COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE SUBCATEGORISATION FRAMES *V[NP1 NP2] AND V[NP1 AP]* IN ENGLISH AND LITHUANIAN ON THE BASIS OF PREDICATION

Judita GIPARAITĖ

Under the influence of cognitive psychology, Chomsky (cf.: 1981, 3,5) adopts the hypothesis that grammar as the human language faculty is innate to human beings, i.e. all human beings are equipped with inborn knowledge of grammar[1] – Universal Grammar (UG) – a system of principles that are common to all human languages. However, 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 to attain 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, 520). Such experience permits the extension of UG (cf.: Chomsky, 1982, 7,8). Thus the task of the linguist is, on the basis of linguistic comparative studies, to define the properties and regularities (i.e. universal principles) of grammar which would enable to describe any language adequately (cf.: Haegeman, 1994, 12,13; Radford, 1997, 5; Hawkins, 1986, 1)[2].

The present article will focus on characteristic properties and regularities of the constructions of the subcategorisation frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP][3] found in English and Lithuanian. In English generative tradition a part of the constructions, i.e. the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP], are defined as Small Clauses (SC). Thus the purpose of the article is to present a comparative analysis of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] in English and Lithuanian and attempt to

---

[1] Compared to Standard Theory (cf.: Chomsky, 1965, 4), where the basic notion was "knowledge of language", Chomsky makes a shift focusing on the notion of "knowledge of grammar" (cf.: Chomsky, 1981, 6,7).

[2] For an account of the development of Chomskian generative-transformational grammar, see Newmeyer's "Linguistic Theory in America" (1986).

[3] The symbols refer to: V – the matrix verb; NP1 – the Noun Phrase denoting the Subject of the clause; NP2 – the Noun Phrase denoting the verbal element of the clause; AP – the Adjectival Phrase denoting the verbal element of the clause.

show, on the basis of predication, that in Lithuanian their syntactic status can also be described as that of a clause.

According to Aarts (1992), a Small Clause is 'a structure which has clausal characteristics in that it contains a subject phrase and a predicate phrase' (e.g., Mike considers sc[Sue an intelligent person]) (Aarts, 1992, 21). The string [Sue an intelligent person] contains no verb, but we can treat it as a clause since there is an implicit predicate relationship between the NP *Sue* and the NP *an intelligent person*. Haegeman (1994), characterising a Small Clause, describes it as 'a constituent which has a propositional meaning, i.e. the same sort of meaning as a full clause structure has, but it lacks any verb forms' (cf.: *Maigret believes [the taxi driver innocent]* and *Maigret believes [that the taxi driver is innocent]*) (Haegeman, 1994, 57,59). The constituent *[the taxi driver innocent]* and the sentence *[that the taxi driver is innocent]* are very close in meaning: what *Maigret believes* is that *the taxi driver is innocent.* Wekker and Haegeman (1985) indicate that a Small Clause is 'a clause in which the verb (usually a form of *BE*) and sometimes other elements have been deleted' (Wekker, Haegeman, 1985, 34). A similar description of Small Clauses is given by Culicover (1997) who defines it as 'a phrase that has a clausal (or propositional) interpretation, but lacks the full inflectional morphology of a sentence' (Culicover, 1997, 47). According to Culicover (1997), 'any part of a sentence that has a complete propositional interpretation is represented as a clause at some level of syntactic representation' (Culicover, 1997, 22). As we can see from the descriptions of the English SC given above, the main characteristic of the SC is that it is defined as a clausal constituent. The theory is known as SC theory (Cardinaletti, Guasti, 1995, 2; Freidin, 1991, 185; Stowell, 1995, 272; Gueron, Hoekstra, 1995, 99–101).

SC theory is opposed by predication theory which recognizes the predication relation within the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP], however, it denies the presence of a syntactic unit (Williams, 1983, 298,300; Rothstein, 1995, 44–45; Schein, 1995, 50; Napoli, 1989, 20). The theory proposes that the structures NP2 and AP is part of a complex verbal predicate. Traditional English grammar, as well as Predication Theory, treats the sequences in question as not forming a constituent[4] (cf.: Cardinaletti, Guasti, 1995, 2; Winkler, 1997, 17).

The analogous constructions in Lithuanian are also described in different ways. The first element NP1 in the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] in Lithuanian traditional grammar is defined as the Object, whereas the second element of the sub-strings, i.e. NP2 and AP, is analysed differently. Similar to predication theory, some Lithuanian grammarians characterise NP2 and AP as part of a Nominal Predicate (1a, b) (Jablonskis, 1957, 455,456; Balkevičius, 1963, 119,120; Sirtautas, Grenda, 1988, 76; Gailiūnas, Žiugžda, 1970, 172). In the grammars by Sirtautas and Grenda (1988,

---

[4] With the exception of Otto Jespersen (cf.: Aarts, 1992, 36).

