

JUDITA GIPARAITĖ. *The Non-Verbal Type of Small Clauses in English and Lithuanian*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2010. x + 242 p.
ISBN (10) 1-4438-1723-6, ISBN (13) 978-1-4438-1723-3

Reviewed by PETER M. ARKADIEV, MOSCOW¹

The book under review is a comparative study of the non-verbal small clauses in English and Lithuanian, i.e. of structures shown in boldface in examples (1a) and (1b).

- (1) a. *Vis-i* ***j-i*** *laik-ė* ***dor-u***
all-NOM.PL.M 3-ACC.SG.M consider-PST honest-INS.SG.M
žmog-umi.
man-INS.SG

- b. Everybody considered ***him an honest man.***

Such constructions present particular problems for syntactic analysis: first, the noun phrase (NP) such as *jī* / *him* in (1) (hereafter NP1), on the one hand, shows behaviour characteristic of the object of the main verb, and, on the other hand, has some properties of subjects; second, the syntactic relation between the two components of the construction, i.e. the aforementioned NP and the constituent such as *doru žmogumi* / *an honest man* in (1) (hereafter NP2, or the ‘secondary predicate’) is not easy to establish and incorporate into a general theory of syntax and the syntax-semantics interface. Such and similar constructions have been extensively studied in English and some other languages, mostly by the adherents of the generative paradigm (see e.g. Cardinaletti & Guasti, eds., 1995, but cf. also Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt, eds., 2005), however, their counterparts in Lithuanian have not been subject to a detailed investigation (except for such papers as Holvoet 2004, 2008). Thus Giparaitė’s book, based on her 2008 Vilnius University dissertation, fills this gap in the study of Lithuanian syntax and makes Lithuanian data available to the general linguistic audience.

¹ I am grateful to Cori Anderson and Wayles Browne for improving the English of this review.

The book consists of five chapters and three huge appendices, bibliography and subject index. Chapter 1 (“Introduction”, p. 1–26) lays out the objectives of the study, describes its empirical basis and methodology, and states the main points which the author defends. The study includes in its scope only non-verbal small clauses, i.e. those where the secondary predicate is a noun phrase or an adjective phrase (AP), setting aside constructions with verbal (participial) secondary predicates (see Arkadiev, to appear, on the latter type of construction in Lithuanian). The investigated constructions are cross-classified according to two independent parameters: (i) complement, i.e. subcategorized by the main verb vs. adjunct (non-subcategorized, or ‘free’) secondary predicates; (ii) depictive, which “express a state that holds during the reference time of the event encoded by the main predicate” (p. 27), vs. resultative secondary predicates. The main goal stated by Giparaitė (p. 1) is to contrast the English and Lithuanian constructions and to show that the small clause analysis, which claims that (i) there is a predication relation between NP1 and NP2 and (ii) that NP1 and NP2 form a syntactic constituent, is valid not only for English, but for Lithuanian, too.

In Chapter 2 (“Small Clause Analysis”, p. 27–37) the author presents a brief overview of the different kinds of analysis proposed for the English secondary predicate constructions, focusing mostly on the two competing generative accounts, viz. the ‘predication theory’ (Williams 1980, 1983) and the ‘small clause theory’ (Aarts 1992), whose major point of divergence is whether the sequence NP XP is considered to form a syntactic constituent.

Chapters 3 (“Properties of Constructions V [NP XP]”, p. 39–78) and 4 (“Small Clause Analysis of Constructions Representing the Subcategorization Frames V [NP1 NP2] and V [NP1 AP]”, p. 79–153) constitute the core of the book. In Chapter 3 the author surveys and compares the syntactic environments where the constructions in question appear in English and in Lithuanian, basing her analysis on the abovementioned distinction between complement vs. adjunct and depictive vs. resultative small clauses. Having stressed a certain degree of similarity in the behaviour of parallel constructions in two languages, Giparaitė observes that the English adjunct resultatives such as *The men slammed the door shut* have no regular counterparts in Lithuanian, where the result is usually ‘incorporated’ into the verb as a preverb. Here it

would have been instructive to draw parallels between, on the one hand, resultatives and particle-verb combinations in English, such as *The man **picked me up** in the street* (cf. e.g. den Dikken 1995, 43–85; Ramchand & Svenonius 2002), and, on the other hand, verb-particle constructions and verbal prefixation (cf. e.g. Müller 2002 on German, Masini 2002 and Ramchand 2008 on English and Russian). Further, the internal structures of the [NP XP] constructions in both languages are discussed and compared, as well as the lexical classes, semantics and subcategorization frames of verbs which co-occur with such constructions. The author concludes that despite a number of divergences, the two languages show a high degree of similarity in the syntactic properties of the constructions under investigation.

