Depictive Secondary Predication in Slovenian[*]

Franc Marušič (Stony Brook University),
Tatjana Marvin (MIT),
Rok Žaucer (University of Ottawa)

1. Introduction: Slovenian Data

In Slovenian, Depictive Secondary Predicates (DSPs) appear in various
argument (and non-argument) positions with relatively few restrictions.
Depictives can be predicated of Subjects (1a), Direct Objects (1b),
Indirect Objects (1c), Prepositional Objects, etc. (Orešnik 1996). A DSP
agrees with its host-DP in Gender, Number, and Case. DSPs with
"instrumental case-marking" do not exist in Slovenian.

(1) a. Subject:
$Peter_i$ *je   dal   Meti   piškote   ves $polomljen_i$.*[1]
P-NOM AUX gave M-DAT biscuits-ACC all-NOM broken-NOM
'Peter$_i$ gave Meta some biscuits all broken$_i$ (= back-sore).'

b. Direct object:
Peter   je   dal   Meti $piškote_i$ vse $polomljene_i$.
P-NOM AUX gave M-DAT biscuits-ACC all-ACC broken-ACC
'Peter gave Meta some biscuits$_j$ all broken$_j$ (= crumbled).'

---

[1] Note that the judgments of all examples hold under neutral intonation. The English
translations may not be grammatical but will nevertheless be used for maximum
clarity.

c. Indirect object:
Peter   je   dal   Meti$_i$ piškote   vsej   polomljeni$_i$.
P-NOM AUX gave M-DAT biscuits-ACC all-DAT   broken-DAT
'Peter gave Meta$_i$ some biscuits all broken$_i$ (= back-sore).'

d. Dative subject:
Budweiser Vidu$_i$ ugaja   pijanemu$_i$, ne   pa   tudi treznemu$_i$.
B-NOM   V-DAT pleases drunk-DAT, NEG MODAL also sober-DAT
'Vid$_i$ may like Budweiser drunk$_i$, but certainly not sober$_i$.'

e. Locative:
Peter   je   dal   piškote   v košarico$_i$ vso   polomljeno$_i$.
P-NOM AUX gave biscuits-ACC in basket-LOC all-LOC broken-LOC
'Peter put the biscuits into the basket$_i$ all broken$_i$.'

f. Genitive:
Slik$_i$ se   je   dotaknil še   vseh   mokrih$_i$.
paintings-GEN REFL AUX touched   still all-GEN wet-GEN
'He touched the paintings$_i$ still all wet$_i$.'

g. Instrumental:
Mučil   se   je   s   sekiro$_i$ že   vso   topo$_i$.
struggled REFL AUX with axe-INST already all-INST blunt-INST
'He struggled with the axe$_i$ when it had already gone all blunt$_i$.'

As can be seen from (1c), the restriction on the indirect object that has been observed in English—and upon which some theories were built—does not hold in Slovenian. DSPs hosted by indirect objects are perfectly acceptable in Slovenian. Indirect object-oriented DSPs have also been reported in Icelandic and German (Maling 2001), Russian (Richardson 2002) and (although with great restrictions) even in English (Maling 2001: p. 424):

(2) a. *The nurse gave the patient$_i$ his medication still groggy$_i$.*
    b. *The perverted orderly liked to look at female patients$_i$ nude$_i$.*

The interesting restriction on DSPs hosted by prepositional hosts[2] (nominals in the Locative and Instrumental, and objects of an Accusative-assigning P) is that they are only possible if the DSP is adjacent to its host, as in the grammatical example (3a)[3]. If the prepositional host moves, leaving the DSP behind, the sentence becomes unacceptable as in (3b).

(3) a. Prepositional object:
    In potem na Petra$_i$ še čisto pijanega$_i$ naletim na obali.
    and then into P-ACC still all   drunk-ACC ran   at beach
    'And then I run into Peter$_i$ at the beach, and he$_i$ is still all drunk$_i$.'
   b. **In potem na Petra$_i$ naletim še čisto pijanega$_i$ na obali.*
    and then into P-ACC run   still all drunk-ACC at beach

The same holds of the locative- and instrumental-hosted disjoined DSPs in (4a-b) below:

(4) a. Locative: → compare with the grammaticality of (1e)
    *V košarico$_i$ je dal Peter piškote   vso   polomljeno$_i$.
    into basket-LOC AUX gave P-NOM biscuits-ACC all-LOC broken-LOC
    b. Instrumental: → compare with the grammaticality of (1g)
    *S   sekiro   se je mučil   že   čist topo.
     with axe-INST REFL AUX struggled already all blunt-INST

Note that Slovenian—as Slavic languages generally—in principle does not allow adjectival resultative secondary predication (see Strigin & Demjjanow (2001)).