91,92), Valeckienė (1967, 99,100), Lithuanian Grammar (LKG, 1976, 437,438) and Modern Lithuanian Grammar (DLKG, 1996, 604), NP2 and AP is ascribed to the Predicative Attribute (1c, d), 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. One more view, expressed by Balkevičius[5] and Labutis (1998, 250,251), attributes the second nominal element[6] of the sub-string to a part of the Complex Object[7] (1e), namely, its predicative component (cf.: Balkevičius, 1963, 193).

(1) a. *Ir atnešė tą žvėrelį gyvą.* (Jablonskis, 1957, 455)
      'And they brought that animal alive.'
  b. *Mergaitės vežimą prikrovė pilną.* (Balkevičius, 1963, 119)
      (The girls the cart loaded full.)
      'The girls loaded the cart full.'
  c. *Broliai grįžo patenkinti.* (LKE, 1993, 629)
      'Brothers returned delighted.'
  d. *Radome visus sumigusius.* (LKE, 1993, 629)
      'We found everybody asleep.'
  e. Brazys *pirkelę* rado *tuščią.* (Balkevičius, 1963, 194)
      (Brazys the cabin found empty.)
      'Brazys found the cabin empty.'

In all three views the analysis of the relations between the two elements of the sub-strings is based on case-marking[8], with the exception of Valeckienė, Labutis and Balkevičius who apply diagnostic transformations[9] in their analyses.

Analyzing the subcategorisation frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP], Valeckienė applies diagnostic transformations[9], thus showing that the constructions with the predicative attribute have only one predicative center: *Lapę parvežė gyvą* 'The fox was brought alive' → *Lapę parvežė* 'The fox was brought' and *ji buvo gyva* 'it was alive'. Here the adjective *alive* only specifies the state of the noun *the fox* at the moment of bringing it, and it can be easily omitted (cf.: Valeckienė, 1967, 106).

---

[5] 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).

[6] Only the AP is analysed.

[7] 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).

[8] The grammatical means of marking syntactic relations in Lithuanian are endings (LG, 1997, 454).

[9] 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).

Labutis expresses the opposite opinion pointing out that such transformations, on the contrary, show that the adjectival word can form a predication centre, i.e. the relation established between the subject and the predicate. Labutis proposes considering the adjectival word *a secondary predicate* [10] (cf.: Labutis, 1998, 251). However, he restricts the definition of the secondary predicate to the description of the state of the thing expressed by the Subject (cf.: Labutis, 1998, 250,251). Labutis also suggests applying transformations to show secondary predicative relations in complex object constructions: *pamatė žiburėlį mirgant* 'saw the light glimmering' → *kad žiburėlis mirga* 'that the light is glimmering' (cf.: Labutis, 1998, 277). Balkevičius expresses a similar idea while speaking about the nominal predicative. He indicates that the nominal predicative in some cases establishes secondary predicative relations with the object of the sentence (cf.: Balkevičius, 1963, 119).

Lithuanian scholars agree that none of the three constructions, representing NP2 and AP, are sufficiently described. Valeckienė proposes to attribute both the nominal predicate (e.g. *Visi jį laikė doru žmogumi*. 'Everybody considered him an honest man.' (Balkevičius, 1963, 120)), and the Complex Object[11] (e.g. *Jie pagavo lapę gyvą*. 'They caught the fox alive.') to the Predicative Attribute (e.g. *Žmonės jį laikė išminčiumi*. 'People considered him a wise man.' (DLKG, 1996, 604)). However, she agrees that there are certain problems defining the so-called transitional cases between the Predicative Attribute and the Predicate[12], the Predicative Attribute and Adverbial Modifiers[13], as well as between the Predicative and Attributive Attribute[14] (cf.: Valeckienė, 1967, 108).

Speaking about the Predicative Attribute, Sirtautas and Grenda (1988, 92) point out that instances of the construction cannot always be clearly identified. In school

---

[10] It is 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).

[11] According to Valeckienė (1967, 105), the Complex Object is neither sufficiently described nor motivated in Lithuanian syntax.

[12] The predicative attribute is comparable to the predicate when it is adjoined to the verbs *rasti* "find", *(pa)daryti* "make", *turėti* "have", *laikyti* "consider" which, though have an independent meaning, in a certain context, when they require 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).

[13] Predicative Attributes and Adverbial Modifiers 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, Adverbial Modifiers express an action. An action realized by Adverbial Modifiers is earlier in time than the action represented by the matrix verb, while Predicative Attributes have the same time reference to that of the matrix verb (cf.: Valeckienė, 1967, 110,115).

