DETERMINING SENTENCE CONSTITUENT STRUCTURE
IN ENGLISH AND LITHUANIAN

Judita GIPARAITĖ

According to Radford "a Grammar is a model of the grammatical competence of the native speaker of a language. It comprises a finite system of rules which generate the infinite set of well formed sentence-structures in the language" (Radford, 1988, 27). The main task of a linguist is to choose certain means to adequately describe the grammar of a particular language. For this purpose Chomsky (1965, 24–26) has proposed two main criteria of adequacy for grammars: descriptive adequacy and explanatory adequacy. Radford in addition mentions observational adequacy which is the weakest requirement for any grammar of a language and can be defined as: "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" (Radford, 1988, 28).

Descriptive adequacy is a higher level of adequacy. It includes the requirement of observational adequacy and in addition specifies that "a grammar of a language properly describes the syntactic, semantic, morphological, and phonological structure of the sentences in the language 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 in addition it would have to show that *these* modifies *boys*, not *girls*, and that those modifies *girls*, not *don't* (Radford, 1981, 25). It is also important to emphasise 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 recognise 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 (Radford, 1997, 3–4). The native speaker's intuitions about interpretation are related to ambiguity of sentences. Radford suggests that "a sentence such as *He loves her more than you* is ambiguous by virtue of the fact that it has two interpre-

tations, one paraphraseable as *He loves her more than he loves you*, and the other as *He loves her more than you love her*" (Radford, 1997, 253).

Explanatory adequacy is the highest level of adequacy. "A grammar attains explanatory adequacy in case it correctly predicts which sentences are and are not well formed in the language, correctly describes their structure, and also does so in terms of a highly restricted set of optimally simple, universal, maximally general principles which represent psychologically plausible natural principles of mental computation, and are "learnable" by the child in a limited period of time, and given access to limited data" (Radford, 1981, 26). Explanatory adequacy requires a grammar to be "psychologically real" and maximally constrained, i.e. all impossible rules in any language must be ruled out to make a language acquisition as simple as possible (Radford, 1981, 26–27). This is the main task of generative-transformational gra mmar.

The present article will be oriented to descriptive adequacy. The aim of the article is to show in how far the Lithuanian equivalent of the sub-string [NP1NP2][1], which is a complement of a complex transitive verb and in English has been called a Small Clause (Williams, 1983, 287), behaves as a constituent in the Lithuanian sentence *Mergaitės pripažino jį tikru vyru*[2] "The girls have adjudged him a real man" in the framework of generative-transformational grammar. For this purpose we will apply constituent tests to two Lithuanian sentences: **1.** *Mergaitės pripažino jį t i k r u v y r u* "The girls have adjudged h i m a r e a l m a n " NPn Vfin sc[NPa NPi] and **2.** *Mergaitės pripažino: j i s t i k r a s v y r a s* "*The girls have adjudged: h e a r e a l m a n*"[3] NPn Vfin s[NPn NPn]. Lithuanian traditional descriptive grammar describes the sub-string [NPa NPi] of the first sentence as a Direct Object with a Predicative Attribute (Ambrazas, 1996, 603, 604), whereas the sub-string [NPn NPn] of the second sentence is related to a full asyndetic Object Clause (Drotvinas, 1961, 190, 191), i.e. a full Object Clause without a complementiser. With the help of the constituency tests we will try to prove that the sub-string [NPa NPi] is a constituent, and that it can be described as having the syntactic function of a clause.

In order to analyse the English sub-string [NP1 NP2] within the string NP Vfin [NP1 NP2], it is very important to discuss the distinction between complements and adjuncts. Complements are more closely related to the verb than adjuncts. Adjuncts can be added fairly freely, they are optional elements of a sentence, whereas complements are obligatory (cf. *The doctor put the girl on a diet* and *L a s t y e a r the doctor r e l u c t a n t l y put the girl on a diet*) (Aarts, Meyer, 1995, 3), (Wekker, Haegeman, 1989, 83). Complements subcategorize verbs, i.e. verbs can be distinguished by the types of complements they take. In other words, verbs occur inside certain frames, and are obligatorily followed by certain classes of categories (cf. **John put*

---

[1] In the string NP Vfin [NP1 NP2].

