Towards a Taxonomy of Small Clauses in English. An Extended Review of B. Aarts (1992)

AARTS, Bas (1992). *Small Clauses in English. The Nonverbal Types.* Mouton: Berlin (pp. xii+228).

Javier PÉREZ GUERRA
Universidade de Vigo

0. INTRODUCTION

In transformational studies, the principles of binary branching and the X-bar theory itself, based on a relationship of complementation between Specifiers and Heads, a bit blurred by the constant of endocentrism, imply that analyses of the kind of (1) can at least be improved:

(1) $[V\ NP\ AP]_{VP}$

Scholars have thus tried to accommodate structures into binary phrase markers and at the same time to develop a theory centred on the maxim that categories are projections of other minor categories with which they share basic features. For instance, an NP is a superior level of the category N which has undergone a type of 'process' by means of which certain specifiers or other segments are added to the N just mentioned, building up an N′, and finally the NP, also labelled N″.

Apart from the tendency to explain linguistic facts by using binary endocentric structures, it has also proved necessary to limit the number of categories. The standard group of categories consists of N[oun], A[djective], Ad[verb], P[reposition], V[erb], COMP[lementiser] and their projections,

Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense, 3, Servicio Publicaciones UCM, Madrid, 1995

apart from other more heterodox ones such as TOP, AGR, and so on, whose inclusion is still under consideration [1].

Let's introduce at this stage of the argumentation the topic of this book under review and see whether it stands any chance of survival. As Haegeman (1991: 50, footnote 16) declares, in informal notes, telegrams, newspaper headlines or in colloquial speech, we hear expressions such as *Mother in hospital, Hijackers under arrest* or *(What?) Me angry?* [2], which in previous times were regarded as «register-specific properties», or, say, were acts of performance with no consequences at all for the theory of grammar. However, these structures, called 'Small Clauses,' are not restricted to the uses just mentioned, but occur in perfectly orthodox utterances, like (2):

(2) I wanted her happy.

From the outset, the concept hidden under the label of 'Small Clauses' not only challenges both X-bar principles and binary branching, but also stirs up a vast hornet's nest of problems when one tries to accommodate it among the list of available categories. In other words, what can Transformational Grammar say about *her happy* in (2) if we are (i) to avoid a three-fold analysis of the VP which would contradict the subcategorization frame of the verb *want*, and (ii) to demonstrate the existence of a unique constituent which could be functionally descriptive in other environments of the language, and at the same time ruled by X-bar theory?

The problem posed by (i) can easily be answered by arguing that *her happy* comprises simply V and an XP, in which X stands for an unknown category. What about (ii)? Which is the head element of the suggested constituent *her happy*: *her*, *happy* being its sister within an N?-category, or *happy*, complemented by *her* and creating an A?-category? None of these suggestions seems desirable on the grounds that *her happy* does not show up like this in any other sentential location distributionally equivalent to either a nominal or an adjectival element. The solution transformational studies have chosen is the coinage of a new item, to wit, the *Small Clause* –hereafter abbreviated *SC*.

Bas Aarts in this volume analyzes this new category first by doing deep revision of the scanty literature on this topic and afterwards by scrutinizing the relatively narrow scope of this structure among the patterns of the English language. Added to the complexity of the objectives just mentioned, the framework Aarts follows is Government-Binding –GB henceforth– in its most updated version, which makes the reading of *Small Clauses in English. The Nonverbal Types* a difficult task, only lessened by the large number of examples and a fairly plain style. Nonetheless, it is unfortunately still far from a 'friendly-interfacing' characterization. Readers must be conversant with GB theory, even though in Chapter 2 –§§ 2.2 and 2.3– some hints,

more 'refreshing' than informative, are put forward, containing the basic principles and concepts of which Aarts will make use in the ensuing sections of the study.

The book is organized into seven Chapters, an Appendix containing details on the *Survey of English Usage* Corpus –University College London–, and an eleven-page reference list incorporating about 150 bibliographical entries. Chapter 1 introduces both the topic and the theoretical framework. The latter is described in more detail in Chapter 2, to which a revision of the literature on SCs is added. Chapter 3 accounts for the existence of the constituent SC, different, in principle, from the rest of the categories recognized by transformational studies. In an attempt to connect actual language and the theory already discussed in previous sections, an in-depth analysis of the types of predicates that apparently take SCs as complements is put forward in the fourth Chapter. Chapters 5 and 6, theoretical in nature, deal with, respectively, the consequences for the theory of grammar of extracting the constituents of an SC, and the syntactic and categorial treatment the SC must be given. For the expository purposes of this paper, even though it will imply changing the division of the book, I will organize the contents just listed into four sections: concept, analysis, SC node and SCs with PPs.

1. CONCEPT OF SC

This section covers the contents of Chapters 1, 2, part of 6 and the first half of 3. SCs are described from a merely descriptive point of view, first by demonstrating that they are single constituents; secondly, by justifying their two primary functions: subject-predicate; and thirdly, by accommodating their structure within the transformational framework, from the first studies to GB Theory. In order to do so, SC Theory will be confronted with Predication Theory. Besides, special treatment is given to matters such as SCs in *seem-*, *be-* or passive constructions, and the distributional parallelism between SCs and free adjuncts and appositions.