[14] The Predicative and Attributive Attribute 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 lacks such a relation (cf.: Valeckienė, 1967, 114,115).

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 verbs has not been studied sufficiently either (cf.: Sirtautas, Grenda, 1988, 76).

The analysis of the subcategorisation frames of the three Lithuanian constructions mentioned above shows that they follow almost the same pattern. In all these constructions the verb is followed by the object manifested by an NP in the Accusative (2a) or Genitive case[15] (2b).

(2)   a. *Lig šiolei matė gyvenimą sunkų.* (Labutis, 1998, 227)
        'Up to now he has seen life hard.'
    b. *Aš nemačiau gero žmogaus turtingo.* (Balkevičius, 1963, 195)
        (I have not seen a good man rich.[16])
        'I have not seen a good man to be rich.'

All three constructions contain an AP (3a, c) or a Participle[17] (3b) in the Accusative and Instrumental case as their second element. Only the Nominal Predicate and the Predicative Attribute can be represented by an NP[18] (3d, e), whereas the Complex Object can, in addition, be realized by a gerund (3f).

(3)   a. *Radau trobelę tuščią.* (Acc.) (Balkevičius, 1963, 193)
        'I found the cabin empty.'
    b. *Jis pakėlė ją nuo žemės dejuojančią.* (Acc.) (Balkevičius, 1963, 193)
        (He lifted her from the ground moaning.)
        'He lifted her moaning from the ground.'
    c. *Darbas žmogų daro laimingą.* (Acc.) (Šukys, 1980, 23)
        (Work man makes happy.)
        'Work makes man happy.'
    d. *Kaip šiandien jis matė save studentą.* (Acc.) (Valeckienė, 1967, 100)
        'He saw himself a student as if it had happened today.'
    e. *Visi jį laikė doru žmogumi.* (Instr.) (Balkevičius, 1963, 120)
        'Everybody considered him an honest man.'
    f. *Kartą berniukas girdėjo savo tėvus kalbantis* (Balkevičius, 1963, 193)
        'Once the boy heard his parents speaking.'

---

[15] When the verb is used in its negative form.

[16] In fact, the complex object is represented by double Accusative and Genitive constructions.

[17] In Lithuanian, Participles possess both verbal and adjectival properties; verbal properties are manifested through the verbal stem and the categories of tense and voice, and adjectival properties are revealed by the ability to have categories of gender, number and case (cf.: LG, 1997, 326,327); they can perform the functions of a verb, an adjective, a noun, sometimes even an adverb (cf.: Klimas, 1993, 49).

[18] Balkevičius (1963, 46) indicates that NP manifestation is also possible in complex object constructions; however, examples show that this is plausible only in structures where an NP follows the gerundial form of the verb *to be* (e.g. *Žinau jį esant mokytoju.* Lit.: "I know him being a teacher." (Balkevičius, 1963, 193)).

All three constructions under investigation can be used after the verbs of speaking (4a) and the verbs expressing state or change of state (4b, c, d). Only the Predicative Attribute and Complex Object are used after the verbs of physical perception (4e, f) and, in addition, the Predicative Attribute as well as the nominal part of the Complex Predicate can follow the verbs of movement (4g, h), and the Complex Object – the verbs of perception (4j).

(4) a. *Jis vadino save karjeristu.* (Balkevičius, 1963, 120)
         'He called himself a career man.'
     b. *Žmonės jį laikė išminčium.* (DLKG, 1996, 604)
         'People considered him a wise man.'
     c. *Brazys pirkelę rado tuščią.* (Balkevičius, 1963, 194)
         (Brazys the hut found empty.)
         'Brazys found the hut empty.'
     d. *Aš tave utėle paversiu.* (Balkevičius, 1963, 120)
         (I you a louse will make.)
         'I will make you a louse.'
     e. *Ji dar niekada nebuvo mačiusi savo vyro tiek supykusio.* (Labutis, 1998, 227)
         'She has never seen her husband so angry.'
     f. *Matau ją liekną, aukštą, kasančią pavasary daržely lysves.* (LKG, 1976, 440)
         'I see her slim, tall, digging beds in the garden in spring.'
     g. *Ir atnešė gyvą tą žvėrelį.* (LKG, 1976, 439)
         'And they brought that animal alive.'
     h. *Mergaitės vežimą prikrovė pilną.* (Balkevičius, 1963, 119)
         (The girls the cart loaded full.)
         'The girls loaded the cart full.'
     j. *Jis žinojo ją esant nelaimingą.* (Balkevičius, 1963, 193)
         (He knew her being unhappy.)
         'He knew he to be happy.'

