of a program of comparative syntax into generative-transformational grammar which provides a theoretical foundation for linguistic typology (cf. Newmeyer, 1986: 199).

assignment of thematic roles, *binding theory* is concerned with relations of anaphors, pronouns, names and variables to possible antecedents, *case theory* deals with assignment of abstract case and its morphological realization, *control theory* determines the potential for reference of the abstract pronominal element PRO (Chomsky, 1981a: 5, 6).

On the basis of comparative studies, the task of the linguist is to define the properties and regularities (i.e., universal principles) of grammar which would enable him to describe any language adequately and to show differences among languages which “result from each language setting slightly different values (‘parameters’) for <...> various grammatical subsystems” (Newmeyer, 1986: 199) (cf. Chomsky, 1981b: 7, 8; Haegeman, 1994: 12, 13; Radford, 1997: 5; Aarts, 1992: 12, 13; Hawkins, 1986: 1).

The Standard and the Extended Standard Theories were orientated to the study of a single language. Within the framework of the Standard Theory it is stated that “deep analysis of a single language may provide the most effective means for discovering properties of universal grammar” (Boas H. U., 1992: 86). In the Extended Standard Theory Chomsky describes UG as

the set of formal means that had been developed for a syntax-based generative grammar of English <...> without ever having shown that this set of descriptive devices would be sufficient to construct successful grammars for other languages, too. (Boas H. U., 1992: 86, 87)

1.3 Analysis of Constructions V [NP XP]

In the following section I will show how the constructions V [NP XP] can be analysed both in English and Lithuanian.

1.3.1 Constructions V [NP XP] in English

The changes of generative-transformational grammar that led to GB theory advanced the development of the analysis of the constructions V [NP XP]. Within the framework of GB much attention is paid to the above-mentioned structures. However, there is no consensus as to how they ought to be analysed. The main debate has developed around the question whether the sequence [NP XP] forms a constituent or not and whether this sequence expresses a subject-predicate relation. If we can show that there is a subject-predicate relation in the sub-string [NP XP] and that we are dealing with an [NP XP] constituent, this would point to a clausal analysis of the sequence in question¹¹ (cf. Aarts, 1992: 37).

¹¹ According to Aarts, the semantic fact that there is a subject-predicate relation and the syntactic fact that the sequence [NP XP] forms a constituent on its own are not sufficient evidence for a SC analysis, but combined they are (1992: 37).

Questions of constituency are not original to generative-transformational grammar but occur in previous linguistic research. According to Cardinaletti and Guasti, traditional grammarians have treated the sequence [NP XP] as not forming a constituent (1995: 2). They refer to the predicative V [NP XP] constructions as being complex transitive. The postverbal NP in the sub-string [NP XP] is defined as the object, and XP is understood as the complement of the object which applies an attribute or definition to the object (cf. CGEL, 1991: 53, 55; Aarts, 1992: 35). The exception was Jespersen (1924: 120, 121, 130) who was “the first linguist to propose analysing the predicative [NP XP] sequences of V [NP XP] constructions as constituents” (Aarts, 1992: 36). Jespersen calls such constituents *nexus*. A nexus is understood as a syntactic unit which expresses the subject-predicate relationship. Jespersen distinguishes between *independent nexus* and *dependent nexus* structures. Independent nexus structures are simple sentences, whereas dependent nexus structures cannot occur on their own; the latter structures are considered to contain the predicative strings [NP XP] (cf. Aarts, 1992: 36).

There have been three main proposals within generative-transformational grammar. One of the approaches treats the sequences [NP XP] in the structures V [NP XP] as “being clausal in those cases where the NP and XP are in a subject-predicate relationship with each other and where there is no thematic relationship between V and NP” (Aarts, 1992: 21). For instance, in *Mike considers* [_{SC} *Sue an intelligent person*] the string [*Sue an intelligent person*] contains no verb, but we can treat it as a clause since there is a predicate relationship between the NP *Sue* and the NP *an intelligent person*. Such an approach has become known as Small Clause Theory¹² (henceforth: SC Theory) (cf. Chomsky, 1981a: 111, 112; Aarts, 1992: 21, 22; Stowell, 1991: 185; 1995: 272)¹³. In the framework of this theory the sequence [NP XP] is considered a clausal constituent at all levels of presentation (cf. Cardinaletti & Guasti, 1995: 3).