1.1 What makes these data interesting?

In many languages DSPs can be predicated of the matrix-clause subject and direct object, but not of dative or genitive objects, or at least only with severe restrictions. The IO-coindexation (5c) is impossible in

---

[2] Unlike in Russian (and some other Slavic languages), Slovenian locative and instrumental cases are obligatorily prepositional.
[3] Note that the same restriction seems to hold also in English, as seen in (i) ((2b)).
(i) *The perverted orderly liked to look at female patients$_i$ in his office nude$_i$

English (but see Maling's (2001) example with indirect object-hosted DSPs in (2)).

(5) English: Williams (1980), etc.
    a. *John$_i$ drank the coffee tired$_i$.*
    b. *John drank the coffee$_i$ hot$_i$.*
    c. *John$_i$ gave Mary$_j$ the coffee tired$_{i/*j}$.*

The standard approaches (Williams 1983, Rothstein 1985, Bowers 2001) were built on data such as (5), and moreover made the wrong assumption that these data exhaustively represented the crosslinguistically available facts. Therefore, these approaches are not adequate to account for Slovenian, which allows DSPs with indirect objects. The aim of this paper is to offer an analysis that will account for the Slovenian data in (1) and (3). Section 2 reviews previous approaches to DSPs. In Section 3 we overview the basic properties of Slovenian adjectival modification and in Section 4 we present our analysis. Section 5 discusses the consequences of our proposal and Section 6 some problems.

2. Previous Analyses of Depictive Secondary Predicates

2.1 Flat ternary analysis

The structure given in (6), first proposed by Williams (1980, 1983) (and adopted in McNulty (1988), Rothstein (1985)), takes the DSP to be a sister of the verb and the object of which it is predicated.

(6) [$_{VP}$[$_V$ *pushed*] [$_{NP}$ *the door*] [$_{AP}$ *open*]]

The ternary branching structure has several problems. To begin with, it is not binary. When such an analysis is applied to indirect object DSPs, the VP ends up with four daughters. The AP is in such a structure in the same relation with both objects, making it impossible to determine which one is the host. Similarly, it is hard to see how one would distinguish between subject- and object-oriented DSPs if they both originate in the same structure. There is no obvious local relation

between the depictive and its subject host, so it is not clear how agreement can be derived. Further problems arise with multiple DSPs and stacking of same-host DSPs. Both processes are completely regular in Slovenian (Section 5.7), and occur also in English, as in (7) (examples from Bowers 2001: 326).

(7) *John$_i$ sketched the model$_j$ [nude]$_j$ [drunk as a skunk]$_j$.*
    John$_i$ sketched the model$_j$ [nude]$_i$ [drunk as a skunk]$_i$.

2.2 Shells

Larson (1989) gives the structure in (8) for object-oriented DSPs. AP is the lowest argument of the verb. When the object is merged in to [Spec,VP] the verb moves to the upper V-head. AP forms a constituent with the verb in this analysis. The structure in (9) shows Larson's right-adjunction analysis of subject-oriented DSPs, where AP is directly adjoined to V'.

(8) [$_{VP}$[$_{NP}$ *Jude*] [$_{V'}$[$_V$ *eat*] [$_{VP}$[$_{NP}$ *the fish*] [$_{V'}$[$_V$ __] [$_{AP}$ *raw*]]]]]

(9) [$_{VP}$[$_{NP}$ *John*] [$_{V'}$[$_{V'}$[$_V$ *leave*] [$_{NP}$ *the party*]] [$_{AP}$ *angry*]]]

Such structures cannot account for indirect object-oriented DSPs. Only the lowest argument can host a depictive, and so an IO-oriented DSP does not seem to be possible. The proposal also runs into problems with multiple DSPs and stacking of same-host DSPs.

2.3 Binary S(mall)C(lause)-analysis

Kayne (1984), van Voorst (1986) and Hoekstra (1988) adopt a binary SC analysis as in (10). The SC is composed of only two elements, the subject and the DSP, but it has no functional head.