English constructions representing Small Clauses have similar properties to Lithuanian constructions manifesting the subcategorization frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP], the first element following the verb is expressed by an NP (5a, b), and the second element can be realized by an NP, AP[19] (5c, d).

(5) a. *Malcolm considered him a hero.* (CWC)[20]
     b. *The Foreign Office branded the arrests 'unacceptable'.* (CWC)
     c. *Washington considered Syria a state sponsor of terrorism.* (CWC)
     d. *They acclaimed him guilty.* (CWC)

---

[19] The second element of Small Clause constructions can also be represented by the Infinitive and Participle (e.g. I saw John run (Cardinaletti, Guasti, 1995, 10). Nelson saw them running away (Aarts, 1992, 21)); however, most linguists consider the structures *John run* and *them running away* non-finite clauses (Wekker, Haegeman, 1985, 33).
[20] CWC refers to Cobuild Word Corpus.

The English constructions under investigation are also used after the verbs of speaking (6a, b), the verbs expressing state or change of state (6c, d), the verbs of movement (6e), and the verbs of perception (6f, g).

(6) a. *The accused man declared himself innocent.* (CWC)
     b. *Let's call the town Harlow.* (CWC)
     c. *I found the cage empty.* (Moro, 1995, 116)
     d. *Experience made him a man.* (CWC)
     e. *John hammered the nail flat.* (Stowell, 1995, 278)
     f. *Imagine yourself rich and famous.* (CWC)
     g. *They thought him foolish.* (Aarts, 1992, 9)

Linguists of both Lithuanian and English agree that predication is an essential property of clauses (cf.: Moro, 1995, 109–110; Būda, 1979, 63, 68). According to linguists of English, predication can be revealed in the following ways: 1) as an inclusion relation always involving AGR[21], i.e. the predicate is connected to its subject via agreement; 2) by the relative word order of subject and predicate; 3) by theta role[22] assignment, where a predicate assigns a theta-role to its subject.

As opposed to full clauses, SCs are assumed to contain no functional projection; they only include the lexical projection of the predicate. Functional projection is understood as the projection of a word which has no descriptive content, but serves an essentially grammatical function (cf.: Radford, 1997, 508). More recent conceptions propose that SCs can be characterized as having a functional structure and the difference between full and small clauses is described by the presence of a tense operator in the former and the lack of it in small clauses. However, small clauses contain AGR. In English, AGR is only observed in nominal small clauses, where the subject and the predicate agree in number and gender (e.g. *They acclaimed him king.* (CWC) *They found her a sensible woman.* (CWC) *Numerous former Cabinet ministers can count themselves victims of Baxendale's.* (CWC)) (cf.: full clauses have person and number features) (cf.: Cardinaletti, Guasti, 1995, 9). Adjectival SCs contain no AGR, but adjectives are always event words because they denote states (e.g. *The court acclaimed him guilty.* (CWC) *He considered me too lazy.* (CWC)). The Predicate is defined as an event word, i.e. a word expressing a state or action. Due to this fact adjectives are always predicates (cf.: Napoli, 1989, 7,31).

In Lithuanian both nominal and adjectival, i.e. [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] constructions contain agreement, which is expressed through number and gender features: *Mergaitės jau pripažino jį tikru vyru.* (Sližienė, 1998, 249) 'The girls have al

---

[21] A syntactic category in Chomsky's Principles and Parameters theory (Chomsky, 1982, 52), comprising the features of person, number and gender as opposed to those of tense (Matthews, 1997, 12).

[22] The term is used in Government and Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981) for semantic roles such as agent or patient (Matthews, 1997, 377).

ready acclaimed <u>him a real man</u>.' *Visi laiko <u>jį išmintingu</u>.* (LWC)[23] 'Everybody considers <u>him wise</u>.' *Šventieji tekstai pataria <u>dievus įsivaizduoti labai jaunus</u>.* (LWC) 'Saint texts propose to imagine <u>gods</u> very <u>young</u>.' *Klaipėdiečiai <u>maršrutinius taksi</u> pravardžiuoja <u>mikrobais</u>.* (LWC) 'Citizens of Klaipeda nickname <u>express taxis microbes</u>.'

As already indicated, the main difference between full and small clauses is that the latter lack a tense operator. Though SCs lack a verb, we think that they have an implicit tense operator, i.e. they implicitly indicate time reference. According to Gueron and Hoekstra (Gueron, Hoekstra, 1995, 79) two main tendencies are observed: 1) SCs which are epistemic complements – they can be expanded into full complement clauses and they express the time indicated by the matrix verb (*I consider John wise. I consider that John is wise. We found him a silly boy. We found that he was a silly boy.*); 2) resultative complements – they refer to the time which is the result of the activity denoted by the matrix verb (*They elected him President → They elected him* and, as a result of elections, *he became President. We christened our baby John → We christened our baby*, and thus *he got the name John.*) (cf.: Gueron, Hoekstra, 1995, 78–79, 99–101).

