

# The Syntax of Depictives. Subjects, Modes of Judgement and I-L/S-L Properties\*

Ana Ardid-Gumiel

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

ana.ardid@uam.es

## Abstract

In this work, I provide an analysis of adjectival depictive constructions which accounts for most of their fundamental properties. First, I focus on the restrictions having to do with the integration of the depictive and the verbal predicate: they are based on aspectual compatibility between the two predicates, which, in turn, will depend on the ability, on the part of the depictive, to make reference to some (sub)event in the event structure of the verbal predicate. Facts not captured by previous approaches in the literature will be straightforwardly accounted for, among them the possibility to have I-L depictive constructions, and the impossibility to combine a depictive with some non-stative verbal predicates. Second, it will be shown that the informational import of the depictive in the sentence can be equivalent to that of the verbal predicate: both can be the *primary lexical basis of predication*. This is reflected in the sentence in various ways, having to do with aspectual modifiers, and in the properties of the sentential subject. In this connection, we will reconsider the notion of *subject*, arguing that no subject-predicate relation takes place in the lexical domain of sentences, and hence that the argument the depictive is oriented to, the *common argument*, cannot be a subject of the depictive. Finally, a minimalist analysis is proposed for the syntax of the construction, in terms of direct syntactic merge of predicative constituents and sideways ( $\theta$ -to- $\theta$ ) movement for the common argument, from the lexical domain of the depictive to the lexical domain of the verb. As to morphosyntactic properties, a syntactic Double Agree relation is assumed to hold between T/v, as probes, on the one hand, and the common argument and depictive, as simultaneous goals, on the other, which would allow for the deletion of Case features on *both* goals. The assumed presence of Structural Case on the adjectival depictive will be responsible for the well-known restriction on the orientation of depictives to the sentential subject or object.

## 1. The depictive construction

The example in (1) illustrates the adjectival depictive construction in Spanish, whose characterization is given in (2):

- (1) El veterinario me devolvió el gato enfurruñados.<sub>I</sub>  
The veterinarian to-me gave-back the cat upset

- (2) *Characterization of the depictive construction:*

The adjectival predicate depicts an individual (represented by the subject or object in the sentence) strictly *insofar as* a participant involved in the event denoted by the verbal predicate, in the specific sense that the property it is attributed to necessarily holds during the internal development of that event (i.e. there is no other implication in relation to the persistence of the property denoted by the depictive, apart from those coming from pragmatic inferences).

Thus, the precise span the property lasts is determined by the Aktionsart of the verbal event in various subtle ways, beyond the assumed broad aspectual compatibility between the two predicates: in the case of (1), it holds just during the transference denoted by the verb.

Therefore, a depictive construction does *not* inform about two independent eventualities that should be temporally linked in one of various possible forms. On the contrary, just a single eventuality is reported: in the case of (1), the sentence reports an event of the veterinarian transferring the cat to me, where either the vet or the cat is upset.

---

\* Many thanks to the audience at the Workshop, for their questions and suggestions, and for the pleasant atmosphere they created. I'm very grateful to Carlos Piera and Gema Chocano, for their generous support in all respects; in relation to this paper, thanks to Carlos for his reviewing of the various drafts, for discussion, and for giving me the examples in note 3 and (53); and thanks to Gema for Latin data (which will be incorporated in the next version). For both their friendship and love, I dedicate this work to Ana Álvarez and Jesús Muñoz

### 1.1. Depictive constructions are monoclausal

As a point of departure, I'll briefly distinguish between depictive constructions and superficially identical constructions in which the adjectival predicate denotes a time interval - we can call it *concealed time interval constituent*. The sentence in (3) is an example of the latter. It can be given any of the interpretations that are represented in (3)a and (3)b in semiformal terms; these interpretations correspond to the glosses in (3)a.i and (3)b.i, where we can see that *relaxed* acts as a constituent whose denotation must include a time specification independent from that associated with the verbal predicate, with which it establishes a specific time relation. The sentence is a suitable answer to the questions in (3)a.ii and (3)b.ii, and it will show a different intonational pattern depending on which of them it is a reply to: the intonational emphasis will be on the predicative adjective denoting a time interval, if the content of the main predicate is understood as presupposed, so the adjectival constituent is what introduces new information, as in (3)a.ii; and, on the contrary, the emphasis will be on the main predicate and its internal argument, if it is the content of the adjectival constituent that introduces new information, as in (3)b.ii. Both possibilities are indicated by capital letters:

(3) María leyó el periódico relajada  
 María read the newspaper relaxed

- a.  $\exists$  {María read the newspaper} [María was relaxed] Head-clause restriction reading  
 i. *The eventuality of María reading the newspaper is included in the time interval of María being relaxed (reading the newspaper didn't take place in any other circumstances).*  
 ii. *When did María read the newspaper? María read the newspaper (when) RELAXED*
- b.  $\exists$  {María was relaxed} [María read the newspaper] Adjunct restriction reading  
 i. *The time interval of María being relaxed included an eventuality of María reading the newspaper (reading the newspaper was (one of) the activity (activities) performed while being relaxed).*  
 ii. *What did María do when she was relaxed? María READ THE NEWSPAPER (when) relaxed*

The fact that the sentence has these two interpretations indicates that the adjectival predicate *relaxed* behaves as a *when*-clause: this status allows it to function as what is asserted in the sentence (the eventuality of María reading the newspaper would be presupposed), or as what is presupposed (the eventuality of María reading the newspaper would be what is asserted). The former function is what we have in (3)a, where the verbal (head) clause restricts the existential quantifier; the latter function is represented in (3)b, where the adjectival constituent (adjunct) acts as a restrictor of the existential quantifier (see Johnston (1994), a thesis on adverbial clauses, on which the formal expression of the above readings is based). If the adjectival constituent behaves here as equivalent to an adverbial time clause, it should be taken as the lexical basis for an independent (adjunct) clause, so that the sentence in (3) is biclausal.