In Chapter 1 a preliminary structure of an SC is put forward, reflected in (3):

(3) (V) $[NP\ XP]_{SC}$
where X=N, A, P

Two different types of relationship occur between those elements: one could be sketched as V-NP-NP-XP, and another one as V-NP-XP. Examples (4) and (2), repeated here as (5) illustrate, respectively, the connections just mentioned:

(4) They appointed her head of the Department.
(5) I wanted her happy [3].

In other words, the SC complements V within a VP, and at the same time another relationship holds between NP and XP, similar to that between subject and predicate.

With the two conditions outlined in the previous paragraphs in mind, to wit, the structure shown in (3), and the subject-predicate connection between NP and XP, Aarts opens Chapter 2 by revising the analyses given in the transformational literature to structures fulfilling both requirements. In Extended Standard Theory, the core idea was that NP in (3) was the object of a complex verb group which comprised V and XP. Put another way, from a stage of the sort of (6), by means of a transformation which raised the NP to an object position adjacent to V, we got (5):

(6) $[\text{wanted-happy}]_{V}$ [4] $[\text{her}]_{NP}$

In my opinion, the relative success of this analysis could well be attributed to (i) the avoidance of postulating new categories, that is, the implication that the concept SC is superfluous, and (ii) the coherency with which we can manage every occurrence of *want*, without distinguishing between different *want*s or several subcategorization frames of the same lexical item. Obviously, the immediate obstacle is the overgeneration of a large number of D-structure lexical items such as *want-happy*, *want-interested*, *want-sad*, and so on, which will never be operative in S-structure and thus in actual speech. And what is more, not only would the lexicon be artificially increased, but also the filter component of grammar would be, in order to block the occurrence of those items in other environments like (7):

(7) **After wanting-happy, she had a shower.*

To sum up, the aforementioned suggestion, in trying to accommodate SC-structures without predicting new principles, complicates the system extraordinarily. At a later stage, that proposal gave way to the raising-to-object as formulated by, for instance, Rosenbaum (1965) and Postal (1974), who compare the transformation operated in, for instance, *He seems to be happy*, with examples like (5). The only difference would be that in the former example it is to the main subject position that the subject of *be* is raised, whereas in (5), *her* would occupy the primary location of the object. Obviously this raising-to-object analysis is preferred to the previous one on the grounds of the unnecessary multiplication of the lexicon postulated by the latter. However, from a conservative point of view, the theory of grammar cannot easily deal with the construction emerging from the raising transfor-

mation. Put more graphically, a structure of the sort of [*believe* [*Tom to be a fool*]]$_{VP}$ would derive into [*believe Tom*]$_{VP}$ [*to be a fool*], which is rather revolutionary if one bears in mind that the operation produces no alteration in actual speech at all.

This second Chapter ends with a dense section devoted to the exploration of the, say, 'traditional' bases of GB Theory, in particular those concepts which will be used in the ensuing parts of the volume. Notions such as subjacency, government, Theta-, Binding-, Case- and Control-Theory are explained in a way that is too straightforward, especially if we take into account the initial elementary level intended in this study. We will have to wait till § 2.3 to face the new developments in GB from Chomsky's *Barriers*, *ie* the mechanisms the Universal Grammar must incorporate in order to block the undesirable results of an almost-free *Move* α, particularly that of *barrier*, and the concepts of *blocking category* and *L-marking* required for a full understanding of the former.

Once the foundations have been laid, Aarts introduces the two analyses of SCs to which much space has been devoted in the GB literature, namely, (i) SC Theory itself, and (ii) Predication Theory, which is explored later in the book. The latter, mostly due to Williams (1980), is justified on a tripartite division of the VP, in the same way other functional or more descriptive accounts would do, as reported by Aarts in § 2.4, that is to say, *I* [*wanted* [*her*]$_{NP}$ [*happy*]$_{AP}$]$_{VP}$. We are not far from the raising theories already discussed, since, under Williams' postulation, the problem of positing different subcategorization frames for the same predicate remains also unsolved, otherwise *happy* in (5) would have to be regarded as either an adjunct or part of the only internal complement or argument taken by *want*. As repeatedly pointed out in this paper, on a mere basis of coherency with the general principles ruling the standard generative model of grammar, we are obliged to reject Predication Theory and to accept, and consequently offer explanations for, a single-constituency analysis of the so-called SC-segment. And that is precisely what at first examination seems to be the most attractive feature of SC Theory. This proposal mixes two features: (i) the obvious predicative relationship established between, for instance, *her* and *happy* in (5), and (ii) the one-fold structure the predicate *want* seems to require in the light of its wide use in actual speech. As for (i), the immediate consequence is that the constituent as a whole is given a clausal structure –*ie* subject plus predicate– which lacks its COMP so as to prevent examples such as (8):

(8) *I wanted {that, whether, *etc*} her happy.