(10) [$_{VP}$ [$_V$ *pushed*] [$_{SC}$ [$_{NP}$ *the door*] [$_{AP}$ *open*]]]

Just like the analyses in 2.1 and 2.2, this account runs into problems with multiple DSPs and stacking of same-host DSPs. In a binary SC there is

no space for an additional AP. It is also not clear how such an analysis can deal with subject-oriented DSPs.[4]

2.4. Right adjunction of Small Clause

Drawing on Stowell (1983), various linguists have adopted the analysis in (11) for subject-oriented DSPs (e.g., Koizumi (1994), Bowers (2001), Strigin & Demjjanov (2001)). The subject of the SC is a PRO which needs to be c-commanded by a controller. The SC is adjoined either to the VP for subject-oriented or to V' for object-oriented DSPs.

(11) [$_{TP}$ *John$_i$* [$_{VP}$ [$_{V'}$ *drives* [$_{DP}$ *the car*]] [$_{SC}$ PRO$_i$ *drunk$_i$*]]].

Because of the obligatory control requirement on PRO, Koizumi (1994) assumes that indirect object-oriented DSPs are structurally ruled out[5]. Since in Slovenian, IOs *can* freely host DSPs, an analysis structurally ruling out IO-oriented DSPs must in the light of the Slovenian data in (1) above be rejected.

2.5. Thematic-role and lexical-semantics accounts

Williams (1980) and Rothstein (1983) restrict depictives (to S- and DO-hosts as opposed to putatively ungrammatical IO-hosts) in terms of thematic roles, claiming that the host of a DSP cannot be Goal but must rather be Theme/Patient or Agent. This generalization, already falsified by Jackendoff (1990: 203), is clearly incompatible with the Slovenian data in (1c,e,g).

   Rapoport (1993), on the other hand, disputes Williams' (1980) and Rothstein's (1983) generalization on the grounds that not every verb's DO can host a DSP. A sentence such as *Herman kicked the bear$_i$ tired$_i$* is ruled out on an attempted depictive reading, while it is fine on a resultative reading (Rapoport 1993: 177). She concludes that DSPs are

---

[4] Admittedly, the structure was used to explain resultatives, for which it seems to work fine, and none of the authors make any claims about DSPs.
[5] IOs can in fact be controllers, as seen in (i).
(i)   a. I wrote him$_i$ a message to PRO$_i$ show his friend.
       b. I$_i$ told her$_j$ the truth drunk$_{i/*j}$.

restricted to verbs causing a change in the state or location of their objects. Slovenian falsifies the claim, (12).

(12) *Lanko   je   brcnil medveda$_i$ vsega utrujenega$_i$.*
    L-NOM AUX kicked bear-ACC all   tired
    'Lanko kicked the bear$_i$ all tired$_i$.'

2.6. Why can these analyses not account for Slovenian data? A brief recapitulation

The proposals for the structure of DSPs are often based on the opposition between the grammatical Subject/Direct Object-oriented depictives vs. the putatively ungrammatical Indirect Object-oriented depictives. The data from Slovenian show that the opposition in question is not universal and that some other explanation is called for. That is, Slovenian treats all arguments and adjuncts of the verb alike, DSPs can be predicated of any of them, except for the prepositional ones *when they are not next to each other*.

Furthermore, Williams (1980) and Rothstein (1983) restrict DSPs in terms of thematic roles and Rapoport (1993) in terms of verb lexical semantics. Neither of these restrictions applies to Slovenian.

3. Properties of Slovenian Depictive Predicates

In this section we review some further properties of DSPs that provide additional motivation for our proposal.

3.1. Interpretation of Depictive Secondary Predicates

DSPs can only have stage-level interpretation (in addition to other interpretational restrictions on adjectival predicates / adjectives in predicative use). The individual-level adjective *inteligenten* "intelligent", used as a DPS in (13), can only have an s-level interpretation, something like "Meta was pretending to be intelligent", or that at the moment she seemed more intelligent than I had known her to be. For further discussion on the interpretation of DSPs see Rapoport 1993, McNally 1994, Rothstein 2000, Filip 2001, Strigin & Demjjanow 2001.

(13)   *Meta   je   na zabavo   spet prišla vsa inteligentna.*
         M-NOM AUX to   party-ACC again came all intelligent-NOM
        '(Once again,) Meta came to the party seemingly intelligent.'

3.2. Modifiers and Depictive Secondary Predicates

Attributive adjectives in Slovenian are in principle prenominal. Post-nominal adjectives (PNAs) are possible only when they have some modification (14).