But (3) can also be taken as a depictive construction, which is the reading this paper is concerned with. That is the interpretation we have in (3)c, where there is no restriction to the existential quantifier, and the adjectival predicate is integrated in the only existing clause:

- c.  $\exists$  [María read the newspaper relaxed] No restriction reading  
 i. *There was an eventuality of María reading the newspaper relaxed, i.e. she was relaxed insofar as a participant in that eventuality*  
 ii. *What happened?*

As reproduced in the gloss in (3)c.i, the adjectival predicate is in this case a true depictive. The whole sentence would be a suitable answer to the question in (3)c.ii, so the depictive does not

denote a time interval in any sense. There is a unique event, and the time extension through which it can be said that the property denoted by the adjectival predicate holds is dependent on the aspect of the verbal predicate: María was relaxed during the process subevent included in the event structure of *reading the newspaper*.

The ambiguity of (3) makes it relevant to recognize a different status for depictive predicates and concealed time interval predicates, and, further, to recognize the monoclausal nature of depictive constructions. This has the immediate consequence that the constituent formed on the basis of the depictive cannot be given a small clause analysis, which would imply biclausality. Thus, an alternative syntactic analysis is required, which can capture this.

## 2. Aspectual compatibility between the predicates

In order to determine the syntactic status of the depictive constituent, let's take a closer look at the kind of aspectual compatibility that is required to hold between the two predicates present in the sentence.

(4) and (5) are equivalent to (1) in that the verbal predicate expresses a simple transition (in the sense of Pustejovsky (1995)): their event structure includes two subevents - a process followed by a state:

(4)

- a. Pedro salió de la escuela *asustado*<sub>S-L</sub>  
Pedro went-out from the school scared-M-SG
- b. Pedro salió de la escuela *primaria bilingüe*<sub>I-L</sub>  
Pedro went-out from the school primary bilingual

(5)

- a. Carlos sacó a Gema de la reunión *irritada*<sub>S-L</sub>  
Carlos took-out (to) Gema from the meeting annoyed-F-SG
- b. Carlos sacó a Gema de la secta *paranoica*<sub>I-L</sub>  
Carlos took-out (to) Gema from the sect paranoid-F-SG

In (4)a and (5)a the state denoted by the depictive is understood to hold of the sentential subject or object during the process subevent: Pedro was scared in the process of going out of school; Gema was annoyed in the process of being taken out of the meeting. Actually, it seems that the depictive refers to this subevent, and can be oriented to any of the two participants it is associated with, a possibility that is often restricted in Spanish by the agreement features of the adjective (in (5)a the gender and number features of *irritada* restrict the orientation to the object). Significantly, the depictive can *only* be stage-level when related to the process subevent.

In (4)b and (5)b the state denoted by the depictive is understood to hold at the turning point between the process and the following state: Pedro was bilingual at the point he was out of primary school; Gema was paranoid at the point she was out of the sect. In both cases, the lexical structure of the verb includes a subevent denoting a state for one of the arguments that is the opposite to a presupposed initial one (and is brought about by the preceding process): the event of Pedro going out of primary school is followed by a state of Pedro being out of the school; the event of Carlos taking Gema out of the sect is followed by a state of Gema being out of sect. They are *causative achievements* (in Pustejovsky's (1995) terms). Thus, there is in both cases a change of state (hence a turning point) for one of the arguments. Two immediate consequences follow from this: (i) the depictive must be oriented to the only argument associated with the reached state; (ii) the depictive can be individual-level: the turning point denoted by the verbal predicate can be taken as the point at which the property denoted by the depictive can be said to hold of the

entity denoted by the relevant argument.

I am actually proposing, then, that in depictive constructions the state event denoted by the depictive must get to be connected with the event structure of the verbal predicate: either with the whole event, or with some of the subevents it consists of. In particular, this can be seen as an operation of event unification<sup>1</sup> triggered by the syntactic merge of the two predicates.

Assuming this to be the case, we are going to analyze the various possible ways in which this operation works, in order to determine what the aspectual compatibility required between the two predicates should be.

In the preceding examples with transition verbs (achievements), we have seen, on the one hand, that there is the possibility for the depictive to unify with the process subevent, in which case the depictive can only be S-L; on the other hand, the depictive can unify with the whole event, with the transition itself, in which case it doesn't make reference to any of the subevents the transition consists of, and can be I-L.