[2] The sentence was chosen as representing the syntactic relations observed in English Small Clauses.

[3] The symbol marks ungrammatical sentences.

the book and *John put the book on the table*). Such frames are called subcategorisation frames (Wekker, Haegeman, 1989, 45). The subcategorisation frame for verbs taking a Small Clause as their complement in English is V [NP XP] where X = N, A or P (Aarts, 1992, 1).

Small Clauses or "Verbless Clauses are clauses in which the verb (usually a form of *to be*) have been deleted" (Wekker, Haegeman, 1989, 34). Aarts (1992) describes Small Clauses (SCs) as "structures which have clausal characteristics in that they contain 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 a predicate relationship between the NP *Sue* and the NP *an intelligent person*. The string [*Sue an intelligent person*] can be regarded as a SC by analogy[4] with the clauses in the following sentences:

(1) Mike considers *Sue to be an intelligent person*.

(2) Mike considers *that Sue is an intelligent person*.

The two sentences, the first of which contains a non-finite clause and the second one a finite clause, are paraphrased variants of *Mike considers Sue an intelligent person*. What distinguishes the SC from the corresponding full clauses is the absence of the verb, i.e. the copula *be*. However, no semantic difference can be observed. The two paraphrased sentences express exactly the same idea as the one containing a SC, i.e. what *Mike considers* is that *Sue is an intelligent person* (Aarts, 1997, 218).

Paraphrase is one of the constituency tests. The internal structure of sentences can be also investigated using other constituency tests. Radford[5], for example, proposes the following diagnostics for determining whether a given set of words in a sentence is a constituent or not, and if so, of what type (Radford, 1988, 89) and gives the list of the tests: Distribution, Movement, Sentence-fragment, Ordinary Coordination, Shared Constituent Coordination, Proform. Applying those tests to the English sentences *Drunks would get off the bus* and *Drunks would put off the customers*, Radford shows that to some extent the two sentences have similar structure. They have the same type of subject *drunks*, modal element *would*, their Verb Phrases (VP) *would get off the bus* and *would put off the customers* are parallel, but within the VP they behave differently (Radford, 1988, 91,92).

The Distribution test demonstrates that the sub-string [*off the bus*] is a Prepositional Phrase (PP) since it can be replaced by other PPs with a related meaning, for example, by [*on the bus*], whereas the sub-string [*off the customers*] proves the verb *put off* to be a Phrasal Verb for the simple reason that the sub-string [*on the customers*] is ungrammatical (Radford, 1988, 93,94).

---

[4] English children intuitively know that the sentence Mike considers Sue an intelligent person can be paraphrased into Mike considers Sue to be an intelligent person and Mike considers that Sue is an intelligent person.

[5] Similar constituent tests were proposed by Aarts (Aarts, 1997, 180–182, 191, 213–217),Wekker and Haegeman (Wekker&Haegeman, 1989, 18–36).

The Movement test indicates that the sub-string [*off the bus*] is a full phrase, since only full phrases can undergo movement: *Every afternoon, the big red bus would stop in front of the village clock, and [off the bus] would get a dear old lady carrying a shopping bag.* However, the sub-string [*off the customers*] cannot be moved: **The manager suspects that drunks would put off the customers, and [off the customers] they certainly would put*, which suggests that it is not a phrase and not even a constituent (Radford, 1988, 95).

The Sentence-fragment test gives the same results as the Movement test. It confirms the PP status of the sub-string [*off the bus*]: *A: Did he get off the train? B: No, off the bus.* The sub-string [*off the customers*] cannot function as a sentence-fragment: *A: Would drunks put off the waitresses? B: *No, off the customers* (Radford, 1988, 96).

The ordinary Co-ordination test implies that only constituents of the same type can be co-ordinated. The test proves the string [*off the bus*] to be a PP constituent and [*off the customers*] not: *Drunks would get [off the bus] and [on the train]*, but **Drunks would put [off the customers] and [off the waitress]*. The Shared Constituent Co-ordination gives 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 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*[6] (Radford, 1988, 99).

Having applied the tests we can see that there is strong empirical evidence to state that in a VP like [*put off the customers*], *off* is merely a P, while in a VP like [*get off the bus*], *off* has the status of PP (Radford, 1988, 100).