As well as 'COMPless', this special type of clause is untensed, that is to say, no inflected verb form should appear in an SC. As a consequence of both requirements just mentioned, (9) below does not contain an SC, since *was* carries INFL [+tense], but an S', whereas (11) does:

(10) I believe (that) James was a fool.
(11) I believe James to be a fool.

Let's simply remember that, as the title announces, this study is concentrated in the nonverbal types of SCs, that is, those without even INFL node [5].

In Chapter 6, which in my opinion should be located earlier in the book, Aarts makes a quick review of the different accounts given to the SC node in the literature, and finally accommodates, plausibly, this concept among the general categories recognized by GB Theory, even though he is obliged to do so in a rather ad-hoc and controversial way. I will go back to this point after identifying what we must understand by SC, and the relations held in those environments incorporating this category.

Table 1: Summarizes the most important types of SCs recognized by Aarts

average Type		Mike considers Sue intelligent [6].
		declares
		wants
PP type		Mike wants the dog out of the house.
verbal types		Nelson saw them running away.
		run
		Nelson made them run [7] away.
seem-type	→	Ann_i seems t_i happy.
be-type	→	Ann_i is t_i happy.

We could seemingly adhere with no further problems to the classification just mentioned. I have already accounted for the first type and, in passing, the verbal types; much space will be devoted below to the PP group, and the *seem*-examples meet proper explanations when confronted with other occurrences of the same lexical item [8]. What strikes me is the suggested radical extension of the SC formula to simple examples of *be* plus subject complements of the kind of the last of the examples in Table 1, repeated under (12):

(12) Ann^i is $[t^i$ happy$]_{SC}$

To maintain this analysis leads us to advocate a subcategorization frame for *be* containing only one argument in the shape of an SC. To the best of my knowledge, there is no other occurrence in grammar which may support this analysis. Nor even reasons analogical to passivisation can be brought into play, since the treatment given to the passive voice in generative studies –see footnote 6– does in fact keep pace with the argumental characteristics of the predicate, in contradiction with the effects of an analysis such as that posited for (12) above. Besides, such an analysis would generate ungrammatical sentences like (13):

(13) *Ann$_i$ is [t_i to be happy] [9]

Chapter 3 is organized into two parts, the first one containing linguistic facts supporting the SC option, and the second suggesting analyses of SC environments. The main pieces of evidence promoting the analysis of, for example, *her happy* in (5) as an SC, are summarized as follows:

(i) on the basis that only constituents can be coordinated, one can demonstrate that *her happy* is a constituent: *I wanted her happy and that man a genius.*

(ii) (non-referential) dummy *it* or *there* can occur as first elements in SCs. Since dummies cannot be arguments of matrix verbs, then the only possibility is to regard them, in examples like (14), as subjects of clausal complements, *ie* subjects of SCs.

(14) *I* consider it a beautiful day.

(iii) the occurrence of these segments is distributionally parallel to other clausal elements: in (15), the SC even appears independently; in (16), it functions as a free adjunct; in (17) as the complement of a preposition, and in (18) as a clausal subject agreeing with a singular verb form:

(15) [A: Do you consider that man an idiot?]
B: *That man an idiot?* You must be joking! */no intonational break between* that man *and* an idiot*/*

(16) [PRO$_i$ *A journalist by profession,*] Mr Cosmos*i* has written an excellent book on...

(17) *With Jeremy happy* we can now go and see the film.

(18) *Workers angry about the pay* is just the sort of situation that the company wanted to avoid.

I do not think that these pieces of data are strong enough. As for (15), the so-called SC uttered by B is simply a repetition, followed by a further comment about it. The B speaker could well say *Consider that man an idiot? You must be joking!.* Far from supporting a small-clausal analysis of the highlighted segment in (15), Aarts' proposal does not even demonstrate that this component is a constituent, as (19) counter-exemplifies:

(19) [A: She told me that you gave your daughter £20]
B: *My daughter £20?* You must be joking!

My daughter £20 is obviously neither a clausal nor a single constituent.

I partially agree with the analysis of (16), in which the constituent in italics is considered an SC. What I do not share in the least is Aarts' account of examples like (20):

(20) Mr Cosmos*i*, PRO*i* *a journalist by profession*, has written an excellent book on...

This scholar claims that (20) also contains an SC belonging to the subject. To the best of my knowledge, if we precisely make use of (16) in order to demonstrate that SCs and other clauses are distributionally equivalent, that will lead us to assert that there should be functional equivalence as well. In other words, (16) should be comparable to (21), and likewise, (20) to (22), all of them illustrating segments functioning as adjuncts of the VP:

(21) Since [10] *he*$_i$ *is a journalist by profession*, Mr Cosmos*i* has written an excellent book on...

(22) Mr Cosmos$_i$, *since he*$_i$ *is a journalist by profession*, has written an excellent book on...