In chapter 4 the small clause analysis of the Lithuanian and English [NP XP] constructions is carried out. Giparaitė starts by claiming that there is a predication relation between the elements of the construction. The following arguments are given in favour of this conclusion: first, NP1 displays certain subject properties in English (unfortunately, the author does not discuss whether the corresponding NPs in Lithuanian have any subject properties as well); second, it is shown that both in English and in Lithuanian NP1 and NP2/AP show agreement in gender and number (it must be said, however, that in English this agreement is semantic rather than syntactic, especially since English lacks grammatical gender, while in Lithuanian the presence of grammatical agreement between two nominals does not in fact prove that they are necessarily in a predication relation—they could form an attributive or an appositive construction as well), but not in person. The most interesting piece of evidence for the predication relation in the NP1 NP2/AP construction comes from the purported availability of sentence negation, especially in contrastive contexts, cf. (2) (p. 91).

- (2) *Šuo laik-o Jon-q savo šeimink-u,*
 dog:NOM.SG consider-PRS John-ACC.SG self master-INS.SG
o ne prieš-u.
 but not enemy-INS.SG
 ‘The dog considers John his master, and not his enemy.’

It is not clear, however, whether *ne* in (2) is actually sentence negation and not constituent negation; the fact that it is written separate from

the noun is a matter of pure orthographical convention and cannot be considered sufficient evidence for the clausal status of negation.

Further, word order and constituency of the constructions in question are discussed. Application of various syntactic tests is supposed to show that the [NP XP] constructions in Lithuanian form a syntactic constituent. The author acknowledges that many of the tests do not give as neat results in Lithuanian as in English, since word order in Lithuanian is 'free' (i. e. determined primarily by information structure considerations) and the components of the small clause construction can move independently of one another. However, the fact that certain tests such as topicalization, coordination, and pronominalization, can apply to the [NP XP] construction as a whole, supports the treatment of such strings as syntactic constituents. On the other hand, a number of tests, including coordination and the so called 'somewhere else' test with 'echo-sentences' (*The court adjudged him guilty. Him guilty? It can't be true*, p. 140) yield identical results both for the small clause construction and for the ditransitive construction, which does not speak against the constituency status of the former, but rather against the diagnostic force of the tests themselves. Most important, probably, is the fact that sentence-level and VP-level adverbials may occur inside the small clause construction in Lithuanian and be interpreted in this position. Actually, Giparaitė does not make the last point clear on p. 132, seemingly paying attention just to the linear position of the adverbial and not to its scope; however, it is the scope of adverbials which is crucial for the whole small clause analysis, and so it is unfortunate that the author does not systematically pay attention to it.

Chapter 5 ("Conclusions", p. 155–159) summarizes the findings of the book. Appendices (pp. 161–230) contain the full data-set, including English and Lithuanian corpus examples, their translations into the other language, as well as the statistical results of the survey of the native speakers' grammaticality judgments on a large number of constructed sentences conducted in order to apply the constituency tests. There is also a list of sources and references and the subject index.

The book by Giparaitė is undoubtedly a welcome contribution to the study of Lithuanian syntax and to the contrastive analysis of Lithuanian and English. It is also instructive as a rare example of a systematic application of various constituency tests to Lithuanian, showing which of these tests are applicable to this language and with which limitations.

The conclusion reached by the author, i.e. that Lithuanian NP1 NP2/AP constructions can be treated as small clauses forming a syntactic constituent, seems to be robust. However, there are a number of respects (some of them already pointed out above) in which the book is to a certain degree disappointing.