Another way to indicate the presence of predication relations is word order. In English word order in both full and small clauses is the same, i.e. the subject precedes the predicate (*They acclaimed her their leader. They considered themselves very important.*) (Moro, 1995, 112). However, in Lithuanian, where word order is relatively free, both elements of the sub-strings in question can be found in the following positions within the sentence:

1. S + V + NP1 + NP2/AP [24]
   e.g. *Mergaitės jau pripažino <u>jį tikru vyru</u>.* (Sližienė, 1998, 249)
   'The girls have already **adjudged** <u>him a real man</u>.'
   Teismas pripažino <u>jį kaltą</u>. (Sližienė, 1998, 249)
   'The court **acclaimed** <u>him guilty</u>.'
2. S + NP1 + V + NP2/AP
   e.g. *Vyskupas Antanas Karosas <...> <u>Justiną Steponaitį</u> įšventino <u>kunigu</u>.* **Na – Ni** (LWC)
   Lit.: 'Bishop Antanas Karosas <u>Justinas Steponaitis</u> **anointed** <u>priest</u>.'
   'Bishop Antanas Karosas anointed Justinas Steponaitis priest.'
   Visi <u>jį laiko išmintingu</u>. (LWC)
   Lit.: 'Everybody <u>him</u> **considers** <u>wise</u>.'
   'Everybody considers him wise.'
3. S + NP1 + NP2/AP + V
   e.g. *Tėvas <u>sūnų žmogumi</u> **daro**.* (Sližienė, 1994, 166)
   Lit.: 'Father <u>his son man</u> **makes**.'
   'Father makes his son man.'

---

[23] LWC refers to Lithuanian Word Corpus.
[24] The symbol S stands for the Subject of the sentence (the other symbols are indicated in the footnote 2).

4. S + NP2/AP + V + NP1
   e.g. Balandžio mėnesį Lietuvos vyriausybė <u>savo įgaliotu ministru</u> **paskyrė** <u>J.Šaulį</u>. (LWC)
   Lit.: 'In April the Lithuanian government <u>its authorised minister</u> **appointed** <u>J.Šaulys</u>.'
   'In April the Lithuanian government appointed J.Šaulys its authorized minister.'
5. NP1 + S + V + NP2/AP
   e.g. <u>Šiuos dokumentus</u> žurnalas **pavadino** <u>bomba</u>. (LWC)
   Lit.: '<u>These documents</u> the magazine **called** <u>a bomb</u>.'
   'The magazine called these documents a bomb.'
   <u>Kiekvieną darbą</u> galima paversti <u>įdomiu</u>. (LWC)
   '<u>Every job</u> **can be made** <u>interesting</u>.'
6. NP2/AP + S + V + NP1
   e.g. <u>Urėdu</u> jis **paskyrė** <u>G. Gibą</u>. (LWC)
   Lit.: '<u>Steward</u> he **appointed** <u>G. Gibas</u>.'
   'He appointed G. Gibas steward.'
7. NP2/AP + NP1 + V + S
   e.g. <u>Vergoviniais šiuos kvartalus</u> **praminė** Karlas Fergizas. (LWC)
   Lit.: '<u>Slave-holding these blocks</u> **called** Carl Fergiz.'
   'Carl Fergiz called these blocks slave-holding.'

As we can see from the above word order instances, only the Subject, an NP1 and NP2/AP are used in the first position in sentences representing the constructions of the subcategorization frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP]. However, sentences containing a Predicate in the first position are also grammatical: *Paskyrė jis urėdu G. Gibą.* Lit.: '**Appointed** he steward G. Gibas.' *Paskyrė G. Gibą jis urėdu.* Lit.: '**Appointed** G. Gibas he steward'. In fact, all word order variations in sentences under investigation are grammatical.