The tests given above have been proposed for English. The next step is to see in how far these tests help to reveal the syntactic structure of Lithuanian. For this purpose the following strings will be used: 1) Mergaitės **pripažino** jį tikru vyru "The girls **have adjudged** him a real man" NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i]; 2) Mergaitės **pripažino**: jis tikras vyras "*The girls **have adjudged**: he a real man" NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]. Both sentences comprise the sequence of a NP (*the girls*), a finite form of the verb (*have adjudged*) and a clause consisting of a NP (*he and him*) and a NP (*a real man*).

The symbols used refer to: NPn – a Noun Phrase in the Nominative case; NPa – a Noun Phrase in the Accusative case; NPi – a Noun Phrase in the Instrumental case; NPg – a Noun Phrase in the Genitive case; NPd – a Noun Phrase in the Dative

---

[6] 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).

case; NP1 – the Noun Phrase denoting the Subject of the Clause; NP2 – the Noun Phrase denoting the Verbal element of the Clause; Vfin – the finite form of the verb; Vnonfin – the nonfinite form of the verb; M – the Modal Verb; S-Adv – a Sentence Adverbial; VP-Adv – a Verb Phrase Adverbial; SC – the Small Clause; Crd – a Coordinating Conjunction; C – a Complementiser; Dem – a Demonstrative; neg – a negative particle; pass – The Passive Voice; "|" the intonation break; ":" the punctuation mark used to separate the Subordinate Clause from the Main Clause in Asyndetic Clauses; ", –" the punctuation mark that indicates the separation of the direct and indirect speech.

1. Distribution test

1a) Mergaitės **pripažino** jį t i k r u v y r u . 1a) NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i]
"The girls **have adjudged** h i m a r e a l m a n ."
2a) Mergaitės **pripažino**: j i s t i k r a s v y r a s . 2a) NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]
"*The girls **have adjudged**: h e a r e a l m a n ."
1b) Mergaitės **pripažino** jį b u k a g a l v i u . 1b) NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i]
"The girls **have adjudged** h i m a d u n c e ."
2b) Mergaitės **pripažino**: j i s b u k a g a l v i s . 2b) NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]
"*The girls **have adjudged**: h e a d u n c e ."
The Distribution test shows that both sub-strings – sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] – appear in the same environment, i.e. as a constituent of the VP *have adjudged*. This means that they have similar distribution (Wekker, Haegeman, 1989, 36).

2. Movement test

1a) Ar **pripažino** mergaitės jį t i k r u v y r u ? 1a) Ar Vfin NPn sc[NP1a NP2i]
"**Have** the girls **adjudged** h i m a r e a l m a n ? Ar – interrogative particle
2a) (?) Ar **pripažino** mergaitės: j i s t i k r a s v y r a s ? 2a) **Ar Vfin NPn | [NP1n NP2n][7]
"***Have** the girls **adjudged**: h e a r e a l m a n ?"
1b) *Jį t i k r u v y r u* mergaitės **pripažino**. 1b) sc[NP1a NP2i] NPn Vfin
"*Him a r e a l m a n the girls **have adjudged**."
2b) – J i s t i k r a s v y r a s , – mergaitės **pripažino**. 2b) [NP1n NP2n] | NPn Vfin
"*He a r e a l m a n , – the girls **have adjudged**."
1c) Jį mergaitės **pripažino** t i k r u v y r u . 1c) sc[NP1a] NPn Vfin sc[NP2i]
"*Him the girls **have adjudged** a r e a l m a n ."
2c) Jis, mergaitės **pripažino**, t i k r a s v y r a s . 2c) [NP1n] | NPn Vfin | [NP2n]

---

[7] The sentence is grammatical, however, the construction of the sentence is not characteristic of Lithuanian, i.e. its usage is peripheral.

33

"*H e , the girls **have adjudged**, a r e a l m a n ."

1d) T i k r u v y r u mergaitės **pripažino** j į . 1d) sc[NP2i] NPn Vfin sc[NP1a]

"*A r e a l m a n t h e girls **have adjudged** h i m ."