I-L properties, by definition, denote states that are independent of any eventuality. Then, in principle, we would not expect to find I-L depictive constructions at all, since the depictive in them seems to be dependent on the event denoted by the main predicate. However, I-L properties can perfectly well be restricted to spatiotemporal locations of an individual/entity, as in the following examples in (6):

(6)

- a. Riqui es obediente en el colegio  
Riqui is obedient in the school
- b. Paco era tímido en su adolescencia  
Paco was shy in his adolescence
- c. Ese medicamento fue imprescindible en los años cuarenta  
That medicament was indispensable in the years forty

The prepositional modifiers in these sentences delimit the stage in the existence of the individual/entity during which the property can be said to hold (they do not ascribe it to particular events). They are properties which can be under the control of an individual (like *obedient*), or they can be either developed or lost along an individual's existence (like *shy* or *indispensable*). We will descriptively call them rise/drop (R/D) I-L properties.

Now, notice the following important aspect of I-L-depictive constructions like those in (4)b and (5)b: the source arguments (*primary school* and *the sect*) associated with the verb are not understood as a particular location; they represent an organization, or an institution, where the individual referred to by the relevant argument has been involved in some activity (actively or passively), and that activity is directly responsible for the development and final possession of the property denoted by the I-L depictive. In other words, the achievement denoted by these transitions constitutes a landmark in the existence of the individuals that undergo them, and that landmark is materialized in the acquisition of the property expressed by the depictive. The I-L property does not make reference to the process denoted by the verb itself, but to the turning point that culminates that process: to the transition. This is crucial in two important respects: (i) achievements whose subevent structure lacks a (causing) process are unable to form a depictive

---

<sup>1</sup> This operation can be taken as event co-composition (in the sense of Pustejovsky (1995)); I will not deal with this issue here, though I suspect that there is some form of qualia unification between the two predicates. I use the term 'event unification' in a noncommittal way to refer to the semantic counterpart to syntactic merge.

construction; and (ii) sentences with an accomplishment, and even with a process main event, which generally reject I-L depictives, can in some cases abstract the content in their lexical domain in such a way that it can be taken as a particular stage of existence, in which case an I-L predicate is allowed.

Let us begin with non-process achievements. As opposed to the previous examples, we find that it is impossible to form a depictive construction when the verb denotes a non-causative achievement: whether the depictive is S-L or I-L, and whether the depictive is subject or object oriented, the constructions we obtain are all ungrammatical. This is illustrated by the examples in (7) and (8):

- (7) \*María captó el doble sentido *nerviosa*<sub>S-L</sub> / *sagaz*<sub>I-L</sub>  
 María grasped-3P-SG the irony nervous-F-SG / sagacious-F-SG
- (8) \*María reconoció mi coche *limpio*<sub>S-L</sub> / *lujoso*<sub>I-L</sub>  
 María recognized-3P-SG my car clean-M-SG / luxurious-M-SG

Contrary to the achievements in (4) and (5), the achievements in (7) and (8) denote punctual events: even if a process can be identified in the event of grasping, or in that of recognizing, it is not a causing process - informally, there is no grasping process that ends up in the grasp of the irony, and there is no recognizing process that ends up in the recognition of the car. Probably, the subevent structure of a punctual achievement consists of two individual stative subevents, one immediately following the other, where the first one would express the lack of a certain state and the second one its presence. Thus, the event of grasping something would be an instantaneous transition from the state of not possessing the knowledge of something to the state of possessing it: in the grammatical counterpart of (7) (with no depictive), María goes from the state of not having gotten mental hold of the irony to the state of having gotten it. Similarly, in (8), María goes from a state of not having identified the car to the state of having identified it. This particular subevent structure is what makes the transition be strictly punctual. Therefore, on the one hand, in these cases there is no process subevent an S-L depictive could make reference to; on the other, there is no activity implied that can bring about the acquisition of a property, be it S-L or I-L in nature. Thus, the ungrammaticality of (7) and (8) is neatly accounted for: no depictive is aspectually compatible with the kind of event expressed by a punctual achievement, taking aspectual compatibility in this subtle way; there is no possibility for the depictive to make reference to the appropriate event or subevent.

Let us see now what the situation is with accomplishment and process verbal predicates. As we can check in the examples in (9) and (10), there is no problem in forming depictive constructions with an S-L adjective in these cases:

- (9)
- a. Matías escribió una canción *entusiasmado*<sub>S-L</sub> / \**pobre*<sub>I-L</sub>  
 Matías wrote-3P-SG a song enthusiastic-M-SG / poor-M-SG
- b. Matías escribió su primera novela *entusiasmado*<sub>S-L</sub> / *pobre*<sub>I-L</sub>  
 Matías wrote-3P-SG his first novel enthusiastic-M-SG / poor-M-SG
- (10)
- a. Jorge caminaba *pensativo*<sub>S-L</sub> / \**rico*<sub>I-L</sub>  
 Jorge walked-3P-SG meditative-M-SG / rich-M-SG
- b. Jorge creció *enfermo*<sub>S-L</sub> / *rico*<sub>I-L</sub>  
 Jorge grew-up-3P-SG sick-M-SG / rich-M-SG