7. a. S + V + NP1 + NP2/AP
      Mergaitės pripažino <u>jį tikru vyru</u>.
      'The girls **have adjudged** <u>him a real man</u>.'
      Visi laiko <u>jį išmintingu</u>.
      'Everybody **considers** <u>him wise</u>.'
   b. S + V + NP2/AP + NP1
      Mergaitės pripažino <u>tikru vyru jį</u>.
      '*The girls **have adjudged** <u>a real man him</u>.'
      Visi laiko <u>išmintingu jį</u>.
      '*Everybody **considers** <u>wise him</u>.'
      S + NP1 + V + NP2/AP
      Mergaitės <u>jį</u> pripažino <u>tikru vyru</u>.
      '*The girls <u>him</u> **have adjudged** <u>a real man</u>.'
      Visi <u>jį</u> laiko <u>išmintingu</u>.
      '*Everybody <u>him</u> **considers** <u>wise</u>.'
   d. S + NP2/AP + V + NP1
      Mergaitės <u>tikru vyru</u> pripažino <u>jį</u>.

'*The girls <u>a real man</u> **have adjudged** <u>him</u>.'
Visi išmintingu laiko jį.
'*Everybody <u>wise</u> **considers** <u>him</u>.'
e. S + NP1 + NP2/AP + V
Mergaitės <u>jį tikru vyru</u> pripažino.
'*The girls <u>him a real man</u> **have adjudged**.'
Visi jį išmintingu laiko.
'*Everybody <u>him wise</u> **considers**.'
f. S + NP2/AP + NP1 + V
Mergaitės <u>tikru vyru jį</u> pripažino.
'*The girls <u>a real man him</u> **have adjudged**.'
Visi išmintingu jį laiko.
'*Everybody <u>wise him</u> **considers**.'
g. NP1 + S + V + NP2/AP
*<u>Jį</u> mergaitės **pripažino** <u>tikru vyru</u>.*
(?)'<u>Him</u> the girls **have adjudged** <u>a real man</u>.'
<u>Jį</u> visi laiko <u>išmintingu</u>.
(?)'<u>Him</u> everybody **considers** <u>wise</u>.'
h. NP1 + S + NP2/AP + V
<u>Jį</u> mergaitės <u>tikru vyru</u> pripažino.
'*<u>Him</u> the girls <u>a real man</u> **have adjudged**.'
<u>Jį</u> visi <u>išmintingu</u> laiko.
'*<u>Him</u> everybody <u>wise</u> **considers**.'
    NP1 + V + NP2/AP + S
<u>Jį</u> pripažino <u>tikru vyru</u> mergaitės.
'*<u>Him</u> **have adjudged** <u>a real man</u> the girls.'
<u>Jį</u> laiko <u>išmintingu</u> visi.
'*<u>Him</u> **considers** <u>wise</u> everybody.'
j. NP1 + NP2/AP + S + V
<u>Jį tikru vyru</u> mergaitės pripažino.
'*<u>Him a real man</u> the girls **have adjudged**.'
<u>Jį išmintingu</u> visi laiko.
'*<u>Him wise</u> everybody **considers**.'
k. NP2/AP + S + V + NP1
*<u>Tikru vyru</u> mergaitės **pripažino** <u>jį</u>.*
(?)'<u>A real man</u> the girls **have adjudged** <u>him</u>.'
<u>Išmintingu</u> visi laiko <u>jį</u>.
(?)'<u>Wise</u> everybody **considers** <u>him</u>.'
l. NP2/AP + S + NP1 + V
<u>Tikru vyru</u> mergaitės <u>jį</u> pripažino.
'*<u>A real man</u> the girls <u>him</u> **have adjudged**.'
<u>Išmintingu</u> visi <u>jį</u> laiko.
'*<u>Wise</u> everybody <u>him</u> **considers**.'
m. NP2/AP + V + NP1 + S
*<u>Tikru vyru</u> **pripažino** <u>jį</u> mergaitės.*

'*A real man **have adjudged** him the girls.'
Išmintingu laiko jį visi.
'*Wise **considers** him everybody.'
n. NP2/AP + NP1 + S + V
Tikru vyru jį mergaitės pripažino.
'*A real man him the girls **have adjudged**.'
Išmintingu jį visi laiko.
'*Wise him everybody **considers**.'

In general, word order is of no direct importance as a means expressing grammatical relations in Lithuanian sentences. The sequential arrangement of words does not usually change their syntactic or semantic functions (cf.: LG, 1997, 454, 690). Alongside the constructions manifesting the subcategorisation frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP], relatively free word order can be observed in Lithuanian full complement clauses: *Aukščiausias teismas pripažino, kad jo protestas pagrįstas.* (LWC) 'The Supreme Court **declared** that his protest (was) reasonable' *Aukščiausias teismas pripažino, kad pagrįstas jo protestas.* Lit.: 'The Supreme Court **declared** that reasonable (was) his protest.'). However, the movement of the elements in the full complement clause can take place only within the boundaries of the clause.