As has been already mentioned, the book is based on the author's dissertation. Actually, it appears to be almost identical to the dissertation except for some minor, purely stylistic changes. However, a dissertation (especially of the East European kind) and a monograph are different genres, and I believe Giparaitė should have spent more time revising and restructuring her dissertation before publishing it as a book. In particular, the Introduction could have been seriously reworked. On the one hand, some purely 'formal' sections such as "Positions to be defended" and "Theoretical and practical value of the study" are unnecessary in the monograph and could well be dispensed with; on the other hand, the section describing the constituency tests should be also excluded and incorporated into the relevant chapter of the main body of the book. The titles of chapters 3 and especially 4 are too long and cumbersome. Moreover, even some typographical errors occurring in the original dissertation have been retained in the book, e.g. the non-italicized "atidaryti" 'to open' on p. 72 or "Internal Projection Principle" instead of "Projection Principle" on pp. 152 and 157. More importantly, when making her thesis available to the international audience, Giparaitė should have added interlinear glosses to the Lithuanian examples, even though this would have resulted in a considerable increase of the book's size.

Though the topic of the book is the contrastive analysis of English and Lithuanian constructions, I believe that the author should have paid more attention to the peculiarities of the Lithuanian constructions, and less to the description of their English counterparts. In contrast to English, Lithuanian is virtually undescribed in terms of contemporary syntactic theories, and deserves an investigation more thorough than has been actually presented in the book. For instance, Giparaitė does not systematically treat one of the most important problems of Lithuanian secondary predicate constructions, viz. the case marking of the predicate nominal, in particular the Accusative vs. Instrumental alternation (see Timberlake 1988, 1990; Holvoet 2004), just making several remarks in passing. For instance, on pp. 108–109 the author

mentions an interesting asymmetry of Accusative vs. Instrumental NP2 with respect to the possibility of appearance to the left of NP1, but does not discuss it further and does not provide any explanation for these facts. It is also a pity that the question of possible divergent syntactic analyses of constructions with Accusative and with Instrumental predicate nominals is not even raised; actually, in order to argue that both instantiate a small clause construction, it is necessary to show that instances with different cases on the predicate nominal are in fact one and the same construction.

Narrowing down the scope of the study to non-verbal constructions to the exclusion of the participial ones seems to be legitimate, but it is unfortunate that no language-internal empirical arguments are provided for this move (only theory-internal considerations on the basis of English are given in fn. 33 on p. 15). It would have been highly instructive to include a brief comparison of the major syntactic peculiarities of participial complement and non-verbal small clause constructions in Lithuanian. And of course, it is illegitimate to provide examples like (3) on p. 127 actually containing the participial construction and not a small clause.

The analysis in the book is based on the assumptions of the classic Government and Binding theory of the mid-1980s—early 1990s. This is not in itself a shortcoming, but for the fact that the whole Minimalist literature on small clauses, secondary predicates and related constructions (see Rothstein 2006 for an overview and such works as Dalmi 2005, Ch. 5; Progovac *et al.*, eds., 2006 or den Dikken 2006) has been mostly ignored in the book. This is unfortunate, since recent works on small clauses and predication in such languages as Russian (e.g. Pereltsvaig 2001) or Polish (Citko 2008) could prove relevant to the study of Lithuanian.

The analysis of adjunct small clause constructions as involving a null pronominal (PRO) subject controlled by the subject or the object of the matrix clause is not unproblematic. Indeed, very little empirical (not theory-internal) evidence is given in favour of the presence of PRO in these constructions on p. 98–100. Since the subject of the adjunct small clause is null, constituency tests cannot be applied to the construction in order to show that its elements form a larger unit. For instance, the coordination test on p. 125 can well be interpreted as conjoining several adjective phrases with one and the same putative PRO

subject, not as two separate small clauses. Failure of the proform test on p. 129, which is mentioned but not accounted for in any principled way, can also be indicative of the different status of adjunct predicate nominals in comparison to the complement small clause construction. In this context it is hard to understand what Giparaitė means saying on p. 159 that her “study proposes a solution to the problem of PRO”. It should also be added that Giparaitė does not take into account recent proposals concerning the status of PRO and its case marking, in particular Landau (2006).