The S-L depictive in these examples makes reference to the process of writing, walking and growing, respectively. However, the contrast we see in these examples when the depictive is I-L (*poor/rich*) illustrates what was mentioned above: if the content of the accomplishment or the process can be abstracted as a particular stage of existence for an individual, then it would denote a period preceded or followed by a potentially different one. This makes it possible to take it as a landmark, which in turn would be responsible for the development or the loss of the I-L property (which is an R/D property). Thus, it is not that Matías was poor as a participant in the process of writing his first novel, but that he was poor in that period of his life in which he was writing his first novel (ex.(9)b); for obvious reasons, writing a song cannot be abstracted as a stage of existence, so then there is no possibility to take it as a landmark (ex.(9)a). Similarly, in (10)b, it is not that Jorge was rich as a participant in the process of growing up, but that he was rich in that period of his life at which he was growing up (ex.(10)b); as opposed to this, the process of walking does not allow abstraction as a stage of existence (ex.(10)a).

We have enough evidence by now to describe in what specific sense aspectual compatibility between the two predicates in these constructions has to be taken. The descriptive generalizations are made in (11):

(11) *Aspectual compatibility in depictive constructions*

- a. An adjectival depictive predicate is aspectually compatible with the verbal predicate in a depictive construction if the event structure of the latter allows the depictive to make reference to either a process (sub)event or a transition.
- b. An I-L depictive can only make reference to a transition, provided that the depictive denotes a raise/drop I-L property and the transition includes a causing process.  
An S-L depictive can make reference to both a process (sub)event and a transition.

Finally, to complete the revision of all predicate types, let us consider examples where the verb denotes a state event:

(12)

- a. \*Javi admira a los ciclistas *emocionados*<sub>S-L</sub> / *sincero*<sub>I-L</sub>  
     Javi admires-3P-SG (to) the bike-riders moved-M-SG / sincere-M-SG
- b. \*Javi admira a los ciclistas *exhaustos*<sub>S-L</sub> / *veloces*<sub>I-L</sub>  
     Javi admires-3P-SG (to) the bike-riders exhausted-M-PL/ speedy-M-PL

In principle we could think that two stative events should be aspectually compatible. However, the examples in (12) show that no depictive construction can be formed with a state event. The generalizations in (11) correctly exclude this case. For event unification to be possible, the depictive must find an appropriate event or subevent to refer to. In this respect, S-L predicates can refer to a process, or to a whole transition; I-L predicates can only refer to a transition that constitutes a stage of existence preceded or followed by a turning point. But the event structure of states consists of a single event, where, as described in Pustejovsky (1991):51, “[t]here is no change [...] and no reference to initial or final periods [...] [;] it is the homogeneity of states that distinguishes them from other aspectual types”. Given this, we can say that a depictive does not find any of the properties it requires in the simple aspectual structure of a state: there is no process in which an individual is involved, and there is no transition undergone by an individual. Again, the nature of the event structure that the depictive has to unify with is responsible for the facts - here for the impossibility to form a depictive construction of any kind.

We can summarize our findings about the facts of aspectual compatibility seen in the preceding data as follows, in (13):

(13)

- a. *Achievement predicates:*
  - i. A causative achievement allows event unification with both an S-L depictive and an I-L depictive, so depictive constructions are formed with both, and the depictive has to be oriented to the argument associated with the reached state the verb denotes:
    - an S-L depictive can make reference to the process subevent or to the whole transition denoted by the verb;
    - an I-L depictive must necessarily make reference to the whole transition.
  - ii. A punctual achievement does not allow unification with either an S-L or an I-L depictive. No depictive construction can be formed.
- b. *Accomplishment predicates:*
  - i. An accomplishment predicate allows event unification with an S-L depictive, which makes reference to its process subevent. The depictive can be oriented to any of the arguments involved in the process
  - ii. Marginally, it allows event unification with an I-L depictive, provided that the content of the transition event the accomplishment denotes can be abstracted as a particular stage of existence for the relevant argument.
- c. *Process predicates* allow event unification only with an S-L depictive.
- d. *State predicates* do not allow event unification with either an S-L or an I-L predicate.

I believe that the generalizations in (11) account for the facts we have seen so far in a way that captures the spirit of Kratzer (1989) in her proposal to distinguish I-L from S-L predicates by means of recognizing an event position in the argument structure of the latter, but not in that of the former<sup>2</sup>. However, our approach is significantly different in that it is based on the (sub)event type a predicate can make reference to, and it goes a step further in as much as it provides an explanation for cases that were not accounted for or not considered. Any approach based on the presence/absence of an e-position predicts: (i) that I-L depictives should be always rejected in depictive constructions; and (ii) that S-L depictives should be able to form a depictive construction with any kind of S-L verbal predicate. As we have seen, both predictions are incorrect: (i) some I-L depictives (R/D I-L depictives) are allowed without difficulty in a variety of depictive constructions, and (ii) not all S-L verbal predicates can form a depictive construction: punctual achievements cannot.

Assuming the view of aspectual compatibility I have presented and taking event unification as a semantic operation which is possible as a result of the syntactic merge of the two predicates, I will move forward to another aspect of depictive constructions that will be relevant for their syntactic analysis.