(14)   *Hiša velika *(kot Triglav)* (PNA)
        house big   as Mount Triglav

Similarly, DSPs improve if they are used with overt modification, either a DegP, a comparison class or any modifying adverb. When the adjective is itself clearly s-level, this modification may not be necessary, as in (15). With an otherwise individual-level adjective, used as a DSP, the tendency to be modified is very strong, as seen in (16).[6]

(15)   *Metki   sem zoprni   ?(kot hudič) dal odpoved.*
        Metka-DAT AUX moody-DAT   ?(as devil) gave resignation
        'I gave my resignation to Metka, who was being quite nasty.'
(16)   *Vidu   sem *(vsemu) pametnemu pomagal skuhati kosilo.*
        V-DAT AUX *(all)   smart-DAT helped   cook   lunch-ACC
        'I helped Vid make lunch, and he was being a smart-one.'

3.3. Internal structure

A further property DSPs share with predicative adjectives and post-nominal adjectives is their matching internal structure. All of them contrast in this respect with attributive adjectives (Orešnik 1996, Marušič 2001). PNAs, primary predicates and DSPs all have the order:

---

[6] There is a tendency for the obligatory modification to be restricted to 'high-degree' modification (thanks to Wayles Browne, for pointing this out to us). This tendency is not present with s-level adjectives, which also do not have the obligatory modification requirement.

adjective + modifier internal to AP, as shown in (17) for DSPs. Attributive adjectives have the inverse order: the modifier precedes the adjective, (18).

(17) a. *Meta   je* / [*kuha   kosilo*]   [*utrujena kot svinja*].
      Meta-NOM is / cooks lunch-ACC tired-NOM as   swine
      'Meta is (making lunch & she is) very tired'
    b. **Meta   je* / [*kuha   kosilo*]   [*kot svinja utrujena*].
      Meta-NOM is/ cooks lunch-ACC as swine tired-NOM
(18)   [*Kot svinja utrujena*] *punca* vs. **[utrujena kot svinja*] *punca*.
      as swine tired   girl   tired   as swine girl

3.4. Quantifier restriction differences

DSPs differ from PNAs in the interpretation of the quantifier, (19). With PNAs, (19b), both the adjective and the noun are quantified, yielding a restrictive reading, while the adjective in the DSP in (19a) modifies the entire quantified DP, yielding a non-restrictive reading.

(19) a. depictive
      [*Vsi* [*gusarji*]]   *so zadeti   kot mina jedli čevape.*
      all   pirates-NOM AUX drunk-NOM as mine ate   kebab
      'All pirates ate kebab, and they were dead drunk.'
    b. post-nominal adjective
      [*Vsi*   [*gusarji   zadeti   kot mina*]] *so jedli čevape.*
      all   pirates-NOM drunk-NOM as mine   AUX ate   kebab
      'All pirates who were dead drunk ate kebab.'

This difference in the interpretation of the quantifier can also serve as a test to differentiate PNAs from depictives. Assuming that the nominal and its modifier form a constituent in both cases, we see that PNAs form a tighter constituent than DSPs. Clitics cannot break up the DP with a PNA. (We return to this issue in Section 4.)

3.5 Post-Nominal Adjectives vs. Depictives

Since the two were described as having several similarities, we have to clarify how we can tell whether an adjective is a PNA or a DSP.

PNAs can—unlike depictives—not be disjoined from the NP. Whenever a predicate is not adjacent to the nominal it modifies, it cannot and does not have the PNA reading, by which we do not necessarily mean an s-level restrictive interpretation. An example of an i-level PNA is in (20).

(20)   *Ogovoril me   je otrok, genialen kot sam   Einstein.*
        addressed me-ACC AUX child intelligent as   himself Einstein
        'A kid, as intelligent as Einstein himself, spoke to me.'

The difference between PNAs and DSPs is most clearly seen in the following minimal pair.

(21)   *Otrok,   nonstop pijan,   mi   je zatežil   za jurja.*
        child-NOM non-stop drunk-NOM me-DAT AUX harassed for 1000
        'The/a child who is drunk all the time harassed me for 1000 sit.'
(22)   **Otrok   mi   je nonstop pijan zatežil   za jurja.*
        child-NOM me-DAT AUX non-stop dr-DAT harassed-PF for 1000

The sentence (22) is ruled out because *non-stop drunk, always drunk* is necessarily an i-level predicate. Thus it is impossible for the child to have been always drunk only at the time of the harassment (note that an iterative interpretation is impossible because of the verb's perfectivity). *Always* necessarily applies to all possible times, giving the predicate the i-level reading.