Nonetheless I do believe that, whereas both the SC in (16) and the *since*-clauses in (21) and (22) are effectively VP adjuncts, (20) has two readings: under one, this example would be equivalent to (22); under the second reading, the syntactic relation held between *Mr Cosmos* and the SC is also adjunction or subordination *but* within the NP, resulting in an (endocentric) appositional construction, functionally equivalent to (23) [11]:

(23) Mr Cosmos, journalist by profession,... [12]

Consequently, the SC analysis is not necessary under the appositional reading on a mere economical basis, since no constituent functioning as subject can be inserted before the NP *a journalist by profession* –*|*Mr Cosmos, he a journalist by profession*,$]_{APP}$–. Despite these drawbacks, Aarts suggestion must be considered highly valuable, since, apart from portraying a parallelism between free clausal adjuncts and SCs, which is doubtlessly valid, it has allowed us to show a distributional, syntactic and semantic difference between initial and medial SCs and non-SC members in apposition.

As far as examples (17) and (18) are concerned, I have nothing to comment upon. I agree with the SC analysis on grounds similar to those postulated in previous paragraphs. What strikes me is the way in which *with* in (17) can be justified, since SCs have no COMP position, and *with* obviously cannot be the COMP of the matrix clause. Radford (1988b), for example, simply claims that the segment in italics in (17) is a PP, *with* being the preposition, and the SC its complement. Obviously this point needs further research.

Apart from evidence shown by coordination, dummies and distributional facts already discussed, in this first half of Chapter 3, two further proofs are added, the first supported by the placement of adverbials like *perhaps* or *probably*, the complexity of which lies beyond the purposes of this

paper. Thus, in the following lines, I will limit myself to making some remarks on the final group of testimonies:

(iv) That the first constituent of an SC functions as subject is corroborated by at least three different facts: (a) the reflexive *self*-pronouns can only be related to subjects –*I consider this man himself an idiot*–, (b) *not*-initial and *alone*-final only occur in subject position –*I consider not many students good PhD students; I consider MA students alone good PhD students*–, and (c) following Kayne's (1984) principle that nothing can be extracted from left branches, since subjects are left branches in binary phrase markers, extraction from subjects should be blocked – **Who*$_i$ *do you consider the father of* t$_i$ *a gentleman?* [13].

2. ANALYSIS OF SCs

In this section, which deals specifically with Chapter 3, I explore the different types of complementation and the syntactic levels into which they are organized in sentences including SCs.

The second half of Chapter 3, perhaps the most complex in the book, puts forward the possibilities of analysing SCs. In order to account for the different strength degrees of the syntactic relation held between the matrix verb and the first member of the SC, two groups of verbs taking SC complements are distinguished:

(24a) *consider*-verbs: the SC is the only complement in VP: *I* [*consider*$_V$ [*you an idiot*]$_{SC}$]$_{VP}$.

(24b) *appoint*-verbs: the SC is adjoined to the VP, *ie* the only complement of V is NP:

We [[*appointed you*$_i$]$_{VP}$ [NP$_i$ *professor of logic*]$_{SC}$]$_{VP}$

(24b)-verbs may occur in sentences having only an NP as complement: *We appointed you, vs* the (24a)-class, to which that possibility is not available –**I considered you*–. In my opinion, instead of establishing two clear-cut classes of verbs on the basis of whether an SC proves compulsory or not, I would suggest a gradient going from those verbs which unquestionably do not take SC complementation, like *eat* in (25) below, to verbs which indisputably require an SC as complement in order to satisfy their subcategorization frame, *ie* those of the (24a)-type.

(25) John ate the meat raw.

In positing an analysis like (24b), in which the verb takes *you* as the only complement, and the SC is simply an adjunct of the VP, Aarts links, for in-

stance, *appoint* with *eat*. That seems completely wrong to me, especially once we bear in mind the fact that the parallelism with *We appointed you* – can easily be explained by allowing for the existence of two *appoints*, namely *appoint*$_1$, subcategorized for simply an NP, and *appoint*$_2$ requiring an SC as the only complement. Both subcategorization frames indeed coincide on a syntactic basis, that is to say, both comprise just one object, and even the distinction between *appoints*, which one could well justify semantically, would perhaps be unnecessary. In conclusion, I strongly reject the analysis of the SC in the *appoint*-class as an adjunction to VP, which is correct for the *eat*-example [14], and embrace the evaluation of the SC in (24b) as a clear complement, sister to V.

A third type of verb, illustrated in (24c), comprises those ditransitive verbs having an SC that fulfills one of the positions reserved for the arguments, to which I have no objections at all:

(24c) *persuade*-verbs:
I [*persuaded*$_V$ [*him*]$_{NP}$ [PRO *to leave*]$_{SC}$]$_{VP}$

This Chapter ends with statistical data taken from the Corpus to which I made reference at the beginning of this review. These 'percentage'-episodes are given no importance at all in the book, and consequently a theoretical study like the one under review could well get rid of them, rather than incorporate them in quite an anecdotal manner.