A further indicator of a predication relation is theta-role assignment. Theta-role assignment is important as far as clausal status of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] is concerned. Thus, as regards the subcategorization frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP], theta-role assignment must be viewed from the following perspective: whether theta-role assignment is executed by the matrix verb to the whole sub-string [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP], or just to the object of the matrix verb, i.e. the unit NP1.

SC theory claims that theta-role assignment in subcategorization frames such as V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP] is carried out not to a single argument NP1, which is the subject of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP], but to the whole sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP], which are clausal structures in which a subject and a predicate combine with each other to form a clause. This can be illustrated by the sentence *Mike considers Sue intelligent* where what Mike is considering is not Sue, but the proposition that she is intelligent. Predication theory, on the contrary, relates theta-role assignment to a single argument. According to Predication theory, the matrix verb assigns the semantic function only to the first element of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP], i.e. NP1, which has the syntactic status that of an object, not a subject as in the case of SC theory. Thus Predication theory denies the clausal sructure of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP].

Stowell (1995, 273) proposes to reduce the problem of theta-role assignment to the question of constituency, i.e. if the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] form a constituent or not (as was indicated above, this is the main point of disagreement

between SC and Predication theories). Constituency tests[25] applied to both English (Stowell, 1982, 300) and Lithuanian[26] data support the SC analysis (cf.: Stowell, 1982, 300; 1995, 273; Aarts, 1992, 19, 22).

Summing up we can state that it is possible to draw parallels between the structures representing the subcategorization frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP] in English and the corresponding constructions in Lithuanian. In both languages the second element NP2 and AP in the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] is considered to have predicative characteristics, however, in different approaches its syntactic status differs. Small Clause theory regards NP2 and AP as a part of constituent [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP], which have the status of a clause, whereas Predication theory treats it as a part of a Complex Predicate, and Traditional Grammar – a complement of an Object. Thus the latter two approaches deny the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] forming a constituent. In Lithuanian three basic approaches to the constructions under investigation can be traced as well. Some linguists view NP2 and AP as a part of a Complex Predicate, others relate NP2 and AP to Predicative Attribute which is described as a separate part of the sentence. Consequently the two approaches also disclaim the constituency of the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP]. According to the third view, the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] form a semantically unified construction, i.e. Complex Object, syntactic status of which, however, is not specified.

The structural similarity of the constructions representing the subcategorization frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP] in English and Lithuanian can be observed too. In both languages the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP] can be used after verbs of speaking, movement, perception, and verbs expressing state or change of state. However, in Lithuanian the sub-strings in question can also follow verbs of physical perception.

As already pointed out, predication is one of the main indicator of the clausal status of grammatical units. The comparison of small and full clauses shows that in both predication can be realised by AGR and tense features. However, the difference is that in small clauses tense is demonstrated implicitly, i.e. tense representation is related to the action expressed by the matrix verb. In both languages agreement is manifested in number and gender.

Word order, as means of predication, is of great importance only in English. In Lithuanian, where word order is relatively free, a change in word order does not usually affect the syntactic status of a grammar unit. Thus in Lithuanian word order constitutes weak support for the evidence of predication.

Theta-role assignment, one more indicator of predication, reduced to the question of constituency, as proposed by Stowell, shows that the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and

---

[25] Distribution, Movement, Sentence Fragment, Ordinary Coordination, Shared Constituent Coordination, Proform, S-Adverbial Distribution, VP-Adverbial Distribution and other tests were applied to Lithuanian.
[26] See (Giparaitė, 2001).

[NP1 AP] can be considered as constituents. This provides strong evidence for their clausal status.

In conclusion, we can state that Lithuanian constructions representing the subcategorisation frames V[NP1 NP2] and V[NP1 AP] could be regarded as containing a small clause manifested by the sub-strings [NP1 NP2] and [NP1 AP].

Comparative analysis, defining the properties and regularities which hold for all languages, is the main goal of Universal Grammar. Such analysis, applied to quite different languages such as English and Lithuanian, enables not only to define regularities of the languages, but also gives a deeper insight into the languages taken separately.

LYGINAMOJI KONSTRUKCIJŲ V[NP1 NP2] IR V[NP1 AP] ANGLŲ IR LIETUVIŲ KALBOSE ANALIZĖ, PAGRĮSTA PREDIKACIJA

Santrauka

Generatyvinėje transformacinėje gramatikoje anglų kalbos konstrukcijų V[NP1 NP2] ir V[NP1 AP] sudėtinės dalys [NP1 NP2] ir [NP1 AP] funkcionuoja kaip eliptiniai šalutiniai dėmenys.