SC theory is opposed by Predication Theory (henceforth: PT) which is an alternative approach within the GB framework. Predication Theory recognizes the predication relation within the sequences [NP XP]; however, it denies the presence of a syntactic unit¹⁴ (cf. Williams, 1983:

¹² Contreras (1995: 136-141) indicates that SC analysis is correct for adjectival and verbal, but not for nominal or prepositional predicates. Using binding and reconstruction facts, he proposes considering the latter complex predicates.

¹³ Cardinaletti & Guasti (1995: 2), Guéron & Hoekstra (1995: 99-101), Chung & McCloskey (1987: 173, 174) can be added to the list.

¹⁴ This view was the traditional Extended Standard Theory analysis of the [V NP XP] constructions. In addition to Predication Theory, developed on the basis of this

291, 298, 300; Rothstein, 1995: 44, 45; Schein, 1995: 50; Napoli, 1989: 20; Bowers, 1993: 591-593). The theory is based on the assumption that “both NP and XP are arguments of the verb, among which a relation of predication is established” (Winkler, 1997: 17). The predication relation is established by coindexing the secondary subject with a secondary predicate. However, the postverbal NP has the status of subject of a predication relation only at the level of Predicate Structure¹⁵. At the Surface Structure level the postverbal NP in the V [NP XP] string is a direct object (cf. Winkler, 1997: 17; Aarts, 1992: 25-27). In the analysis of PT, XP is treated as an independent complement of the V (cf. Stowell, 1991: 184).

According to the third view, which goes back to the model of Syntactic Structures (Chomsky, 1957), the NP and the XP do not form a constituent, “but the NP is an argument¹⁶ of the complex predicate formed by the main verb and XP” (cf. Cardinaletti & Guasti, 1995: 2; Contreras, 1995: 135; Stowell, 1991: 186; Bowers, 1993: 591). This analysis was proposed by Chomsky in 1955 and was developed in works by Bach (1979), Dowty (1978, 1982), Bowers (1983), Jacobson (1983), and Larson (1988) (cf. Bowers, 1993: 591).

The third account of the structure [V NP XP] is similar to Predication Theory in the fact that it disclaims a constituency of the sequence [NP XP]; however, it differs from both SC and Predication Theory in that it excludes the predication relation in the sub-string [NP XP]. On the other hand, the two rival theories, SC and Predication Theory, are similar in that they recognize the subject-predicate relation within the sequence [NP XP], but maintain different assumptions towards its clausal character.

view by Williams (1980: 205-207), a similar version of this account was developed by Bresnan (1982: 246-248) in the framework of lexical functional grammar (cf. Stowell, 1995: 273).

¹⁵ “Williams (1980, 1983) claims that predication is a more elaborate notion that cannot be captured in strictly configurational terms at the syntactic level. He therefore suggests that there is an additional level of representation in grammar that is derived from Surface Structure, namely Predicate Structure” (Boas H. C., 2000: 92). “In Williams’ framework the narrow structural restriction on predication <...> holds for any kind of predication, i.e., both for primary and secondary predication” (Boas H. C., 2000: 93).

¹⁶ The view holds that the postverbal NP is the direct object of the complex predicate (cf. Bowers, 1993: 591).

1.3.2 Constructions V [NP XP] in Lithuanian

Structures of the type V [NP XP] are also described in different ways in Lithuanian grammar. The postverbal NP in the sub-string [NP XP] in Lithuanian traditional grammar is defined as the object, whereas the predicative element of the sub-string, i.e., XP, is analysed differently. Some Lithuanian grammarians characterize XP as a part of a compound nominal¹⁷ predicate (cf. Jablonskis, 1957: 455, 456; Balkevičius, 1963: 119, 120; Sirtautas & Grenda, 1988: 76; Gailiūnas & Žiugžda, 1970: 172). In the grammars by Sirtautas and Grenda (1988: 91, 92), Valeckienė (1967: 99, 100), Lithuanian Grammar (LKG, 1976: 437, 438) and a Grammar of Modern Lithuanian (DLKG, 1996: 604), the XP is ascribed to the predicative attribute¹⁸, which is defined as a part of the sentence that has double subordinate relations: with the predicate and at the same time with the subject or object (e.g., *Broliai grįžo patenkinti* “The brothers came back **satisfied**”; *Radome visus sumigusius* “We found everybody **asleep**” (LKE, 1999: 629)). A similar view is presented by Holvoet (2003) who describes the element XP as a secondary predicate. On the basis of syntactic relation, Holvoet distinguishes between modifiers and complements: modifiers are optional and complements are obligatory secondary predicates. Syntactically secondary predicates are dependent on verbs since they cannot function in the sentence independently: they are case-marked by verbs and can be governed by the copula *be*. According to Holvoet, the relation between the postverbal NP and XP is semantic, but not syntactic; secondary predicates have a direct syntactic relation with the matrix verb, but not with the subject or object they describe (2003: 69, 200; Holvoet & Tamulionienė, 2005: 118-121, 128-130). A Functional Grammar of Lithuanian (1998) calls the predicative element XP a complement and gives a similar description to that of the predicative attribute, i.e., a complement has double relations: with the predicate that has an independent lexical meaning and with the words that function as