A number of empirical tests and criteria are applied or interpreted inaccurately or erroneously. For instance, the proform test used as a constituency diagnostic has nothing to do with the possibility of pronominal objects with phrasal verbs; properly applied, this test should have shown whether the verb and the particle form a constituent or not (p. 19). In ex. (3.25) on p. 61 fairly divergent Lithuanian syntactic structures (a plain transitive verb, a verb with a predicate nominal, and a verb with an adverb) are lumped together. On p. 82–83 two very different syntactic operations, viz. extraction of the element occupying the subject position and extraction of the subject’s subconstituent, are mixed together and an unwarranted conclusion about the analysis of small clauses is drawn on the basis of misinterpreted data. Passivization examples on p. 113–114 are misinterpreted, too; the nominal predicate in the Instrumental case or the entire small clause cannot be promoted to the subject position in passivization in Lithuanian, contrary to Giparaitė’s claims. Only the subject of the small clause (or, put differently, the object of the matrix verb) can be promoted in passivization, which is indicated by its Nominative case marking and by the verb’s agreement with it, cf. (3a) (= 4.28a). The fact that the predicate nominal can appear in the preverbal position as in ex. (3b) (= 4.28b) has nothing to do with passivization, but is due to the free word order of Lithuanian.

- (3) a. *Vis-i* *vaik-ai* *bu-s*
 all-NOM.PL.M child-NOM.PL AUX-FUT
pakrykšty-t-i *katalik-ais.*
 christen-PST.PP-NOM.PL.M catholic-INS.PL
 ‘All the children will be christened Catholics.’

- b. *Katalik-ais bu-s pakrykšty-t-i*
 catholic-INS.PL AUX-FUT christen-PST.PP-NOM.PL.M
vis-i vaik-ai.
 all-NOM.PL.M child-NOM.PL
 ‘id.’

On p. 124 it is stated that the ‘double object’ constructions cannot function as sentence fragments, but the relevant example (10a) on p. 123 is marked as grammatical. It is unclear what example (9) on p. 123 is supposed to illustrate; it is given under the rubric “ordinary coordination test” but does not contain any coordinated string. It has already been mentioned as a serious shortcoming that scope of adverbials is not taken into account in chapter 4; in addition no distinction is made between adverbials proper and parenthetical expressions, which behave differently with respect to their syntactic position. It is not evident whether parentheticals like *žinoma* ‘certainly’ can be used in constituency tests on a par with adverbials at all.

It does not seem to be fully justified to treat the Lithuanian *tai* construction shown in (4) as a full equivalent of English cleft and to use this construction as a constituency test (cf. pp. 143–146). The author should have first described this construction and made sure that it is indeed a valid diagnostic of constituency.

- (4) *Tai vaik-ui tėv-as dav-ė obuol-į.*
 that child-DAT.SG father-NOM.SG give-PST apple-ACC.SG
 ‘It is to the child that the father gave an apple.’

Many formulations in the book are not entirely accurate and fully explicit, and the use of terminology is often misleading. For example, the important distinction between ‘phrases’ and ‘constituents’ is not clarified, which makes it sometimes difficult to follow the argumentation in chapter 4. On p. 2 (fn. 4) the Lithuanian term ‘nepilnieji sakiniai’ (lit. ‘incomplete sentences’) is translated as ‘small clauses’, which is certainly incorrect. On p. 17 the notion of observational adequacy introduced by Chomsky (1965) is attributed to Radford. On p. 22 the criteria of subgrouping of constituency tests are not clarified. On p. 47 the verb ‘to eat’ is given as an example of ‘verbs of movement’. On p. 49 (n. 75) Giparaitė refers to Genitive and Dative case marking of the secondary predicate “in double object constructions”, but does not

clarify what is meant by ‘double object construction’ and provides no examples of such case marking. The very application of the term ‘double object construction’ to the Lithuanian constructions with a direct and an indirect object does not seem to be fully justified. On p. 65 it is not clear whether the different senses of the verb *christen* and of its Lithuanian counterparts result in non-identical syntactic structures. On p. 74 verbs denoting a change of state are included into the category of ‘stative verbs’. On p. 85 the notion of ‘case assignment retraction’ is not clarified. The formulation about theta-marking on p. 153 is inaccurate—it is the subject of the small clause that is theta-marked, not the small clause itself.

Though there are not many typos and typographic errors in the book, some can be found; for instance, on p. 14 Dominique Sportiche is referred to with a feminine pronoun ‘she’ instead of ‘he’.