2d) (?) T i k r a s v y r a s , mergaitės pripažino, jis . 2d)**[NP2n] | NPn Vfin | [NP1n]

"*A r e a l m a n , the girls **have adjudged**, h e ."

The Movement test implies that the two sub-strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] act in a similar way. They occupy the same position in Yes/No questions and can be both moved to the front position which would indicate that they are constituents. However, due to free word order in Lithuanian, the Main Clause can occur within the Subordinate Clause, thus splitting it into separate parts: *jį* "him", *jis* "he", *tikru vyru, tikras vyras* "a real man". The latter fact indicates that in Lithuanian the Movement test is a weak argument proving the constituency of the above-mentioned sub-strings.

3. Sentence fragment test

1a) Ką **pripažino** mergaitės? J į t i k r u v y r u ? 1a) Ką (acc) Vfin NPn? sc[NP1a NP2i]

"What **have** the girls **adjudged**? *H i m a r e a l m a n ." Ką? Kas? Kuo? = Who/What? – interrogative words

2a) Ką **pripažino** mergaitės? J i s t i k r a s v y r a s . 2a) Ką (acc) Vfin NPn? [NP1n NP2n]

"What **have** the girls **adjudged**? *H e a r e a l m a n ."

1b) Ką **pripažino** mergaitės t i k r u v y r u ? J į . 1b) Ką (acc) Vfin NPn sc[NP2i] ? sc[NP1a]

"Who **have** the girls **adjudged** a r e a l m a n ? H i m ."

2b) Kas **pripažino** mergaitės t i k r a s v y r a s ? J i s . 2b) Kas (nom) Vfin NPn [NP2n] ? [NP1n]

"Who **have** the girls **adjudged** a r e a l m a n ? *H e ."

1c) Kuo **pripažino** j į mergaitės? T i k r u v y r u . 1c) Kuo (instr) Vfin sc[NP1a] NPn ? sc[NP2i]

"*What **have** the girls **adjudged** h i m ? A r e a l m a n ."

2c) *Kuo **pripažino** j i s mergaitės? T i k r a s v y r a s . 2c) *Kuo (instr) Vfin [NP1n] NPn ? [NP2n]

"*What **have** the girls **adjudged** h e ? A r e a l m a n ."

The Sentence-fragment test indicates that only constituents can occur as sentence-fragments (Radford, 1988, 91) and gives results similar to those of the Movement test, i.e. it proves that both strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] can act as constituents and alongside shows their inner structure. **Kuo (Instr.) pripažino j i s mergaitės? T i k r a s v y r a s (Nom.) "*What have the girls adjudged h e ? A r e a l m a n "* are ungrammatical since Lithuanian interrogative words are case-marked. The interrogative word and the answer to the question should have the same case.

4. Ordinary Coordination test

1. Mergaitės **pripažino** jį tikru vyru, o Joną vaiku.
NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i] | *Crd-and* sc[NP1a NP2i]
"The girls **have adjudged** him a real man and John a child."
2. Mergaitės **pripažino**: jis tikras vyras, o Jonas – vaikas
 NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n] | *Crd-and* [NP1n NP2n]
"*The girls **have adjudged**: he a real man and John a child."
The Ordinary Coordination test proves the sub-strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] to be constituents since they can be coordinated with the sub-string of the same type *John a child.*

5. Shared Constituent Coordination test

1. Mergaitės **pripažino**, o berniukai **paskelbė** jį tikru vyru.
NPn Vfin | *Crd-and* NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i]
"The girls **have adjudged** *and* the boys **have declared** him a real man."
2. Mergaitės **pripažino**, o berniukai **paskelbė**: jis tikras vyras.
 NPn Vfin | *Crd-and* NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]
"The girls **have adjudged** *and* the boys **have declared**: he a real man."
The test supports the claim that the sub-strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] are constituents since both strings can function as the shared constituent in sentences involving Shared Constituent Coordination (Radford, 1988, 97).