    The adjective in a sentence such as (23) is actually ambiguous between a PNA and a DSP reading (discussed in Section 3.4). The DSP reading is preferred in such cases. DSPs can take as their host any nominal (including pronouns (including small *pro*) and proper names), while PNAs cannot combine with proper names (including expressions such as *mum*). Certain nominals do not admit restrictive modifiers, and neither do they admit PNAs.

(23)   *Čaj je   natočil v vse šalčke čisto umazane od prejšnje noči.*
       Tea AUX poured in every cup totally dirty   from previous night
       'He poured tea in all (dirty) cups (dirty) from the night before.'

4. Proposal

The common properties of PNAs and depictives follow from the fact that they are both predicative adjectives. Unlike in PNAs, however, the quantifier of the DP does not quantify over the adjective in depictives. We propose that—unlike in the case of PNAs—the depictive is a small-clause-like constituent with the DP in its Specifier and the AP in its complement. The constituent which we call PrP (following Bowers 2001, but note that we do not wish to make any definite claims about its actual status) is merged into the position where the host of the depictive would otherwise be merged. From there the DP can move up, leaving the predicate behind. The pre-movement structure is in (24).

(24) $[[_{DP}Vid\text{-}NOM]_i$ *aux* $[_{VP}$ t_i $[[_V$ *harrased*$][_{PrP}[_{DP}$ *Marija-*DAT$][[_{AP}$
     all tired$]]]]]]$

This proposal allows a PrP to appear in any A-position, which accounts for the acceptability of depictive predicates with all types of arguments (Subject, Direct/Indirect Object, Oblique). Agreement, present in all Slovenian depictives, is established through the head of the PrP, which carries the features from the DP to the adjective. The same structure is posited also for other kinds of DSPs, as in 'I went to France *as a student*', with the reading that I was a student when I went to France (not the reading where *as a student* is a manner adverb).

   A natural question, however, is the following: how is this supposed to work in other languages? We claim that the PrP with the DP is the starting point for all DSP constructions. The difference between Slovenian and other languages is that unlike other languages Slovenian allows the PrP to be merged (and moved) into any A-position, thus allowing DSP with any DP and allowing it to move around the clause.

5. Consequences of the Proposal

5.1. Subject/Direct Object vs. Indirect Object asymmetry

The restriction on depictive-hosts to Subjects and Direct Objects (but not Indirect Objects) in some languages is not the result of structural issues. All DSPs share the same structure. Therefore, the restriction on IO-oriented DSPs in languages such as English must follow from something else.

5.2. Prepositional cases

The unavailability of disjoined depictives hosted by DPs in pre-positional cases (locative, instrumental, etc.), as shown in (3-4), falls out naturally from this proposal. DSPs are allowed when they immediately follow their prepositional-case host. At that point they all form a constituent. Since there is no preposition stranding in Slovenian, the DP cannot move alone. In cases of disjoined PPs, the DP alone and the preposition do not form a constituent; there-fore they cannot move out of the PrP together without the depictive. However, it is possible to have an instrumental and locative DSP if the whole PP either stays in situ, as in (25a), or if the whole PP together with the PrP moves up as a constituent as in (25c).

(25) Locative:
a. *Jedel sem* [PP *pri* [PrP [DP *mami*] [Pr' [AP *vsej utrujeni   od   dela*]]]]
   I ate AUX   at   mom-LOC   all tired-LOC from work
   'I ate at my mom's, and she was very tired from work.'
b. *[PP*Pri*[PrP[DP*mami*]] *sem jedel* [PP_[PrP__[Pr'[AP *vsej utrujeni od dela*]]]]
        at   mom-LOC AUX ate   all tired-LOC from work
c. [PP*Pri* [PrP[DP *mami*] (*sem*) [Pr'[AP *vsej utrujeni   od dela*]]]] (*sem*) *jedel*.
        at   mom-LOC AUX   all tired-LOC from work AUX ate

Note that the AUX in (25c) is a clitic. There is some variation as to whether a clitic can split the PP constituent or not. Some speakers accept it, some do not (but even those who hesitate at accepting the version of (25c), where the clitic splits the PP, agree that (25c) is much better than

(25b)). In a way this is an argument for phonological positioning of clitics. Regardless of the position of the clitic, the AP has a depictive reading, which is the only one available with a unique-referent host like *mama* "mother".[7]

The restriction on disjoined DSPs is not related to the locative and instrumental case or to the argument/nonargument distinction, since the same restriction holds for prepositional arguments in the accusative case, as shown in (26a) vs. (26b) (repeated from (3)). In addition, (26c) shows that *na Petra* in (26a-b) is an argument of the verb since the sentence is unacceptable when there is no prepositional object.