Straipsnyje dėstoma konstrukcijų V[NP1 NP2] ir V[NP1 AP] lyginamoji analizė rodo, kad jų savybės anglų ir lietuvių kalbose panašios. Tad remiantis anglų kalbos predikacijos požymiais, tokiais kaip derinimas, žodžių tvarka, semantinių funkcijų skyrimas, bandoma įrodyti, kad lietuvių kalboje, kaip ir anglų, analizuojamųjų konstrukcijų sudedamosios dalys [NP1 NP2] ir [NP1 AP] gali atlikti šalutinio dėmens funkciją.

REFERENCES

Aarts B., 1992, Small Clauses in English: The Nonverbal Types. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ambrazas V. etc, 1996, Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Ambrazas V. etc., 1999, Lietuvių kalbos enciklopedija. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Ambrazas V. etc, 1997, Lithuanian Grammar. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

Balkevičius J., 1963, Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos sintaksė. Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Būda V., 1979, Papildinio prijungiamųjų sakinių sandaros elementai. – Kalbotyra, t. 30 (1), 13–22. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Cardinaletti A., Guasti M. T. 1995, Small Clauses: Some Controversies and Issues of Acquisition. – *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 28, 1–23.

Chomsky N., 1965, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. The M.I.T. Press.

Chomsky N., 1981, On the Representation of Form and Function. – The Linguistic Inquiry, vol. 1, 3–40.

Chomsky N., 1982, Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures. Dordrecht-(Holland)-Cinnaminson (USA): Foris Publications.

Culicover P. W., 1997, Principles and Parameters: An Introduction to Syntactic Theory New York: Oxford University Press.

Freidin R. (ed.), 1991, Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar. The M.I.T. Press.

Gailiūnas P., Žiugžda J., 1970, Lietuvių kalbos gramatika: Sintaksė. Kaunas: Šviesa.

Giparaitė J., 2001, Determining Sentence Constituent Structure in English and Lithuanian. – Kalbotyra, t. 50 (1), 29–42.

Gueron J., Hoekstra T., 1995, The Temporal Interpretation of Predication. *Syntax and Semantics*, Vol.28, 77–107. San Diego, New York, Boston, London, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Academic Press.

Haegeman L., 1994, Introduction to Government and Binding Theory (2nd ed.). Oxford UK & Cambridge USA: Blackwell.

Hawkins J. A., 1986, A Comparative Typology of English and German: Unifying the Contrasts. London & Sydney: Croom Helm.

Jablonskis J., 1957, Rinktiniai raštai. Vilnius: Valst. politi. ir moksl. lit. leid.

Klimas A., 1993, Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių vartosena. Vilnius: Mokslo ir encikl. leid.

Labutis V., 1998, Lietuvių kalbos sintaksė. Vilnius: Vilniaus universiteto leid.

Matthews P. H., 1997, The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Moro A., 1995, Small Clauses with Predicative Nominals. – Syntax and Semantics, vol. 28, 109–132. San Diego, New York, Boston, London, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Academic Press.

Napoli D., 1989, Predication Theory: A Case Study for Indexing Theory. Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

Radford A., 1997, Syntactic Theory and the Structure of English. Cambridge University Press.

Rothstein S., 1995, Small Clauses and Copular Constructions. – Syntax and Semantics, vol. 28, 27–48. San Diego, New York, Boston, London, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Academic Press.

Schein B., 1995, Small Clauses and Predication. – Syntax and Semantics, vol. 28, 49–76. San Diego, New York, Boston, London, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Academic Press.

Sirtautas V., Grenda Č., 1988, Lietuvių kalbos sintaksė. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Sližienė N., 1994, Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių junglumo žodynas, t. 1. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

Sližienė N., 1998, Lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžių junglumo žodynas, t. 2. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

Stowell T., 1982, Subjects Across Categories. – The Linguistic Review, vol. 2, 285–312..

Stowell T., 1995, Remarks on Clause Structure. – Syntax and Semantics, vol. 28, 271–286. San Diego, New York, Boston, London, Sydney, Tokyo, Toronto: Academic Press.

Šukys J., 1980, Dvejybiniai linksniai ir jų varžovas įnagininkas. – Kalba ir mintis, 22–29. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Ulvydas K., Ambrazas V., Valeckienė A. (red.), 1976, Lietuvių kalbos gramatika: Sintaksė. Vilnius: Mokslas.

Valeckienė A., 1967, Predikatyvinis pažyminys kaip atskira sakinio dalis. – Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai, t. 9, 97–117. Vilnius: Mintis.

Wekker H., Haegeman L., 1989, A Modern Course in English Syntax. London and New York: Routledge.

Williams E. S., 1983, Against Small Clauses. – Linguistic Inquiry, vol. 14, 287–308..

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

Vilniaus pedagoginis universitetas   Įteikta
Anglų kalbos katedra   2002-02-27