¹⁷ In Lithuanian traditional grammar the compound nominal predicate is characterized as a structure consisting of two parts, a copula and a predicative. The copula is expressed by the finite form of the verb *būti* “be” or of a semi-notional verb, and the predicative is either a noun (or its substitute), an adjective or an adjectivized participle (cf. LG, 1997: 468). According to Balkevičius, the predicative of the compound predicate, irrespective of the semantic structure of the verb, is, first of all, a determiner of attributive relations and acquires its predicative characteristics in the process of communication (1998: 58).

¹⁸ Lithuanian Grammar terms the predicative attribute as predicative complement (LG, 1997: 698).

subjects and objects (cf. Valeckienė, 1998: 21). The third view¹⁹, expressed by Balkevičius²⁰ (1963: 193, 194) and Labutis (1998: 250, 251), attributes the second element of the sub-string under investigation to a part of the complex object²¹, namely, its predicative component (cf. Balkevičius, 1963: 193). In all three views the demonstration of the relations between the two elements of the sub-string is mainly based on case-marking²², with the exception of Valeckienė, Labutis and Balkevičius. Valeckienė and Labutis apply diagnostic transformations²³ in their analyses.

- (1.3) a. *Lapę parvežė gyvą* “They brought the fox alive”
 → *Lapę parvežė* “They brought the fox” and *ji*
 buvo gyva “it was alive” (Valeckienė, 1967: 106)

¹⁹ In modern Lithuanian grammars the third view is not present.

²⁰ In some cases the AP in the Accusative case is treated by Balkevičius as a predicative and in others as an object (cf. Valeckienė, 1967: 104).

²¹ The complex object consists of a semantically closely related word-combination, semantically corresponding to the subordinate clause and expressing the state or action of the thing described (cf. LKG, 1973: 75; LKE, 1999: 462; Balkevičius, 1963: 193).

²² The grammatical means of marking syntactic relations in Lithuanian are grammatical morphemes. It must be noted that case-assignment in English and Lithuania is different due to the fact that Lithuanian has a richer inflectional morphology than English. Lithuanian has inflectional morphemes distinguishing six cases: Nominative, Genitive, Dative, Accusative, Instrumental, Locative. “Each case is characterized by a specific range of functions and meanings; e.g., the Nominative is primarily the case of the grammatical subject of the sentence, the Accusative is primarily the case of the direct object, the Genitive refers to such notions as possession, origin and so on” (LG, 1997: 106). In Lithuanian cases are assigned to an NP, AP, Part(iciple) and Num(eral) (cf. LG, 1997: 106, 135, 165, 186, 327, 454). According to Chomsky (1981a), English has four cases which are regarded as abstract or structural cases: Nominative, Objective, Genitive and Oblique. In English “normally, case is assigned to an NP by a category that governs it” (Chomsky, 1981a: 50). Verbs assign the Objective case, prepositions assign the Oblique case. The Nominative is assigned to the subject of a tensed sentence and the Genitive case is assigned in the context [NP – X bar], as in ‘John’s book’, ‘his reading the book’” (Chomsky, 1981a: 50). Thus Lithuanian has more cases than English; the two languages also differ in their morphological realization of cases.

²³ The diagnostic transformation is the modification of the sentence structure changing morphological forms, but retaining all lexemes and the same meaning of the sentence. Those transformations are used as an explicative device which shows predicative relations in the sentence, i.e., they indicate whether a certain unit expresses a predicative relation and can function as an independent sentence or not (cf. Valeckienė, 1967: 106).