(26) a. Prepositional Object:
　　In potem na Petra$_i$　še čisto pijanega$_i$　naletim na obali.
　　and then into P-ACC still all drunk-ACC　ran　at beach
　　'And then I run into Peter$_i$ at the beach, and he$_i$ is still all drunk$_i$.'
　b. **In potem na Petra$_i$ naletim še čisto pijanega$_i$ na obali.*
　　and then into P-ACC run　still all drunk-ACC at beach
　c. *In potem na obali　naletim *(na Petra).*
　　and then at the-beach run　into Peter-ACC
　　'And then I run (into Peter) at the beach.'

5.3. Depictives in embedded clauses

On our account, DSPs will always be low in the tree (unless they move up together with the DP) and inside the clause they are associated with. Since we do not posit any right adjunction (Kayne 1994), the prediction is that whenever a DSP follows an embedded clause it will be interpreted as occurring at the same time as the event of the embedded sentence. This prediction is borne out. A DSP following an embedded clause can only modify the argument of the embedded clause, (27a), but not one of the matrix clause, (27b). It can refer to its predicate only when it is positioned inside the matrix clause, (27c).

---

[7] If clitics are positioned in PF (Anderson 1995) and if functional projections like PrP do not form a phonological phrase when syntax is mapped onto phono-logy (Truckenbrodt 1999), then splitting of PrP in (25c) is predicted.

(27) a. *Meta$_i$ mi je razlagala* [*koga* (pro$_i$) *bo volila vsa pametna$_i$*].
        M-NOM me AUX explained whom   AUX vote all clever-*f*-NOM
        'Meta was telling me who she will vote for when she *is* all smart.'
     b. **Meta$_i$ mi je razlagala* [*koga* (pro$_i$) *bo volila*] *vsa pametna$_i$*.
        M-NOM me AUX explained whom   AUX vote   all clever-*f*-NOM
        'M was telling me who she will vote for when she *was* all clever.'
     c. *Meta$_i$ mi je vsa pametna$_i$ razlagala, koga* (pro$_i$) *bo volila*.
        M-NOM me AUX all clever-*f*-NOM explained whom   AUX vote
        'Meta was explaining to me all smart who she will vote for.'

The restriction goes also in the other direction: if the DSP agrees with an argument of the matrix clause, which is not present in the embedded clause, it cannot follow the embedded clause, as shown by (28a). (28b) is given just to show that such agreement is possible if the DSP is positioned in the matrix clause.

(28) a. **Meta$_i$ mi$_j$ je razlagala koga* (pro$_i$) *bo volila vsemu pijanemu$_j$*.
        M-NOM me-DAT AUX told whom   AUX vote all drunk-m-DAT
        'M was telling me—and I was all drunk—who she will vote for.'
     b. *Meta$_i$ mi$_j$ je razlagala vsemu pijanemu$_j$ koga* (pro$_i$) *bo volila*.
        M-NOM me-DAT AUX told all   drunk-m-DAT whom   AUX vote
        'Meta was telling me—and I was drunk—who she will vote for.'

A right-adjunction analysis predicts the availability of the reading where the DSP is associated with the matrix predicate, but this prediction is not borne out. In fact, a right adjunction analysis can only derive sentences where the DSP referring to the matrix event is positioned at the right edge of the clause. As has just been shown, DSPs at the right edge can in Slovenian only be associated with the embedded event; in English, (29), the DSP can be associated with both the matrix and the embedded event.

(29) *Meta was telling$_i$ me whom she will vote$_j$ for drunk$_{i/j}$.*

5.4. Control Structures

DSPs can be used in control sentences, where they modify the PRO but agree in case and gender with its controller, as noted in Marušič, Marvin

& Žaucer (2002). The DSP in (30) cannot be associated with the matrix predicate; its only interpretation is in association with arguments of the embedded clause.