6. Proform

1. Mergaitės **pripažino** jį tikru vyru. Mergaitės **pripažino** *tai*.
NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i] . NPn Vfin NPn tai = this = demonstrative pronoun
"The girls **have adjudged** him a real man. The girls **have adjudged** this."
2. Mergaitės **pripažino**: jis tikras vyras. Mergaitės **pripažino** *tai*.
NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]. NPn Vfin NPn
"*The girls **have adjudged**: he a real man. The girls **have adjudged** *this*."
The Proform test indicates that a particular string of words must be a constituent if it can be replaced by a proform (Aarts, 1997, 270). The test shows that both sub-strings – sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] – can be replaced by *this*. The fact supports the claim that the sub-strings are constituents.

7. S-Adverbial distribution test

1a) Mergaitės, *žinoma*, **pripažino** jį tikru vyru.
NPn S-Adv Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i]
"The girls **have** *certainly* **adjudged** him a real man."

2a) Mergaitės, *žinoma*, **pripažino**: j i s t i k r a s v y r a s.

NPn S-Adv Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]

"*The girls **have** *certainly* **adjudged**: h e a r e a l m a n."

1b) Mergaitės **pripažino**, *žinoma*, j į t i k r u v y r u, o ne Petrą.

NPn Vfin S-Adv sc[NP1a NP2i] Crd-and neg NPa

"The girls **have adjudged** *certainly* h i m a r e a l m a n and not Peter."

2b) Mergaitės **pripažino**: *žinoma*, j i s t i k r a s v y r a s, o ne Petras.

NPn Vfin | S-Adv [NP1n NP2n] Crd-and neg NPn

"*The girls **have adjudged**: *certainly* h e a r e a l m a n and not Peter."

1c) Mergaitės **pripažino** j į, *žinoma*, t i k r u v y r u.

NPn Vfin sc[NP1a] | S-Adv | sc[NP2i]

"*The girls **have adjudged** h i m *certainly* a r e a l m a n."

2c) Mergaitės **pripažino**: j i s, *žinoma*, t i k r a s v y r a s.

NPn Vfin | [NP1n] | S-Adv | [NP2n]

"*The girls **have adjudged**: h e *certainly* a r e a l m a n."

In English S-adverbs can be positioned between NP and M, or between M and VP, but not between any other pairs of constituents (Radford, 1988, 93). However, in Lithuanian, due to its relatively free word order, S-adverbs can be placed not only between constituents, but also within constituents: *Mergaitės pripažino j į t i k r u, žinoma, v y r u "*The girls have adjudged h i m a r e a l certainly m a n"* and *Mergaitės pripažino: j i s t i k r a s, žinoma, v y r a s "*The girls have adjudged: h e a r e a l certainly m a n".* Thus, in Lithuanian this test is not a strong argument for proving constituency.

8. VP-Adverbial distribution test

1a) Mergaitės *visiškai* **pripažino** j į t i k r u v y r u. 1a) NPn VP-Adv Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i]

"The girls **have** *completely* **adjudged** h i m a r e a l m a n."

2a) Mergaitės *visiškai* **pripažino**: j i s t i k r a s v y r a s. 2a) NPn VP-Adv Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]

"*The girls **have** *completely* **adjudged**: h e a r e a l m a n."

1b) Mergaitės **pripažino** *visiškai* j į t i k r u v y r u. 1b) NPn Vfin VP-Adv sc[NP1a NP2i]

"*The girls **have adjudged** *completely* h i m a r e a l m a n."

2b) Mergaitės **pripažino** *visiškai*: j i s t i k r a s v y r a s 2b) NPn Vfin VP-Adv | [NP1n NP2n]

"*The girls **have adjudged** *completely*: h e a r e a l m a n."

1c) Mergaitės **pripažino** j į *visiškai* t i k r u v y r u. 1c) NPn Vfin sc[NP1a] VP-Adv sc[NP2i]

"The girls **have adjudged** h i m *completely* a r e a l m a n."

2c) Mergaitės **pripažino**: j i s *visiškai* t i k r a s v y r a s. 2c) NPn Vfin | [NP1n] VP-Adv [NP2n]

36

"*The girls **have adjudged**: h e *completely* a r e a l m a n ."