- b. *pamatė žiburėlį mirgant* “saw the light glimmering”
 → *kad žiburėlis mirga* “that the light is glimmering”
 (Labutis, 1998: 277)

Analyzing the sequence V [NP XP], Valeckienė applies diagnostic transformations, thus showing that the constructions with the predicative attribute have only one predicative center²⁴. In (3a) *Lapę parvežė* “they brought the fox” is a predicative unit which can function as an independent sentence. The AP *alive*, in relation to both the verb *brought* and the NP *the fox*, specifies what *the fox* was at the time *they brought it*, i.e., it adds additional information. Thus, the AP *alive* can be easily omitted since it is not a part of the predicative unit (cf. Valeckienė, 1967: 106). Labutis expresses the opposite opinion pointing out that such transformations, on the contrary, show that the adjectival word can form a predicative centre, i.e., the relation established between the subject and the predicate. Labutis proposes considering the adjectival word *a secondary predicate*²⁵ (1998: 251). However, he restricts the definition of the secondary predicate to the description of the state of the thing expressed by the subject (1998: 250, 251). Labutis also suggests applying transformations to show secondary predicative relations in complex object constructions (3b) (1998: 277). Balkevičius expresses a similar idea while speaking about the nominal predicative. He indicates that the nominal predicative in some cases²⁶ establishes secondary predicative relations with the object of the sentence (1963: 119).

According to Sirtautas and Grenda, none of the three constructions, i.e., the compound nominal predicate (1.4a, b), the predicative attribute (1.4c, d) and the complex object (1.4e, f), representing the predicative XP, are sufficiently described (1988: 76).

- (1.4) a. *Visi jį laikė doru žmogumi*. (Balkevičius, 1963: 120)
 (Everybody him considered **an honest man**.)
 “Everybody considered him **an honest man**.”
 b. *Žmones jį laikė išminčiumi*. (DLKG, 1996: 604)
 (People him considered **a wise man**.)

²⁴ A predicative center is the smallest structural unit which can function as an independent sentence (cf. Valeckienė, 1967: 106).

²⁵ It is a part of a complex predicate, “a confederation” of two predicates; the characteristic expressed by it is oriented to a speech act on the basis of the other predicate (cf. Labutis, 1998: 251).

²⁶ However, Balkevičius does not specify in which cases.

“People considered him **a wise man**.”

- c. (*Jis*) *lapę gyvą sugavo*. (Jonas Jablonskis) (cited in Valeckienė, 1967: 99)

(He the fox **alive** captured.)

“He captured the fox **alive**.”

- d. *Ir amėšę gyvą tą žvėrelį*. (Jablonskis, 1957: 455)

(And they brought **alive** that little animal.)

“And they brought that little animal **alive**.”

- e. *Brazys pirkele rado tuščią*. (Vincas Mykolaitis Putinas) (cited in Balkevičius, 1963: 194)

(Brazys the cabin found **empty**.)

“Brazys found the cabin **empty**.”

- f. *Lig šiolei matė gyvenimą sunkų* <...>. (Jonas Biliūnas) (cited in Labutis, 1998: 227)

“Up to now (he) has seen life (as) **difficult** <...>.”

Valeckienė proposes to attribute both the compound nominal predicate and the complex object²⁷ to the predicative attribute. However, she agrees that there are certain problems deciding on the so-called transitional cases between the predicative attribute and the predicate²⁸, the predicative attribute and adverbials²⁹, as well as between the predicative and attributive

²⁷ According to Valeckienė, the complex object is neither sufficiently described nor motivated in Lithuanian syntax, i.e., its definition and scope are not clear (1967: 105).

²⁸ The predicative attribute (a) is comparable to the predicate (b) when it is adjoined to the verbs *rasti* “find”, (*pa*)*daryti* “make”, *turėti* “have”, *laikyti* “consider”. Though these verbs have an independent meaning, in a certain context, when they require the Accusative or Instrumental case, they are not completely free as in the case of the complex predicate where the verbs *darytis* “become”, *atrodyti* “seem”, *jaustis* “feel”, etc. are used as copulas (cf. Valeckienė, 1967: 109, 115):

Cf.: a. Didelė nosis **dar**o veidą *iškilmingą*. (Ieva Simonaitytė)

(cited in Valeckienė, 1967: 109)

“A big nose **makes** a face *solemn*.”

b. *Ir kiekvieną dieną Vaičiulis darėsi turtingesnis*. (Antanas Venclova)

(cited in Valeckienė, 1967: 108)

“And every day Vaičiulis **became** *richer*.”