### **3. Status of one of the predicates as the *primary lexical basis of predication***

No aspectual type shift is obtained as a result of event unification; the joined events maintain each their own type properties: on the part of the verb, a process continues to be a process, and a transition continues to be a transition. However, it is interesting to note how the depictive may acquire an import at least equivalent to that of the verbal predicate in what I will descriptively call the *primary lexical basis of predication* in the sentence. By this I simply mean that one lexical

---

<sup>2</sup> Hernanz (1988) and Kratzer (1989), both adopting the insight of Davidson (1967), coincide in proposing an e-argument position in the argument structure of S-L predicates only. Rapoport (1991) argues for an e-position in the event structure of S-L predicates, which allows for the assumed necessary linkage to the matrix verb.

predicate or the other has the ability to act as foregrounded, and its content becomes prominent from an informational point of view. This is in correspondance with the two modes of judgement a sentence can be ascribed to: thetic and categorical (in the sense of Kuroda (1992), followed by Ladusaw (2000), both on the basis of the insights of Brentano-Marty). Let's see some examples, taking (14) as a point of departure:

- (14) El profesor de danza despidió a María lloroso<sub>S-L</sub>  
 The teacher-M-SG of dance saw-off-3P-SG (to) María tearful-M-SG
- a. *The dance teacher is said to have been tearful insofar as a participant in the process subevent that the event of seeing Mary off includes.*
  - b. *There was an event of the dance teacher seeing Mary off; the dance teacher showed the property of being tearful insofar as a participant in the process subevent included in that event.*

(14)a and (14)b are two possible glosses for (14), which intend to reflect the two existing possibilities as to the interpretation of the sentence in relation to its judgement mode: in particular, according to the gloss in (a), the sentence can primarily inform about a property of the teacher, in which case we take it as expressing a binary, categorical judgement, where the depictive is foregrounded as the *primary lexical basis* for clausal predication; (b), on the contrary, shows how the verbal predicate can also be foregrounded in the sentence, which can primarily assert the occurrence of an eventuality of the teacher seeing Mary off, where it happened to be the case that the teacher was tearful; in this latter case, the sentence is taken as expressing a unary thetic judgement.

There are even instances in which the construction can *only* be taken as categorical, with the depictive acting as informationally foregrounded. It is typically the case of constructions with a transition verbal predicate and an I-L depictive, which cannot be understood as expressing a thetic judgement, as in the examples in (15) (=4)b and (16). This is due to the specific condition that a depictive construction with an I-L predicate must satisfy: namely the transition must be understood as a landmark in the existence of the individual that undergoes it, which has the consequence that the event denoted by the transition is presupposed. This is clear in (15), where the event of going out of primary school is one that everyone is assumed to go through; in (16), going to mass, or leaving for a mass, is not so clearly, by itself, an event easily taken as marking a landmark, but the time modifier, *last Sunday*, provides the element of meaning that allows us to take it as a habit in the case of Teresa.

- (15) Pedro salió de la escuela primaria bilingüe<sub>I-L</sub> (=4)b  
 Pedro went-out of the school primary bilingual
- a. *Pedro is said to be bilingual insofar as a participant in the transition denoted by the event of going out of primary school.*
  - b. **NOT:** *There was an event of Pedro going out of primary school; Pedro was bilingual in as much as a participant in the transition denoted by that event.*
- (16) El domingo pasado, Teresa se fue a misa creyente<sub>I-L</sub>, y volvió agnóstica<sub>I-L</sub>  
 The Sunday last, Teresa ASP-MARKER went to mass believer and came-back agnostic
- a. *Teresa is said to be a believer insofar as a participant in the transition denoted by the event of leaving for mass last Sunday (up to the point she left for mass that day), and she is said to be agnostic as a participant in the transition denoted by the event of coming back (going out of mass).*
  - b. **NOT:** *There was an event of Teresa leaving for mass; Teresa was a believer in as much as a participant in the transition denoted by that event, and there was an event of her coming back, since the starting point of which (the point at which she is out of mass) she is agnostic.*

The fact that one of the predicates in the sentence acts as its primary lexical basis shows us that

the event unification operation maintains the independence of each predicate, not only aspectually, but also in their ability to be informationally foregrounded.

We would expect to find some visible effects of event unification in the sentence. Actually, there are at least two areas in which they show up. The first one has to do with aspectual modifiers: we find that those typically allowed with transition verbs (frame adverbials) are rejected in a depictive construction; and, conversely, those typically rejected by transition verbs (durative adverbials) are allowed in a depictive construction. The examples in (17) and (18) illustrate this:

(17)

- a. Juan subió al estrado en un periquete  
 Juan went-up to-the stand in a tick
- b. Juan subió al estrado *temerosos*<sub>S-L</sub> <sup>ok</sup>/\*en un periquete  
 Juan went-up to-the stand fearful in a tick
- i. <sup>OK</sup> *There was an event of Juan going up to the stand in a tick; he was fearful as he developed that event.*
- ii. *\*Juan is said to have shown the property of being fearful as a participant in the event of going up to the stand in a tick.*
- c. Juan subió al estrado *culpable*<sub>I-L</sub> \*en un periquete  
 Juan went-up to-the stand guilty in a tick

(18)