In English VP-adverbs can occur only at the beginning, at the end, and in the middle of the VP (Radford, 1988, 96). In Lithuanian they, similar to S-adverbs, can be placed between constituents as well as within constituents. However, in comparison to S-adverbs, VP-adverbs, when placed within constituents, change their syntactic status from Adverbials to Modifiers: cf. 1. Mergaitės **pripažino** jį *visiškai* t i k r u v y r u "The girls **have adjudged** h i m *completely* a r e a l m a n ", 2. Mergaitės **pripažino**: *jis visiškai* t i k r a s v y r a s "*The girls **have adjudged**: h e *completely* a r e a l m a n " and (?) 1. Mergaitės **pripažino** jį t i k r u *visiškai* v y r u "The girls **have adjudged** h i m a r e a l *completely* m a n ", (?) 2. Mergaitės **pripažino**: j i s t i k r a s *visiškai* v y r a s "*The girls **have adjudged**: h e a r e a l *completely* m a n ". In Lithuanian the VP-adverbial Distribution test, as well as the S-adverbial Distribution test, splits the sub-strings; therefore, it is a weak argument for constituency.

9. Paraphrase

1. Mergaitės **pripažino** jį t i k r u v y r u . 1. NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i]

"The girls **have adjudged** h i m a r e a l m a n ."

a) Mergaitės **pripažino** j į e s a n t t i k r u v y r u . a) NPn Vfin [NP1a] Vnonfin [NP2i] Vnonfin – participial-be

"*The girls **have adjudged** h i m b e i n g a r e a l m a n ."

b) Mergaitės **pripažino**, k a d j i s (yra) t i k r a s v y r a s . b) NPn Vfin | C-that NP1n (Vfin) NP2n

"The girls **have adjudged** t h a t h e (is) a r e a l m a n ."

2. Mergaitės **pripažino**: j i s t i k r a s v y r a s . 2. NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]

"*The girls **have adjudged**: h e a r e a l m a n ."

a) Mergaitės **pripažino** j į e s a n t t i k r u v y r u . a) NPn Vfin [NP1a] Vnonfin [NP2i]

"*The girls **have adjudged** h i m b e i n g a r e a l m a n ."

b) Mergaitės **pripažino**, k a d j i s (yra) t i k r a s v y r a s . b) NPn Vfin | C-that NP1n (Vfin) NP2n

"The girls **have adjudged** t h a t h e (is) a r e a l m a n ."

The paraphrase demonstrates that the paraphrased string of words and the resulting one have the same syntactical position (Aarts, 1997, 269) As we can see, the two sub-strings – sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] – act the same way as far as paraphrase is concerned. Both of them can be transformed into structures known in Lithuanian as the Complex Object. Such a Complex Object forms a secondary predicative center (Labutis, 94, 57–58). The two sub-strings can also be transformed into a full Object Clause introduced by a complementiser.

10. Somewhere else test

a) Mad Magazine Sentences[8]
1. Mergaitės **pripažino** jį tikru vyru. Jį tikru vyru? Tu turbūt juokauji.
NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i] . sc[NP1a NP2i] ? NPn S-Adv Vfin
"The girls **have adjudged** h i m   a   r e a l   m a n . H i m   a   r e a l   m a n ? You must be joking."

2. Mergaitės **pripažino**: jis tikras vyras. Jis tikras vyras? Tu turbūt juokauji.
NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]. [NP1n NP2n]? NPn S-Adv Vfin
"*The girls **have adjudged**: h e   a   r e a l   m a n . H e   a   r e a l   m a n ? You must be joking."

b) Subject position
1. * Jį   t i k r u   v y r u   yra neįtikėtinas dalykas, nes mergaitės yra dar labai jaunos.
*sc[NP1a NP2i] Vfin NPn | C-because NPn Vfin NPn
"*Have adjudged h i m   a   r e a l   m a n   is an unbelievable thing, because the girls are still very young."

2. Jis   t i k r a s   vyras yra neitikėtinas dalykas, nes jam tik 10 metų.
[NP1n NP2n] Vfin NPn | C-because NPd NPg
"*H e   a   r e a l   m a n is an unbelievable thing, because he is only 10. "

The Somewhere Else test implies that "if a string of words, whose constituent status is unclear in a particular construction, occurs as a constituent in some other construction, then this constitutes weak support for the possibility of analysing it as a constituent in the first construction as well" (Aarts, 1997, 216). In Mad Magazine Sentences the strings under investigation act in the same way: they can be used as separate sentences. This proves their constituency. However, in Subject position the situation is different. In Lithuanian the sub-string [NP1n NP2n] can occur in Subject position, whereas the sub-string sc[NP1a NP2i] cannot. This is due to the fact that we need a verb to assign Accusative and Instrumental cases within the sub-string.