²⁹ Predicative attributes and adverbials are closely related when they are manifested by a participle in the Nominative case. However, they differ in their meaning and syntactic relations. Unlike predicative attributes, which have the meaning of a state, adverbials express an action. An action realized by adverbials

attribute³⁰ (1967: 108). Speaking about the predicative attribute, Sirtautas and Grenda (1988: 92) point out that the instances of the construction cannot always be clearly identified. In school textbooks, the structures under investigation are still referred to as the predicate, object, or adverbial modifiers. At the same time, they indicate that the compound nominal predicate containing semi-notional copulative verbs³¹ has not been studied sufficiently either (1988: 76).

is earlier in time than the action represented by the matrix verb, while predicative attributes have the same time reference as the matrix verb (cf. Valeckienė, 1967: 110, 115):

- Cf.: a. – *Ta Tautrimikė tikra beždžionė, **pasipiktinusi** sako Gervinienė.*
 (Ieva Simonaitytė) (cited in Valeckienė, 1967: 110)
 (That Tautrimikė (is) a real monkey, **being angry** says Gervinienė.)
 “– That Tautrimikė is a real monkey, says the angry Gervinienė.”
 b. *Senelis **apšilęs** linksmai nusijuokė.* (Žemaitė) (cited in Valeckienė, 1967: 110)
 “The old man, **having warmed up**, laughed cheerfully.”

According to Holvoet, the difference between predicative attributes (depictive predicates) and adverbials is based on the fact that “adverbials ascribe a feature to the predicate, whereas depictive predicates ascribe a feature to one of its arguments”, and “only agreeing adjectivals can be recognized as depictive predicates; the non-agreeing *tarininiai pažyminiai* of traditional Lithuanian grammar should be described as adverbials” (2003: 200).

³⁰ The predicative attribute (a) and attributive attribute (b) are similar in that they can both precede a noun, or follow a determinative. The difference between them is that the predicative attribute has a direct relation to the predicate of the sentence, whereas the attributive attribute, which modifies nouns, lacks such a relation (cf. Valeckienė, 1967: 114, 115):

- Cf.: a. *Darbininkai **kiekvienas** žino savo darbą.* (Žemaitė) (cited in Valeckienė, 1967: 113)
 “Workers **each** know their job.”
 b. ***Kiekvienas** darbininkas žino savo darbą.* (Valeckienė, 1967: 113)
 “**Every** worker knows his job.”

The difference between attributive and predicative relations is analysed in detail by Jespersen (1924: 114, 115) and Bunevičiūtė (1999: 22, 29-31).

³¹ Semi-notional copulative verbs are the verbs, which, beside having a general meaning, denoting the presence of some quality, have a specific meaning showing the character of the presence of the quality. The group of semi-notional copulative verbs comprises only the verbs which have certain lexical meanings. The verbs are as follows: (*padaryti* “make”, *laikyti* “consider”, *vadinti* “call”, *pravardžiuoti*

1.4 Scope of the Study

SC analyses have evoked many discussions in generative linguistics, especially with the appearance of GB theory. SC constructions have been analysed not only for English, but for many different languages as well: Italian (Cardinaletti & Guasti, 1995: 12-17; Moro, 1995: 121-126), French (Sportiche, 1995: 288-320), Irish (Chung & McCloskey, 1987: 173-237), European Portuguese (Raposo & Uriagereka, 1990: 505-537), Hebrew (Rothstein, 1995: 32-41), Russian (Schein, 1995: 52, 53, 56, 57), Slovak (Starke, 1995: 254, 255), Japanese (Kawai, 2006: 330-336), and some others. Due to the different characteristics of the languages, they require different approaches and result in different consequences. For instance, Cardinaletti and Guasti observe that both Italian and French have richer inflectional systems than English; therefore, in these languages, unlike in English, the adjectival predicate of a SC manifests agreement with the subject of predication which indicates that adjectival SCs contain some kind of inflectional projections (1995: 12). Analysing verbal SCs in French, Sportiche discovers one more difference with English, namely, VPs prepose in English, but not in French, and this fact “leads to non-standard conclusions about the syntactic analysis of clauses and of VP small clauses in particular” (1995: 288). Sportiche even doubts whether such structures can be considered small clauses; she would rather call them “restructured clauses” (1995: 288). The evidence on SCs in Irish shows that SCs may take a complementiser and may occur as complements to adjectives or adverbs, which is not characteristic of English (cf. Chung & McCloskey, 1987: 178, 184). In Hebrew, differently from English, matrix SCs, consisting of a subject and bare predicate, are possible (cf. Rothstein, 1995: 32). Russian also provides additional evidence on the case-marking and structure of SCs. Russian has adjunct SCs where “instrumental Case can be predicated only of a direct object”, and this leads to the conclusion that “the instrumental case-marking of a predicate parallels the accusative case-marking of the NP” (Schein, 1995: 52, 53). In Russian, in addition, adjectival adjunct SCs agree with their subject, which can be concluded from the fact that adjectival adjunct SCs can be nominative via agreement with a nominative subject (cf. Schein, 1995: 57). In Japanese, SCs are assumed as non-finite clausal projections, which may include negation, but not tense or inflection. Japanese SCs are instances of subject raising to object. The class of Japanese SC constructions also includes infinitives which are analysed as tenseless and

“dub”, *skirti* “appoint”, etc. (cf. LKG, 1973: 382, 383; Sirtautas & Grenda, 1988: 76).

aspectless projections (cf. Kawai, 2006: 330-336). However, English exhibits different characteristics.