- a. Juan corrió la maratón de Nueva York \*durante varios minutos  
 Juan run the marathon of New York for several minutes
- b. Juan corrió la maratón de Nueva York *mareados*<sub>S-L</sub> durante varios minutos  
 Juan run the marathon of New York dizzy for several minutes
- i. *There was an event of Juan running the New York marathon; for several minutes during the development of the race, he was dizzy.*
- ii. *Juan is said to have shown the property of being dizzy for several minutes as a participant in the event of running the New York marathon.*
- c. ?Juan corrió la maratón de Nueva York *engreído*<sub>I-L</sub> durante varios minutos  
 Juan run the marathon of New York self-conceited for several minutes  
*Juan is said to have shown the property of being self-conceited for several minutes as a participant in the event of running the New York marathon.*

So-called frame adverbials, as is well known, are allowed in sentences with an accomplishment verb, where they refer to the time span during which the process culminating in a state has taken place ((17)a). In (17)b we observe that the frame adverbial is allowed, although, significantly, only when the construction is understood as athetic judgement (as I reproduce in the glosses that appear below the example), i.e. when the verbal predicate is foregrounded. Notice that this is quite interesting if we take into consideration that the frame adverbial would *not* be allowed in a copulative sentence with *fearful* as the main predicate (see (19)). These facts indicate that this modifier can only appear in the depictive construction if the verbal predicate is foregrounded, so that the sentence is thetic; it cannot when the sentence must be categorical, with the depictive foregrounded (as in (17)c, where the depictive is I-L), as it cannot in a copular sentence with the same depictive (see (20)).

(19) Juan estuvo temeroso \*en un periquete  
 Juan was fearful in a tick

(20) Juan fue culpable \*en un periquete  
 Juan was guilty in a tick

In the grammatical version of (17)b, the frame adverbial takes scope over the unit that has been formed as a result of the merge of the two predicative constituents, and it refers to the one that prevails: the one formed on the basis of *going up*, which allows the interpretation of the sentence as a thetic judgement.

In (18), we find facts equivalent in relevance to those in (17), now with a durative adverbial: this modifier is rejected by a logical transition (example (a)), but allowed in a depictive construction with an S-L adjectival predicate (example (b)), or with an I-L adjectival predicate (example (c), marked with ? because I-L depictives are always harder to accept when the transition is not punctual, as in this case). The durative adverbial is easily allowed when these predicates occur in isolation in a sentence:

- (21) Juan estuvo mareado durante varios minutos  
 Juan was dizzy for several minutes
- (22) Juan fue engreído durante varios minutos  
 Juan was self-conceited for several minutes

In (18)b and (18)c, the durative adverbial takes scope over the unit formed by the merge of the two predicative constituents, so that it can make reference not to the event of running the marathon as a whole (which would reject that kind of modification), but to that part of the race at which Juan was dizzy/self-conceited. The presence of the depictive in that unit makes it possible to differentiate between segments of the race. Dizziness is an S-L property and, as such, it can be restricted to the limits of an event or a part of an event; self-conceitedness is an R/D I-L property that can be delimited to a stage of existence: in this case, the event of running the marathon marks a personal landmark - Juan was self-conceited at the time in his life at which he run the New York marathon, but after several minutes of that race, he dropped that property, as a consequence of unmentioned circumstances taking place during the race itself.

In sum, it has to be the occurrence of these depictives that excludes or licenses the adverbial modifier in the constructions in (17) and (18), respectively. This might lead us to think that the adverbial strictly modifies the depictive predicate; however, it does not: actually, if we force it to do so, there will be necessarily a shift in meaning (and a different intonational pattern will be required); the adjectival predicate will have to be understood, if possible, as a concealed time interval constituent of the kind we saw at the beginning of this paper. Obviously, (17)b and (17)c would be ungrammatical under that interpretation, since these adjectives reject a frame modifier; (18)b would be all right, as would (21); and (18)c would be ungrammatical as well, in this case because a time interval constituent cannot be formed on the basis of an I-L predicate.

These facts reinforce the hypothesis that any of the two predicates in a depictive construction can act as its *primary lexical predicational basis* (given the aspectual conditions previously pointed out), but they also illustrate how event unification has visible syntactic effects.

We are in front of a quite intriguing construction that may allow any of two independent predicative constituents to have semantic and syntactic prominence in the sentence, as if they were working in a parallel fashion in the lexical domain, in the sense that they both have to satisfy their own lexical conditions (argument valency), up to a point at which one or the other becomes prevalent.

The second area in which this pattern of prevalence shows up is the one concerning specificity requirements on the sentential subject. In (23) and (24), the plural indefinite in subject position

in the (a) examples can be understood as specific (partitive: a given subset from a known larger set) or as unspecific ("there were some boys/men who went out/sang ...": existential). In the (b) examples, however, we obtain ungrammaticality if we take the indefinite subject as unspecific and the depictive is understood as prevalent (as marked by the underlining in the examples). (This prevalence is necessary in (23)b, due to the I-L nature of the depictive, and optional in (24)b, since the depictive is S-L.) So the sentential subject must meet the specificity conditions on categorical subjects, as it does in a Spanish copular sentence with the same adjective as its lexical basis (the (c) examples are also ungrammatical if they are given an existential reading).