3. THE SC NODE

Before dealing with Chapters 4 and 5, which are extraordinarily technical, I shall report from Chapter 6 the different accounts of the SC node we come across in the literature. Very briefly, there are five proposals into which we can summarize Aarts' report, and which are motivated by theoretical questions such as extraction, agreement, Case marking, and so on:

(i) the SC node is simply an XP, X standing for any category. According to whether the internal structure is seen as the average one in X-bar theory, that is, [Spec X^n]X^{n+1}, or as one of adjunction, two different analyses have been suggested, illustrated in (26) and (27) respectively:

(26) Stowell (1981, 1983): *Michael considers* [[*Sue*]$_{Spec}$ [*intelligent*]$_A$]$_{AP}$
(27) Chomsky (1986), Manzini (1983): *Michael considers* [[*Sue*]$_{NP}$ [*intelligent*]$_{AP}$]$_{AP}$

(ii) Chomsky (1981): the SC node is a projection of X, although not the maximal one but a new level of projection, labelled X*.

(28) Michael considers [*Sue intelligent*]$_{A^*}$

(iii) Kitagawa (1985): the SC node is an S', with an INFL node:

(29) Michael considers $[[[Sue]_{NP}\ [BE]_{INFL}\ [intelligent]_{AP}]_S]_{S'}$

(iv) the SC node is an S:

(30) Hornstein & Lightfoot (1987): *Michael considers* $[[Sue]_{NP}\ INFL_0\ [intelligent]_{AP}]_S$ ($INFL_0$ is said to take NP, AP or PP complements, *vs* average INFL, which takes VP)

(31) Kluender (1985), Chung & McCloskey (1987): *Michael considers* $[[Sue]_{NP} -_{INFL}\ [intelligent]_{AP}]_S$

(v) Radford (1988a, 1988b): the SC node is a special category, different from the rest. It has no COMP nor INFL nodes.

(32) *Michael considers* $[[Sue]_{NP}\ [intelligent]_{AP}]_{SC}$

Both Radford's and Chomsky's (1981) positions are automatically rejected, because Aarts attempts to accommodate the concept of SC without making up a new label. As for possibility (i), one can easily get rid of it, since, on the one hand, Chomsky's adjunction theory cannot be maintained because of the fact that, for instance, (24b) can do without *professor of logic*, but not without *her*, and according to Chomsky's proposal it would be *her* that is adjoined to the other constituent. On the other hand, Stowell's Spec-suggestion is counter-argued by Aarts by saying that, whereas Specifier-fronting produces ungrammatical results, *Sue Michael considers intelligent* is correct. In consequence, *Sue* cannot be a Specifier. We are then left with possibilities (iii) and (iv). (Iii) is repudiated because of Subjacency, and (iv) is finally adopted without the ad-hoc conditions posed by the scholars, otherwise we would be creating a new category. In other words, Aarts' claim is that SCs are Ss, or IPs, with an INFL [15] which is standard [16] *but* [-tense]:

(33) Michael considers $[[Sue]_{Spec}\ [INFL_{[-tense,\ +AGR]}\ [BE_V\ [intelligent]_{AP}]_{VP}]_{I'}]_{IP}$

This analysis is not however free of problems. Since the NP in Spec is Case-marked accusatively by the matrix verb and a future percolation reaching INFL, it is impossible to justify the reception of Case in (i) independent SCs, which lack matrix verbs *–Doors open 20.30–*, and (ii) SCs functioning as subjects, and which are thus Case-marked nominatively *–Him free poses a great threat–* [17]. Aarts' explanations are extremely ad-hoc and even highly dependent on new theoretical apparatus.

4. SCS WITH PREPOSITIONAL PHRASES

Chapters 4 and 5 deal with, respectively, the analysis of structures of the form of (34b-h) below, possibly SCs, and the way in which traditional transformations take place in SCs.

(34) Structure: *V NP PP*
- (a) Prototypical SC: I want *you in the car.*
- (b) I switched the radio off.
- (c) I prevented Andrew from leaving the house.
- (d) I {discouraged, dissuaded,...} the nurse from moving the patient.
- (e) I regarded them as clowns.
- (f) He took her for a lawyer.
- (g) I accused Jim of murder.
- (h) I described them as clowns.

With the objective of checking whether the postverbal segments in these sentences are SCs, the *iter* followed by Aarts comprises three parts: first, by means of coordination and distribution he tries to find out whether the NP+PP segment is a constituent or not. Secondly, there must be a relationship of predication between the NP and the PP. Thirdly, in those examples containing verbs in the embedded complement, the NP is said to function as the subject of an SC if the active and passive reformulations are semantically equivalent. For reasons of space, I will illustrate those tests with simply the (34b)- and (34c)-types, and afterwards I will reproduce the conclusions corresponding to the rest of the examples.

The radio off in (34b) can occur elsewhere:

(35) With the radio off, we are all happy.
We are all happy: the radio off, the TV on...