The present monograph is one more attempt to analyse SC constructions in the framework of generative-transformational grammar. It studies the sequences [NP XP] in Lithuanian. The study is carried out on the basis of Lithuanian equivalents of English. English is the best described language in terms of linguistic analysis, and it is worth attempting to adapt some of its methods to Lithuanian.

The present research is an attempt to analyse Lithuanian, one of the oldest and most archaic³² Indo-European languages, in the framework of generative-transformational grammar. There have been previous attempts to study Lithuanian in the framework of generative-transformational grammar made by Lithuanian linguists Ambrazas (1972: 33-46), Geniušienė (1977: 4, 11, 12), Valeika (1972: 31-34; 1998: 5-13) and others as well as foreign linguists such as Maxwell (1971) and Chien-Ching (1981). According to Ambrazas, the transformational method of generative grammar is an effective means for the analysis of syntactic phenomena that allows the definition of their origin according to the relationship with other elements of the syntactic system of the same language (1972: 33).

The research focuses on the non-verbal³³ type of SC structures represented by the subcategorization frame³⁴ V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1

³² The language retaining the most archaic forms of Indo-European languages (cf. Zinkevičius, 1996: 41).

³³ The verbal element of SC constructions is usually represented by the Infinitive and Participle (e.g., *I saw John run* (Cardinaletti & Guasti, 1995: 10), *Nelson saw them running away* (Aarts, 1992: 21). Sportiche (1995) also presents the analysis of participial SCs (1995: 302-306). However, most linguists exclude VPs as secondary predicates and consider the structures *John run* and *them running away* non-finite clauses (cf. Wekker & Haegeman 1985: 33; Aarts, 1997: 52; Holvoet & Judžentis, 2003: 120, 121). The present research supports Aarts (1995) view. According to Aarts, “the reason why secondary predicates cannot be VPs is twofold. The first reason is that although the VP-secondary predicate and its subject would form a traditional subject-predicate relationship, these two phrases would not be in a copular relationship” (1995: 81). The existence of such a copular relationship is a precondition for an element to have the status of secondary predicate. The second reason is a theory-internal one. Secondary predicates are positioned inside VP. If secondary predicates were allowed in the form of VPs, we would “have a bare VP inside VP acting as a secondary predicate taking the postverbal NP as its subject expression” (Aarts, 1992: 82). However, the framework of GB theory disallows such bare VPs (cf. Aarts, 1995: 81, 82).

³⁴ Subcategorization frames are potential positions in which a lexical item appears with respect to the syntactic elements with which it can combine (cf. Matthews, 1997: 358).

AP]. The subcategorization frame V [NP1 PP] is excluded from the present study for a number of reasons. First, Lithuanian is an inflectional language where cases are realized by inflections, not prepositions as in English: cf.: *in the office* “kontoroje” (Locative), *to people* “žmonėms” (Dative). Second, prepositional small clauses are translated into Lithuanian using *that*-clauses: cf. *I want [the kids in the car]* (Aarts, 1997: 269) “Aš noriu, kad vaikai suliptų į mašiną” (I want that the kids get into the car), *I expect [that sailor off my ship]* (Stowell, 1981: 257) “Aš nenoriu, kad tas jūreivis būtų mano laive” (I do not want that that sailor is in my ship), or participial constructions: *Charley left home [in a red shirt]* (Winkler, 1997: 23) “Čarlis išėjo iš namų vilkėdamas raudonus marškinius” (Charley left home dressed in a red shirt). On the other hand, the sentences *Vaikas gulėjo be gyvybės* (Valeckienė, 1967: 101) (*³⁵The child lay without life) and *Jūsų virtuvė be tarakonų bus kur kas mielesnė* (Your kitchen without cockroaches will be far nicer) are translated into English using non-prepositional structures “The child lay lifeless” and “The kitchen free of cockroaches is a welcome prospect” (Aarts, 1997: 70). However, the main reasons why the structures of the subcategorization frame V [NP1 PP] are not analyzed alongside the constructions V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP] are that the former differ from the structures V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP] in the following:

- PPs are not used as object predicatives (cf. Longman, 1999: 104, 437; LG, 1997: 472);
- the sub-string [NP1 PP] does not contain AGR (Agreement) features³⁶;
- prepositions, like verbs, are case-assigners³⁷.