11. The meaning test

1. Mergaitės **pripažino** jį tikru vyru.
NPn Vfin sc[NP1a NP2i]
"The girls **have adjudged** h i m   a   r e a l   m a n ."
2. Mergaitės **pripažino**: jis tikras vyras.
NPn Vfin | [NP1n NP2n]
"*The girls **have adjudged**: h e   a   r e a l   m a n ."

The Object of what has been adjudged is not *him* or *he*, but the propositions *him a real man* and *he a real man*. On these grounds it is possible to argue that the propositional strings *him a real man* and *he a real man* are constituents and function as the Direct Objects of the VP *have adjudged*, but not the NP *him* or *he* (Aarts, 1997, 217).

12. Clefting

1a) Tai j į t i k r u v y r u mergaitės **pripažino.** 1a) Dem sc[NP1a NP2i] NPn Vfin
"*It was h e m a r e a l m a n that the girls **have adjudged.**"

2a) Tai j i s t i k r a s v y r a s , – mergaitės **pripažino.** 2a) Dem [NP1n NP2n] |
NPn Vfin
"*So h e a r e a l m a n , – the girls **have adjudged.**"

1b) Tai j į mergaitės **pripažino** t i k r u v y r u . 1b) Dem sc[NP1a] NPn Vfin
sc[NP2i]
"*It was h i m whom the girls **have adjudged** a r e a l m a n ."

2b) Tai j i s , mergaitės **pripažino,** t i k r a s v y r a s . 2b) Dem [NP1n] | NPn
Vfin | [NP2n]
"*So h e , the girls **have adjudged,** a r e a l m a n ."

1c) Tai t i k r u v y r u mergaitės **pripažino** j į . 1c) Dem NPn sc[NP1a] Vfin
sc[NP2i]
"*So a r e a l m a n the girls **have adjudged** h i m ."

2c) (?) Tai t i k r a s v y r a s , mergaitės **pripažino,** j i s . 2c) **Dem [NP2n] |
NPn Vfin | [NP1n]
"*So a r e a l m a n , the girls **have adjudged,** h e ."

Cleft constructions enable to highlight a particular string of words in a sentence and discover whether it forms a constituent or not (Aarts, 1997, 213). Clefting suggests that both sub-strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] are constituents. However, as in the case of Movement, the sub-strings can split into separate parts, and this gives weak support for constituency.

13. Pseudo-clefting

1. Ką mergaitės **pripažino,** tai j į t i k r u v y r u . 1. NPa NPn Vfin | Dem
sc[NP1a NP2i]
"*What the girls **have adjudged,** that h i m a r e a l m a n ."

(What the girls **have adjudged,** was that h i m a r e a l m a n .)

2. Ką mergaitės **pripažino,** tai – j i s t i k r a s v y r a s . 2. NPa NPn Vfin | Dem
| [NP1n NP2n]
"*What the girls **have adjudged,** that – h e a r e a l m a n ."

In the case of Pseudo-clefting the highlighted sub-strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] cannot split, thus suggesting that the sub-strings are constituents.

14. Passivisation

1. J i s (mergaičių) **pripažintas** t i k r u   v y r u . 1. sc[NP1n] NPg Vnonfin pass sc[NP2i]

"*H e (by the girls) **has been adjudged** a   r e a l   m a n ."

(H e **has been adjudged** a   r e a l   m a n (by the girls).)

2. J i s (mergaičių) **pripažintas** t i k r u   v y r u . 2. [NP1n] NPg Vnonfin pass [NP2i]

"*H e (by the girls) **has been adjudged** a   r e a l   m a n ."

(H e **has been adjudged** a   r e a l   m a n (by the girls).)

Passivisation is a way of rearranging information in the sentence, and thus showing whether the given string of words is a constituent (Wekker, Haegeman, 1989, 18). The passive of both sub-strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] is arranged in the same way. Due to the fact that Passivisation splits both strings, the argument for constituency is considered weak.