(23)

- a. Unos chicos<sub>SPEC/\*UNSPEC</sub> han salido del salón de sorteos  
Some boys have gone-out of-the room of lottery
- b. Unos chicos<sub>SPEC/\*UNSPEC</sub> han salido del salón de sorteos millonarios<sub>S-L</sub>  
Some boys have gone-out of-the room of lottery millionaire-M-PL
- c. Unos chicos<sub>SPEC/\*UNSPEC</sub> son millonarios  
Some boys are millionaire-M-PL

(24)

- a. Unos señores<sub>SPEC/UNSPEC</sub> cantaron en la boda  
Some men sang in the wedding
- b. Unos señores<sub>SPEC/\*UNSPEC</sub> cantaron afónicos<sub>S-L</sub> en la boda  
Some men sang hoarse in the wedding
- c. Unos señores<sub>SPEC/\*UNSPEC</sub> estaban afónicos  
Some men were hoarse

The conclusion we draw from this is again that there are actual manifestations of the import that the adjectival predicate can acquire in depictive constructions; the two predicates may alternatively be prevalent, and the sentence will have to conform with the syntactic and semantic conditions this prevalence imposes. Here the external argument, which will become the sentential subject, must be a specific nominal if the depictive is the primary lexical basis: adjectival predicates necessarily form sentences expressing a categorical judgement and the first term of a categorical judgement has to be specific (Kiss (1998), Ladusaw (2000)).

Notice that, interestingly, no specificity condition applies if the depictive is oriented to the sentential *object*, a fact that coincides with the impossibility to take the sentence as a categorical judgement, formed on the basis of this predicate. In (25), the object is freely understood as specific or unspecific in both the (a) and the (b) examples, even though the adjective in a copulative (categorical) sentence does not allow an unspecific subject (example (c)):

(25)

- a. Félix metió unas galletas<sub>SPEC/UNSPEC</sub> en la lata  
Félix put some cookies-F-PL in the can
- b. Félix metió unas galletas<sub>SPEC/UNSPEC</sub> en la lata rotas<sub>S-L</sub>  
Félix put some cookies-F-PL in the can broken-F-PL
- c. Unas galletas<sub>SPEC/\*UNSPEC</sub> estaban rotas  
Some cookies-F-PL were broken-F-PL

The grammaticality of (25)b has an immediate consequence for the syntactic analysis of this construction. Observe the contrast between (23)b and (24)b, on the one hand, and (25)b, on the other. The ungrammaticality of (23)b and (24)b (with the intended existential interpretation of the subject) could be taken as evidence in favor of a small clause analysis for the depictive constituent, since the same specificity condition on the subject of a simple sentence with this

predicate ((23)c and (24)c) is at work in the depictive construction. This could be accounted for by proposing that the nominal that ends up as the sentential subject either is generated as the subject of a small clause or is controlling a PRO subject in the small clause. But the grammaticality of (25)b (significantly with the object understood as existential) is an indication that this argument is not acting as a subject, taking subject as *sentential subject*, so actually a small clause analysis would not give the expected results: if *some cookies* were the subject of a small clause, the grammaticality of the construction would be a mysterious fact. As a consequence, this contrast actually becomes further evidence against a small clause analysis, and can be interpreted as an argument in favor of the hypothesis that, once the two predicative constituents merge, one of them becomes the prevalent one, if possible. The options for the depictive to become prevalent seem to be restricted to the possibility that the argument it is oriented to becomes the sentential subject. The two merged predicates will share an argument, which we will call *the common argument*.

To my knowledge, the properties of the depictive construction presented so far in this paper have not been previously pointed out in the literature, and I would like to incorporate them in my analysis.

#### 4. Predication: what is a subject?

The discussion at the end of the previous section raises the question that provides the title for this one, as a preamble for the syntactic analysis of depictive constructions. What is the nature of the constituent that we call *subject*? And further, is there a predication relation between the depictive and the argument it is oriented to?

The overt agreement between the depictive and the common argument in gender and number features, in Spanish and many other languages, has been taken by some authors as a morphological manifestation of the predication relation these two elements are assumed to maintain (e.g. Napoli (1989)), so that the argument the depictive is oriented to is considered as its subject. In fact, they are said to maintain a *syntactic* subject-predicate relation equivalent to the one the clausal subject maintains with the clausal predicate, a relation that, as is well-known, is said to satisfy syntactic locality (e.g. mutual c-command, adopted by many, following the insight of Williams (1980)). The latest approach in this line appears in Rothstein (2001), who extends the strict locality condition to all instances of predication.

I will not follow this line. Certainly, the agreement between the depictive and the argument it shares with the verb overtly marks some kind of relation, and it must be accounted for, particularly because gender and number features are uninterpretable for the adjective, in the sense of Chomsky (*MI*, *DbP*, and *BEA*), and have to be eliminated. I would like to argue that, even though nominal and depictive maintain an Agree relation for feature valuing, there is no subject-predicate relation between them *in the lexical domain of the construction*. In fact, I consider that, more generally, the lexical domain is not the domain for the subject-predicate relation for any sentence, but the domain where constituents are in a given configuration with respect to some head, in order to be thematically interpreted, where the predicate saturates its logical open positions. As we will see below, this is actually implied in the logical analysis of Kratzer (1996).