On the basis of the facts presented above, the structures V [NP1 PP] should not be included in SC analysis³⁸.

³⁵ Sequences of words that are claimed to be impossible sentences in a language are marked with an asterisk; question marks will be used to indicate questionable utterances.

³⁶ According to Chomsky, in SCs AGR is a SUBJECT (1981a: 209, 210).

³⁷ Following Haegeman, “the small clauses themselves do not contain a case-marker” (1994: 171). In Lithuanian, prepositions assign case to the head noun of the PP.

³⁸ The view is supported by Holvoet and Tamulionienė (2005) who claim that there is no morphosyntactic basis to treat PPs as secondary predicates though they can be used in copular constructions (e.g., *Mačiau vakar Joną be kepurės* → *Jonas buvo be kepurės* “Yesterday I saw John without a hat/hatless → John was without

The type of SC constructions chosen for investigation are also limited to object related structures, represented by six groups of verbs: the *consider* group, the *name/call* group, the *make* group, the *find* group, the *bury alive* group, and the verb *serve*. These six groups of verbs were selected as expressing SC construction models in *Grammar Patterns 1: Verbs* (cf. Cobuild, 1996: 277, 278, 281-285).

1.5 Research Method and the Corpus

1.5.1 Research Method and the Description of Constituency Tests

The research method is contrastive in the following sense. Starting out from the description of the data of the two languages in terms of the same grammatical model, it involves two steps: first, the stage of description where the constructions V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP] in both English and Lithuanian are identified; second, the structures in question are juxtaposed for comparison in order to come up with similarities and discrepancies³⁹.

The description is carried out within the framework of generative-transformational grammar which is “a model of the grammatical competence of the native speaker of a language” (Radford, 1988: 27). Chomsky (1965: 24-26) proposes two criteria to describe grammar adequately: descriptive adequacy and explanatory adequacy. Radford (1988) mentions one more criterion, i.e., observational adequacy. Observational adequacy is the weakest requirement for any grammar of a language. Radford points out that

a grammar of a language is observationally adequate if it correctly specifies which sentences are (and are not) syntactically, semantically, morphologically, and phonologically well-formed in the language. (1988: 28)

Descriptive adequacy is a higher level of adequacy. It includes the requirement of observational adequacy and, in addition, indicates that

a grammar of a language properly describes the syntactic, semantic, morphological, and phonological structure of the sentences in the language

a hat/hatless”). Holvoet and Tamulionienė propose to consider such PPs not as secondary predicates, but as obligatory modifiers (2005: 123).

³⁹ The two steps are proposed by James (1980: 30).

in such a way as to provide a principled account of the native speaker's intuitions about this structure. (Radford, 1988: 28)

In terms of descriptive adequacy, grammar would have to specify not only the sequence of words in the sentence *These boys don't like those girls*, but it would additionally have to show that *these* modifies *boys*, not *girls*, and that *those* modifies *girls*, not *don't* (cf. Radford, 1981: 28). It is also important to emphasize the aspect of descriptive adequacy which refers to the native speaker's intuitions. The description of grammatical phenomena is based on the native speaker's intuitions which are reflected in two ways: intuitions about grammaticality and intuitions about interpretation. For example, any native speaker of English would intuitively recognize that the sentence *If you don't know the meaning of a word, look it up in a dictionary* is grammatical and the sentence *If you don't know the meaning of a word, look up it in a dictionary* is ungrammatical (cf. Radford, 1997: 3, 4). The native speaker's intuitions about interpretation decide on the ambiguity of sentences. For instance, the sentence *He loves her more than you*⁴⁰ is ambiguous since it has two interpretations: "one paraphrasable as *He loves her more than he loves you*, and the other as *He loves her more than you love her*" (Radford, 1997: 253).

For comparative purposes and in order to demonstrate the constituency of the structures in question, tests determining sentence constituent structure in English are applied to Lithuanian. The tests as proposed by Radford⁴¹ (1988) are the following:

The Movement test shows that "if we can move a particular string of words in a sentence from one position to another, then it behaves as a constituent" (Aarts, 1997: 180). For example, the test indicates that the sub-string [*off the bus*] is a PP, since only PPs can undergo movement, whereas the sub-string [*off the customers*] cannot be moved which suggests that it is not a phrase and not even a constituent (cf. Radford, 1988: 95):

- (1.5) a. *Every afternoon, the big red bus would stop in front of the village clock, and [off the bus] would get a dear old lady*

⁴⁰ Due to the fact that syntactic relations are expressed by inflections, such ambiguity is not possible in Lithuanian.