Summing up the results of the constituency tests, we can state that the sub-strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] are constituents: 9 out of 14 constituency tests prove the constituency of the strings under investigation. The tests such as Movement, S-Adverbial Distribution, VP-Adverbial Distribution and Clefting give weaker support to the claim because, due to relatively free word order of Lithuanian sentences, a splitting of the sub-strings is observed.

Constituency tests	sc[NP1a NP2i]	[NP1n NP2n]
1. Distribution	+	+
2. Movement	+/-	+/-
3. Sentence fragment	+	+
4. Ordinary coordination	+	+
5. Shared constituent coordination	+	+
6. Proform	+	+
7. S-Adverbial distribution	+/-	+/-
8. VP-Adverbial distribution	+/-	+/-
9. Paraphrase	+	+
10. Somewhere Else tests:		
a) Mad Magazine Sentences	+	+
b) Subject position		+
11. The meaning test	+	+
12. Clefting	+/-	+/-
13. Pseudo-clefting	+	+
14. Passivisation	–	–

The applicability of the tests provides strong empirical evidence for considering the sub-strings sc[NP1a NP2i] and [NP1n NP2n] as having the same syntactic status – that of a clause. Even 13 out of 14 tests show that the sub-strings under investigation syntactically act in the same way. Only the Subject position test indicates that there is a slight difference between them: the sub-string [NP1n NP2n] can occur in Subject position, whereas the sub-string sc[NP1a NP2i] cannot. This accounts for the fact that in the latter case we deal with a Small Clause where NPs are assigned case by the verb of the Main Clause, whereas the sub-string [NP1n NP2n] represents a Full Clause and here the case assignment takes place within the Clause.

The conclusion proves the method to be effective and perspective: it enables the analyst to investigate the Lithuanian language from a different perspective – the perspective of generative–transformational grammar.

ANGLŲ IR LIETUVIŲ KALBŲ SAKINIO SINTAKSINIŲ VIENETŲ NUSTATYMAS

Santrauka

Straipsnio tikslas – nustatyti struktūros [NP1 NP2] sintaksinį statusą lietuvių kalboje, remiantis generatyvine-transformacine gramatika. Analizei pasirinkti du lietuvių kalbos sakiniai, kurių sudėtyje yra minėtoji struktūra, anglų kalboje atliekanti sakinio sintaksinę funkciją. Sakiniams buvo pritaikyti anglų kalbai sudaryti sintaksinių sakinio vienetų nustatymo testai. Testų analizė parodė, kad galime kalbėti apie nagrinėjamą struktūrą kaip apie atskirą sintaksinį vienetą lietuvių kalboje. Testų rezultatai taip pat parodė, kad struktūros [NPa NPi] ir [NPn NPn], kurių pirmoji lietuvių kalboje išreiškia tiesioginį papildinį su tariniiniu pažyminiu, o antroji – bejungtukį papildinio šalutinį sakinį, sintaksiškai funkcionuoja panašiai. Tuo remiantis galime daryti prielaidą, kad, kaip ir anglų kalboje, lietuvių kalboje struktūra [NP1 NP2] funkcionuoja kaip šalutinis dėmuo. Tačiau, skirtingai negu anglų kalboje, lietuvių kalbos šalutinis dėmuo gali būti skaidomas.

REFERENCES

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

Aarts B., 1997. English Syntax and Argumentation. New York: St. Martin's Press

Aarts B., Meyer C.F. 1995. The Verb in Contemporary English: Theory and Description. Cambridge University Press

Ambrazas V. (red.), 1996. Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika. Vilnius: Mokslo ir encikl. l-la

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

Drotvinas L., 1961. Apie dabartinės lietuvių literatūrinės kalbos prijungiamuosius sakinius be jungtukų. – Dabartinė lietuvių kalba, Vilnius: Valst. polit. ir moksl. lit. l-kla, 178–205.

Labutis V., 1994. Lietuvių kalbos sintaksė. Vilnius: VU l-kla

Radford A., 1981. Transformational Syntax. Cambridge University Press

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

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

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

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