Furthermore, coordination gives us proof that *the radio off* is a constituent:

(36) He switched the lights on and the radio off.

Moreover, since the semantic nature of *off* is clearly predicative with respect to *the radio*, we are thus led to conclude that *the radio off* is an SC [18].

As for (34c), in (37) we observe that *Andrew from leaving the house* can be coordinated with another similar segment, and thus must be regarded as a constituent.

(37) I prevented Andrew from leaving the house and Peter from staying.

The same conclusion can also be reached if one takes into account synonymous constructions with *prevent*:

(38) I prevented Andrew's leaving the house.

In (38), *Andrew's leaving the house* is clearly an NP consisting of a possessive determiner –*Andrew's*– and a further nominal component. As a consequence, *prevent* only takes one complement. Once we agree with the convenience of analysing that component as a single constituent, and since: (i) there seems to be a subject-predicate relationship between *Andrew* and *leaving the house*, and (ii) by means of the passive in the pair of sentences under (39) we conclude that the post-*prevent* NP functions as subject, the constituent as a whole receives SC characterization.

(39) (a) He prevented the committee from taking the wrong decision.
(b) He prevented the wrong decision from being taken by the committee.

What about *from* in *prevent*-clauses? After contrasting *from* with other prepositions and complementisers, Aarts concludes that *from* is different from both, and analyses it as the inflectional element, that is, INFL, which is terribly ad-hoc and surprising [19].

By making use of the same criteria, Aarts determines that (34d,g)-verbs do not take SCs but complete clausal complements, whereas *regard* in (34e) or *(mis)take* in (34f) do. The SCs in (34h) examples have an empty element –PRO [20]– and not the overt NP as subject, since on the basis that dummy *there* or *it* are not eligible subjects in this type of utterance, then that position following the matrix-verb is Case-marked by the matrix-verb itself. Besides, the passive-voice criteria lead us to the same conclusion.

In Chapter 5 Aarts examines the behaviour of SCs when either their subjects or their predicates undergo movement. Several operations of extraction to the right and left are checked, to wit, extrapositions, detachment, passivisation, raising, *wh*-movement and topicalisation. Due to their complexity and non-core character, for the expository purposes of this paper, I will not go into this matter at all.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL REMARKS

Radford's (1988b) concepts of 'Exceptional clauses' and 'Small clauses,' distinguished structurally by the inclusion or lack of the INFL node, respectively, meet homogeneous explanation in Aarts' study of SCs. This analysis under review is based on two starting points: first, SCs are single constituents, as demonstrated by coordination, distribution and insertion of VP modifiers. Secondly, the whole constituent has no COMP node, and thus cannot be regarded as S'.

Contrary to Radford's theory, the structure for all these 'COMPless' structures is said to be S, with an INFL node filled by either *to*-infinitives or material such as *as, for* or *from.* Both syntactic and semantic facts support this account: on the one hand, the SC-initial constituent, that is, NP, functions clearly as the subject of the SC, because (i) that position can be filled by dummy *it* or *there*, whose only function is that of subject; (ii) it can be the agent in the passive with no change in meaning; (iii) as reported by Radford (1988b), that location is eligible for subjects of idiomatic chunks, which can only be subjects –*I believe the cat is out of the bag*–; (iv) the SC may contain *self*-pronouns, which are only related to subjects; (v) *not*-initial and *alone*-final, which always modify subject positions, do occur in connection with the

NP; and (vi) extraction from the NP is blocked, in the same way as with other subjects. On the other hand, a semantic relationship of predication holds between NP and XP.

Nonetheless, syntactic and semantic factors also suggest that the NP functions partially as the object of the matrix verb: (i) for instance, in *I consider myself intelligent*, the fact that *myself* and not *me* is grammatical implies that *I* and *myself* somehow belong to the same sentence; (ii) if the NP node is filled by a pronoun, it is Case-marked in the Accusative; (iii) it can function as the subject in a passive reformulation of the matrix clause, in the same way as average objects do —*The President is regarded as a clown*—; and (iv) distributionally, *I appointed you* and *I appointed you professor of logic* are obviously related. As for semantics, one feels that a valid paraphrase of, for instance, *I considered you an idiot*, could well be 'I considered you, and my conclusion is that you are an idiot'.

In consequence, out of the whole discussion in this paper, I have recognized the following groups of structures, the cases meeting different explanations in the book being asterisked:

1. constituents different from SCs, functioning as complements:
   Ann is [happy]*AP (from Table 1)* [*]
2. constituents different from SCs, functioning as adjuncts:

   (25) John ate the meat [raw]$_{AP}$ [*]