(30) *Vid$_i$ ji$_j$ je sklenil zadevo$_k$ razložiti   trezen$_i$.*
    V-NOM her-DAT AUX decided matter-ACC to-explain sober-NOM
    'Vid decided to present the matter to her when he is sober.'
    ✓*present sober / *decide sober*

A right-adjunction analysis predicts the availability of the reading where the depictive is associated with the matrix predicate, but this prediction is not borne out. We will not address the question about DSP's case agreement. It agrees (in case) with the matrix subject while it modifies the embedded subject. It is reasonable to assume that the DSP cannot have null case, as only PRO can have null case. We would only like to point out that if one adopts Hornstein's (1999) analysis of control, this peculiar agreement pattern is compatible with our proposal.[8]

5.5. Event quantifier scope differences

An event quantifier exhibits different scope over the DSP depending on the relative position of the two. When the DSP is positioned above the temporal adverbial *pogosto* "often", the whole DSP is quantified over. (31) thus means that when Lipe was a student/drunk, he often came to Bunker. When the DSP follows the temporal adverb, (32), it falls in its scope. The sentence thus has the meaning that among the times Lipe came to Bunker, he was often a student/drunk.

(31) *Lipe   je kot študent/pijan pogosto prihajal v Bunker.*
    Lipe-NOM AUX as student/drunk   often   come   to Bunker
    'As a student/when drunk, Lipe often came to Bunker.'

---

[8] The proposal given in this paper is also in the spirit of Hornstein (1999) analysis of PRO. As presented in section 2, DSP is often analyzed as a small clause with a PRO in the subject position. Just like Hornstein we propose that instead of PRO there is actually a trace in the subject position of the PrP.

(32) *Lipe   je   v Bunker pogosto prihajal kot študent/pijan.*
      Lipe-NOM AUX to Bunker often   come   as student/drunk
      'Among the times that Lipe came to Bunker, many times he
      came as a student/drunk.'

To explain this alternation we have to posit the following. The DSP is
not freely movable. It can only move together with the argument, and it
can stay in any argument position it went through.
When depictives move together with the argument to the subject
position of the clause (Spec,TP), they are outside the scope of the event
quantifier. If they stay in their original position, then the event quantifier
scopes over them. This suggests that their different positions in the
clause are not the result of some PF scrambling but a syntactic process
which results in a different syntactic position. The position of the DSP is
at the same time not exclusively VP-internal but can also be higher—
outside the scope of the event quantifier. The same scope differences
hold with other event quantifiers:

(33) *Jona   kot otrok nikoli ni   poslušala Pankrtov.*
       Jona-NOM as child never NEG listened   Pankrti-GEN
       'As a child, Jona never listened to Pankrti (and maybe she has still
       never listened to Pankrti).'

(34) *Jona   nikoli ni poslušala Pankrtov   kot otrok.*
       Jona-NOM never NEG listened   Pankrti-GEN as child
       'Jona never listened to Pankrti, when she was a child (but she has
       listened to them later).'

5.6. Multiple Depictive Predicates

5.6.1. On distinct arguments Our proposal easily accounts for the
availability of multiple DSPs on distinct arguments. They represent no
problem since they each come from a separate constituent. DSPs are
merged into the structure at the same position their host would be
merged at when appearing alone. Therefore, the only restriction on the
appearance of DSPs is the restriction on the arguments of the verb
themselves.

(35) *Vsa pijana$_i$ je   Meta$_i$ še kar tepla Vida$_j$ že   vsega podplutega$_j$.*
all drunk-NOM AUX M-NOM still hit V-ACC already all bruised-ACC
'Meta—completely drunk—kept hitting Vid$_i$, already all in bruises$_i$.'

5.6.2. On a single argument (stacking of DSPs) A single argument can host more than one DSP predicate, as shown in (36) (see (7) for an English example with a same-host resultative and DSP). On our account, this construction receives the representation in (37). PrP is in the subject position of the upper PrP. Since PrPs are allowed to be in the argument position of clause-like constituents, same-host multiple DSPs are not unexpected.

(36) *Že   mladega$_i$ so Vida$_i$ vsega srečnega$_i$ izvolili za predsednika$_i$.*
already young-ACC AUX V-ACC all happy-ACC elected for presd-ACC
'They elected Vid president when he was still young & he was all happy.'

(37) $[_{PrP}[_{PrP}[_{DP}$ *Vida*$]$ $[_{Pr'}$ Pr^0 $[_{AP}$ *že mladega*$]]]$
$[_{Pr'}$ Pr^0 $[_{AP}$ *vsega srečnega*$]]]$

6. A problem for our proposal: Constituency tests

Ever since Andrews (1982), constituency tests have been an important source of motivation for V' and VP right-adjunction analyses. They show that DSPs, including subject-oriented DSPs, are part of the VP. Those of the tests that can be applied to Slovenian seem to suggest that what holds for English DSPs also holds for Slovenian DSPs. On the one hand, the apparently undesirable result, i.e., the indication that DSPs have their position inside the VP, is actually not really problematic, since DSPs do originate inside the VP also in our analysis. On the other hand, none of the constituency tests seems to be uncontroversially applicable to Slovenian, but due to space limitations, we cannot support this claim with a full demonstration here.