Despite the abovementioned shortcomings, Giparaitė’s book is an important and valuable contribution to the study of Lithuanian syntax, and I wish to express hope that it will be followed by other high (and higher) quality books by Lithuanian scholars realizing that their language deserves being analysed from the standpoint of contemporary linguistic theory.

Peter M. Arkadiev

Institute of Slavic Studies

Russian Academy of Sciences

Leninskij prospekt 32-A, RU-117334 Moscow

peterarkadiev@yandex.ru

ABBREVIATIONS

ACC — accusative, AUX — auxiliary, DAT — dative, FUT — future,
 INS — instrumental, M — masculine, NOM — nominative, PL — plural,
 PP — passive participle, PRS — present, PST — past, SG — singular

REFERENCES

AARTS, BAS. 1992. *Small Clauses in English: The Nonverbal Types*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- ARKADIEV, PETER M. To appear. Participial complementation in Lithuanian. To appear in Volker Gast & Holger Diessel, eds., *Clause Combining in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CARDINALETTI, ANNA & MARIA TERESA GUASTI, eds., 1995. *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 28: Small Clauses*. San Diego etc.: Academic Press.
- CHOMSKY, NOAM. 1965. The logical basis of linguistic theory. In: Horace Lunt, ed., *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists*. The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 914–978.
- CITKO, BARBARA. 2008. Small clauses reconsidered: Not so small and not all alike. *Lingua* 118.3, 261–295.
- DALMI, GRETE. 2005. *The Role of Agreement in Non-Finite Predication*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- DEN DIKKEN, MARCEL. 1995. *Particles: On the Syntax of Verb-Particle, Triadic, and Causative Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DEN DIKKEN, MARCEL. 2006. *Relators and Linkers: The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion, and Copulas*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- HIMMELMANN, NIKOLAUS P. & EVA F. SCHULTZE-BERNDT, eds., 2005. *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification. The Typology of Depictives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2004. On the marking of predicate nominals in Baltic. In: Philip Baldi & Pietro U. Dini, eds., *Studies in Baltic and Indo-European Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 75–90.
- HOLVOET, AXEL. 2008. Secondary predicates in Baltic. In: Christian Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder, eds., *Secondary Predicates in Eastern European Languages and Beyond*. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky-Universität, 125–140.
- LANDAU, IDAN. 2006. Severing the distribution of PRO from case. *Syntax* 9/2, 153–170.
- MASINI, FRANCESCA. 2002. *Complex Verb Formation in English and Russian*. “Tesi di laurea” in theoretical linguistics, University of Bologna.
(http://francescamasini.caissa.it/Publications_files/Masini%202002%20-%20Tesi%20di%20laurea.pdf)

- MÜLLER, STEFAN. 2002. *Complex Predicates: Verbal Complexes, Resultative Constructions, and Particle Verbs in German*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- PERELTSVAIG, ASYA. 2001. *Copular Sentences in Russian. A Theory of Intra-Clausal Relations*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- PROGOVAC, LJILJANA, KATE PAESANI, EUGENIA CASIELLES & ELLEN BARTON, eds. 2006. *The Syntax of Nonsententials. Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- RAMCHAND, GILLIAN. 2008. Perfectivity as aspectual definiteness: Time and the event in Russian. *Lingua* 118, 1690–1715.
- RAMCHAND, GILLIAN & PETER SVENONIUS. 2002. The lexical syntax and lexical semantics of the verb-particle construction. In: Line Mikkelsen, Chris Potts, eds., *Proceedings of the 21th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 387–400.
- ROTHSTEIN, SUSAN. 2006. Secondary predication. In: Martin Everaert & Henk van Riemsdijk, eds., *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. Vol. IV. Oxford: Blackwell, 209–233.
- TIMBERLAKE, ALAN. 1988. Case agreement in Lithuanian. In: Michael Barlow & Charles A. Ferguson, eds., *Agreement in natural language: Approaches, theories, descriptions*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 181–199.
- TIMBERLAKE, ALAN. 1990. The aspectual case of predicative nouns in Lithuanian texts. In: Nils B. Thelin, ed., *Verbal Aspect in Discourse. Contributions to the Semantics of Time and Temporal Perspective in Slavic and Non-Slavic Languages*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 325–347.
- WILLIAMS, EDWIN. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 203–238.
- WILLIAMS, EDWIN. 1983. Against small clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 287–308.