⁴¹ It should be noted that "no 'constituent structure test' can ever be expected to be foolproof; on occasions, a test may fail to yield the anticipated results, simply because some independent factor is 'interfering' with the test and making it inapplicable in some particular context" (Radford, 1988: 101).

carrying a shopping bag.

- b. **The manager suspects that drunks would put off the customers, and [off the customers] they certainly would put.*

The Sentence-fragment test demonstrates that only constituents can occur as sentence-fragments (cf. Radford, 1988: 91). The Sentence-fragment test confirms the PP status of the sub-string [*off the bus*] since it can function as a sentence; however, the sub-string [*off the customers*] cannot (cf. Radford, 1988: 96):

- (1.6) a. *A: Did he get off the train?*
 B: No, off the bus.
 b. *A: Would drunks put off the waitresses?*
 *B: *No, off the customers.*

The Ordinary Coordination and the Shared Constituent Coordination tests state that “only constituents can be coordinated” (Aarts, 1997: 209). The Ordinary Coordination test proves the string [*off the bus*] to be a PP constituent, but not the string [*off the customers*] (cf. Radford, 1988: 97):

- (1.7) a. *Drunks would get [off the bus] and [on the train]*
 b. **Drunks would put [off the customers] and [off the waitress].*

The Shared Constituent Coordination gives the similar results: *Drunks would get—and junkies would fall—[off the bus]*, but **Drunks would put—and junkies would also put—[off the customers]* (Radford, 1988: 97).

The Proform test indicates that “a particular string of words is a constituent if it can be substituted by a suitable proform” (Aarts, 1997: 191). The Proform test shows that Prepositional verbs can take pronominal Objects: *The trouble with the bus was that drunks would want to get off it every few miles, to exercise their natural bodily functions*, whereas Phrasal verbs require non-pronominal Objects: **What worries me about the customers is whether drunks would put off them*⁴² (Radford, 1988: 99).

In addition, Aarts (1997) proposes constituency tests such as **Insertion tests** which consist of **the S-Adverbial Distribution** and **the VP-Adverbial Distribution tests**. **S-Adverbial Distribution test** suggests

⁴² A Phrasal Verb like *put off* can indeed take a pronominal Object, but only when the preposition is positioned at the end of the sentence: **Drunks would put off them* but *Drunks would put them off* (Radford, 1988: 99).

that S-adverbs can be positioned between NP and VP as well as at the beginning and at the end of the sentence, but not between any other pairs of constituents (cf. Aarts, 1997: 213, 214). For instance, the sentence **Pam will take, **however**, two weeks off in August* is ungrammatical for the reason that the S-adverb *however* intervenes between the main verb and its direct object which are not S-constituents, but constituents of the VP. It can be positioned in various positions as is shown below (cf. Aarts, 1997: 214):

- (1.8) a. *Pam, **however**, will take two weeks off in August.*
 b. *Pam will, **however**, take two weeks off in August.*
 c. *Pam will take two weeks off in August, **however**.*

The VP-Adverbial Distribution test gives results similar to those of the S-Adverbial Distribution test. The only difference is that VP-adverbs can occur only at the beginning, at the end, and in the middle of the VP. The class of VP-adverbs includes expressions such as *quickly, slowly, completely*, etc. (cf. Radford, 1988: 96):

- (1.9) a. *Drunks would get **slowly** off the bus.*
 b. **Drunks would put **completely** off the customers.*

Since VP-adverbs can occur within VPs, we can position such an adverb between the verb *get* and the PP [*off the bus*] (1.9a). However, we cannot place an adverb between the verb *put* and the preposition *off* (1.9b), for the reason that *put off* is a Phrasal Verb which does not form a constituent, and VP-adverbs can be attached only to VP nodes, but not to V nodes (cf. Radford, 1988: 96, 97).

The Paraphrase test demonstrates that the paraphrased and the resulting strings of words have the same syntactical position (cf. Aarts, 1997: 269).

- (1.10) a. *Mike considers **Sue an intelligent person**.* (Aarts, 1992: 21)
 b. *Mike considers **Sue to be an intelligent person**.*
 c. *Mike considers **that Sue is an intelligent person**.*

Sentences (1.10b) and (1.10c) are paraphrased variants of *Mike considers Sue an intelligent person*. Sentence (1.10b) contains a nonfinite clause and (1.10c) includes a finite clause. What distinguishes the sentence containing a SC (1.10a) from the corresponding full clauses