7. Conclusion

We have shown that the current analyses of DSPs cannot account for Slovenian data. In contrast to many better studied languages, Slovenian allows indirect object DSPs, prepositional object DSPs etc. A new proposal was presented, according to which the host DP and the DSP form a constituent merged into the argument position available for the host DP. From this constituent, which we provisionally called PrP, the host DP can move up and strand the DSP. At least in Slovenian, the whole PrP can move up together with the host DP as well. Languages differ with respect to where in the structure they allow the PrP to be merged and moved. The only restriction realized in Slovenian falls out of the proposed structure itself. The host DP and the preposition cannot move up alone since they do not form a constituent by themselves. Since preposition stranding is in Slovenian likewise not allowed, the DP cannot move up alone leaving behind the preposition and the DSP.

References

Anderson, Stephen. 1995. Toward an optimal account of second-position phenomena. In *Optimality Theory: Phonology, Syntax, and Acquisition*, ed. Joost Dekkers, Frank van der Leeuw & Jeoren van de Weijer, 302-333. Oxford: OUP.

Andrews, Avery. 1982. A note on the constituent structure of adverbials and auxiliaries. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 313-317.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1967. Adjectives in English: Attribution and predication. *Lingua* 18: 1-34.

Bowers, John. 2001. Predication. In *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, ed. M. Baltin & C. Collins, 299-333. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Filip, Hana. 2001. The semantics of case in Russian secondary predication. In *SALT* 11. Ms. http://semanticsarchive.net/

Hoekstra, Teun. 1988. Small clause results. *Lingua* 71: 101-139.

Hornstein, Norbert. 1999. Movement and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 69–96

Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kayne, Richard. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1994. Secondary predicates. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3: 25-79.

Larson, Richard. 1989. Light predicate raising. *MIT Lexicon Project Working Papers* 27.

Maling, Joan. 2001. Dative: the heterogeneity of the mapping among morphological case, grammatical functions, and thematic roles. *Lingua* 111: 419-464.

Marušič, Franc. 2001. Prenominal and postnominal adjectives in Slovenian. Ms. Stony Brook University.

Marušič, Franc, Tatjana Marvin, Rok Žaucer. 2002. Secondary predication in control sentences. *Snippets* 6. http://www.ledonline.it/snippets/.

McNally, Luise. 1994. Adjunct predicates and the individual/stage Distinction. In *Proceedings of WCCFL* 12. Stanford: CSLI.

McNulty, Elaine. 1988. The syntax of adjunct predicates. PhD Dissertation, University of Connecticut.

Orešnik, Janez. 1996. Nauk novejše slovenistike o povedkovem prilastku. [Depictive Secondary Predication in Recent Slovenian Linguistics]. *Razprave II. razreda SAZU - Dissertationes Classis II 15*: 255-267.

Pesetsky, David. 1982. Paths and Categories. PhD Dissertation, MIT.

Rapoport, Tuva R. 1993. Verbs in depictives and resultatives. In *Semantics and the Lexicon*, ed. James Pustejovsky. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Rapoport, Tuva R. 1999. Structure, aspect, and the predicate. *Language* 75/4: 653-677.

Richardson, Kylie. 2002. Aspect and the case marking of nouns, adjectives and participles in Russian: Against pure uninterpretable features. Handout at FASL 11.

Rothstein, Susan. 1983. The Syntactic Forms of Predication. PhD Dissertation, MIT.

Rothstein, Susan. 1985. *The Syntactic Forms of Predication*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Rothstein, Susan. 2000. Secondary predication and aspectual structure. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 17: 241- 264.

Stowell, Tim. 1983. Origins of Phrase structure. PhD Dissertation, MIT.

Strigin, Anatoli & Assinja Demjjanow. 2001. Secondary predication in Russian. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 25: 1-79.

Truckenbrodt, Hubert. 1999. On the relation between syntactic phrases and phonological phrases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30: 219-255.

van Voorst, Jan. 1986. Event Structure. PhD Dissertation, University of Ottawa.

Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 203-237.

Williams, Edwin. 1983. Against small clauses. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 287-308

Contact addresses
Franc Marušič: lanko.marusic@guest.arnes.si,
Tatjana Marvin: tatjana@mit.edu,
Rok Žaucer: rok.zaucer@guest.arnes.si