3. sentences containing SCs:
   3.1. independent SC:
   [Mother in hospital]*SC*
   3.2. SCs containing PPs:
   Mike wants [the dog out of the house]$_{SC}$ *(from Table 1)*
   3.3. SCs in which the NP moves compulsorily to the subject position of the matrix clause —*seem* and passives—:
   Ann$_i$ seems [$_i$ *i* happy]$_{SC}$ *(from Table 1)*
   Sue$_i$ is considered [t_i intelligent]$_{SC}$ *(from footnote 6)*
   3.4. other nonverbal SCs:
   (5) I wanted [her happy]$_{SC}$
   Mike {considers, declares, wants} [Sue intelligent]*SC (from Table 1)*
   3.5. verbal SCs:
   (11) I believe [James to be a fool]$_{SC}$
   Nelson saw [them {running, run} away]$_{SC}$ *(from Table 1)*
   Nelson made [them run away]$_{SC}$ *(from Table 1)*
   3.6. SCs with PRO as subject, functioning as complements:
   (4) They appointed [her$_i$]$_{NP}$ [PRO$_i$ head of the Department]$_{SC}$ [*]
   (24c) I persuaded [him$_i$]$_{NP}$ [PRO$_i$ to leave]$_{SC}$

NOTES

[1] I am referring, for example, to the *Minimalist Program* outlined in Chomsky (1992) and Gelderen (to appear), under which different types of AGR, namely AGR_S and AGR_O are added to the general list of categorial elements.

[2] See Akmajian (1984) for the analysis of these strange utterances, called «Mad Magazine Sentences».

[3] (4) and (5) will be given different analyses below, precisely on the semantic basis just expounded.

[4] *Cf* Dowty (1976, 1979), who, in view of examples such as (i) and (ii), postulates that in order to cope with them in a homogeneous way, the verb in (ii) should be reanalysed as *appoint-professor-of-logic*: (i) *We appointed her*, (ii) *We appointed her professor of logic*. I will offer my own view below when I deal with the types of verbs taking SC complementation.

[5] I will show later that SCs, in Aarts' opinion, always have INFL nodes, even filled by 'uninflectable' material.

[6] The passive versions are also said to contain SCs:

(i) Sue_i is considered, declared, wanted t_i intelligent.

Let's remember that in transformational studies, verbs have only one subcategorization frame, and thus the actual subject of a passive sentence has to be generated in a postverbal position, exactly in the same way as in the active. For example, *read* takes simply one internal argument, both in the active and in the passive, as (ii) and (iii) illustrate respectively:

(ii) The boy read a book.

(iii) *e* was read a book.

Since, first, English is a type of language called non-PRO-drop, that is, which always requires a lexical element functioning as subject, and secondly, *a book* in (iii), due to technical reasons, cannot be Case-marked, it has to move to the *e*[mpty] position, deriving into (iv):

(iv) $A\ book_i$ was read t_i

Accordingly, the base structure of (i) above will be (v):

(v) *e* is considered [Sue intelligent]$_{SC}$

Sue moves to *e*, leaving a *t*[race] behind syntactically and semantically coindexed with the actual material in sentence-initial position after movement.

[7] *Running* and *run* are not tensed forms, and thus are appropriate for SC structures.

[8] As Haegeman (1991: 284-85) points out, *seem* «is a one-place predicate which takes a clausal complement» and does not assign a (theta-)role to the subject. If we take that for granted, the following examples will be handled in the same way: a clausal –small or full– complement is generated in postverbal position, and either the empty subject slot of the matrix clause is filled by a dummy *it*, or the subject of the complement clause moves to that location:

(i) *seem [Ann to be happy] *(Ann has no Case, so it moves to the matrix subject position)* Ann_i seems t_i to be happy.

(ii) seem [Ann happy] *(again* Ann *has no Case, so it moves)* Ann_i seems t_i happy.

(iii) *seem [that Ann is happy] *(the matrix subject position must be lexically filled)* It seems that Ann is happy.

Since the bracketed segments in (i) and (ii) have no COMP nor tensed INFL, they are analysed as SCs.

[9] We must not confuse (13) with examples like *Pedestrians are not to walk on the grass*, which contain the modal *be to*.

[10] I have given the SC a causal semantic value. The reader may incorporate other adverbial meanings, with no consequences for the validity of my argument.

[11] Pay heed to the fact that there is not any pause or comma after *Mr Cosmos* in (16). If that were not the case, I would also postulate a further reading of that example, in which both the SC and *Mr Cosmos* would be the members of an appositive structure, independently of the categorial status of the former. This new reading will be discussed in detail below in the paper.

[12] As I have claimed elsewhere –(in press)–, the appositional relationship must not be distinguished from subordination, and as such, it operates at different levels of the sentence structure. If my proposal proves true, this special type of subordination is required at least by spoken and, let's say, journalistic language, as a syntactic way-out to the need for *afterthoughts*.

[13] Apart from the tests put forward by Aarts, under (i) and (iii) above, to demonstrate that SCs are single constituents, Haegeman (1991: 51) adds a further one: «other material associated with the main verb of the sentence [such as *very much*] cannot occur internally to what we have called the Small clause», as reflected in **The chief inspector wants Maigret very much in his office*. Since the post-*want* material cannot be discontinued by the insertion of VP modifiers or complements, then *Maigret* and *in his office* are not different complements of the VP, but constitute a single one.

[14] Taking Chomsky (1986) as the point of departure, constituents can only be adjoined to *maximal* projections. Because of that, for the purposes of this paper, we could postulate that *raw* is subordinated to the VP in (25), and that *naked* to IP in *John ate the meat naked*. In making the last remark I deviate from both Aarts, who suggests that the universal location of adjoined SC with (24b)-verbs is sister to VP, and Napoli (1989), who adjoins *naked* to CP. My proposal is justified in view of examples like *What I said is that naked you cannot enter the disco*, and **What I said is naked that you cannot enter the disco*, which illustrates the claim that COMP must precede the predicate of the SC. Besides, according to Aarts' suggestion, one cannot account for the semantic ambiguity in *John saw Marian naked*, as recognized by himself, in which *naked* may refer to either *John* or *Marian*, whereas following my proposal the difference in meaning would be parallel to the different locations of the SC.

[15] To allow for a clausal constituent with no INFL cannot be easily understood from a 'philosophical' point of view. As Aarts declares, without INFL «we would end up with clauses which are neither finite nor nonfinite. That would be like having human beings who are neither male nor female» (p. 182).

[16] In fact, the INFL or I node posited by Aarts is not completely standard, since it is also the landing-site of strange items, such as *as* in *I regard them as clowns*, as we will see below.

[17] In order to account for the accusatively-marked subject in that clause, Aarts develops a theory in which the Accusative is the unmarked Case in English. Some lines below he reports the existence of counterexamples to his proposal, like *He in the front seat and she in the back one is very common*, and explains them by appealing to the strange features of coordination. What he misses in that generalization is that *He in the front seat would be safer*, with no coordination at all, is possible in English, *he* even preferred to *him* by at least some speakers.

[18] On the contrary, examples such as (i) are not said to contain SCs. (Ii) to (iv) show that the supposed SC in (i) is not a constituent, and thus it cannot be analysed as an SC, but simply as $[V\ NP\ PP]_{VP}$: (i) *I looked the information up*; (ii) **With the information up, we were happy*; (iii) **We are all happy: the information up,...*; (iv) **The information up and the lights off...*

[19] When he deals with the *(mis)take-for* examples, Aarts himself recognises that instead of asserting that *for* is the inflectional element, the whole structure could be analysed as «idiomatic or marked» (p. 123), which stresses the capricious character of the inflectional status of *as*, *from* or *for*.

[20] PRO is «a non-overt NP, i.e. an NP which appears to be syntactically active, hence syntactically represented, but which has no overt manifestation. (...) [It] is characterized by the feature composition [+anaphor, +pronominal]» (Haegeman 1991: 237). The analysis given by Aarts to, for instance, (34h) is: $I\ described\ |them_i|_{NP}\ [PRO_i\ as\ clowns]_{SC}$.

REFERENCES

Akmajian, A. (1984). «Sentence Types and the Form-Function Fit». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2/1. 1-23.

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

— (1986). *Barriers.* Cambridge MA: MIT.

— (1992). «A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory». *Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 1.

Chung, S. and J. McCloskey (1987). «Government, Barriers and Small Clauses in Modern Irish». *Linguistic Inquiry* 18/2. 173-237.

Dowty, D. (1976). «Montague Grammar and the Lexical Decomposition of Causative Verbs». In B. H. Partee (Ed.), *Montague Grammar.* New York: Academic. 201-45.

— (1979). *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Gelderen, E. van (to appear). *The Rise of Functional Categories.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Haegeman, L. (1991). *Introduction to Government & Binding Theory.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hornstein, N. and D. W. Lightfoot (1987). «Predication and PRO». *Language* 63/1. 23-52.

Kayne, R. S. (1984). *Connectedness and Binary Branching.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Kitagawa, Y. (1985). «Small but Clausal». *CLS* 21. 210-20.

Kluender, R. (1985). «Sätzchen: German Small Clauses as S's». *NELS* 16. 274-92.

Manzini, M. R. (1983). Restructuring and Reanalysis. MIT Ph.D.

Napoli, D.J. (1989). *Predication Theory: A Case Study for Indexing Theory.* Cambridge: CUP.

Pérez Guerra, J. (in press). «La Aposición en Inglés: Consideraciones Sintácticas, Semánticas y Pragmáticas». *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses.*

Postal, P. (1974). *On Raising.* Cambridge MA: MIT.

Radford, A. (1988a). «Small Children's Small Clauses». *Research Papers in Linguistics* 1. 1-38.

— (1988b). *Transformational Grammar: A First Course.* Cambridge: CUP.

Rosenbaum, P. S. (1965). *The Grammar of English Predicate Complement Constructions.* Cambridge MA: MIT.

Stowell, T. (1981). Origins of Phrase structure. MIT Ph.D.

— (1983). «Subjects across Categories». *The Linguistic Review* 2. 285-312.

Williams, E. S. (1980). «Predication». *Linguistic Inquiry* 11/1. 203-38.

RESEÑAS