We have seen that the object in (25)b does not have to meet any specificity conditions on subjects, so that it cannot be taken to be the subject of a small clause, it does not behave as a clausal subject. A subject has been traditionally said to represent an entity (*substance* in Kuroda's (1992) terms) that is attributed a given property or to represent a given function in a situation (event), represented by the predicate. This view is associated with the logical tradition, and, in

principle, it is kept aside from the syntactic notion of subject. The syntactic properties of a subject, associated with its own inflectional features (Case and agreement) and part of the features in the verb (agreement features), on the one hand, and with its position within the sentence (its structural prominence in comparison with other constituents), on the other, have made linguists characterize the notion as purely structural: its identification has been understood as a matter of syntactic configuration. However, as we know, the assumed locus of subjects, say (Spec,T), has been shown not to be the only designated subject position, since there are constructions in different languages where nominals with some morphological subject feature do not occupy that position, constructions in which some other constituent has merged and behaves as an actual subject in relation to different syntactic processes: locative inversion constructions and existential constructions with the expletive *there* in English are typically presented as relevant in this respect (Harley (1995) and references cited there); in Spanish, similar properties have been found to characterize impersonal constructions with locative subjects (Fernández-Soriano (1999)):

(26)

- a. There were *trees* in her garden
- b. Down the hill rode *the Indians*

(27)

- a. En estos archivos consta *la identidad del testigo*  
 Inthese files figures-3P-SG the identity-3P-SG of-the witness
- b. En esta sopa sobran *fideos*  
 Inthis soup are-too many-3P-PL noodles-3P-PL

(these two verbs, *constar* and *sobrar*, belong to a class of stative verbs analyzed in Fernández-Soriano (1999))

All these constructions have the common property that the postverbal nominal is the constituent agreeing with the verb, while the preverbal constituent behaves as a subject in respects such as its raising in raising constructions, its position in direct questions, binding, quantifier floating, *that*-trace effects, and relativized minimality effects. But in addition, we find another property, at least for the Spanish examples<sup>3</sup>, on which we will focus in the following discussion. That property concerns again the Specificity Condition, in this case on the preverbal PP: it cannot be realized as an unspecific constituent:

(28)

- a. \*En unos archivos consta la identidad del testigo
- b. \*En una sopa sobran fideos

Fernández-Soriano (1999) points out this fact, illustrating it with bare plurals, necessarily existential in Spanish, but the same results obtain with unspecific indefinites, as in (28).

This immediately reminds us of what we have seen in depictive constructions; remember that the Specificity Condition is at work whenever the depictive is understood as the *primary lexical basis of predication*, which in turn can only be the case when the depictive is subject oriented.

Now notice that the Specificity Condition shows up also in sentences with a non-thematic subject, as the contrasts in the following examples in (29) and (30) show:

---

<sup>3</sup> The example corresponding to (26)b would be \**Down hills rode the Indians*, whose ungrammaticality seems to be parallel to that of (28). However, Locative Inversion constructions involve properties that could make its case different.

(29)

- a. *John* is easy to please
- b. \**A kid*<sub>UNSPEC</sub> is easy to please

(30)

- a. *This book* is for you to read
- b. \**A book*<sub>UNSPEC</sub> is for you to read

Thus, on the one hand syntactic properties of subjects may be scattered about in some constructions, or, as Harley puts it, if a configurational notion of subject is to be maintained, we have to say that there are multiple subject positions in a sentence. As for the nominative nominal that remains in the lexical domain in (26) and (27), the configuration which it maintains in relation with the relevant lexical head will be responsible only for its thematic interpretation as an argument. This has nothing to do with subjecthood; it is the uninterpretable Case feature on this constituent and the uninterpretable features on T that make us put it in connection with the ‘canonical’ subject position: the nominal’s Case feature will be the goal for probe T (in the system of Chomsky (*DbP* and *BEA*)), in an operation where the nominal will ‘in correspondance’ provide values for the uninterpretable agreement features of T. Notice that, according to this, the *vP Internal Subject Hypothesis* should be understood as a *vP Internal Argument Hypothesis*, in the sense that it simply states that all arguments are generated (or first-merged) within the lexical domain, i.e. within *vP*, the domain in which constituents are characterized by bearing a  $\theta$ -role, but in which subjecthood properties are not found. It will be conditions on movement, or on Agree, that will designate the particular argument that turns out to be the subject.

On the other hand, when we have a constituent other than the agreeing nominative nominal in (Spec,T), this constituent is in charge of satisfying the EPP feature of T and it behaves as a ‘canonical’ subject does in all syntactic respects except for what concerns operations associated with its own Case feature and the inflectional features of T.

But notice that, in addition, the merging of a constituent in (Spec,T), be it the ‘canonical’ subject or some other one, brings about a surface semantic effect (in the sense of Chomsky (*BEA*): this constituent will have the possibility of being interpreted as having the informational import of an entity which is attributed a property, as being the lefthand term of a categorical judgement, if it is specific, whereas if it is unspecific or it is realized as an expletive, the sentence will necessarily express athetic judgement (if unspecific, it will be interpreted simply as one of the participants in the event denoted by the predicate). I would like to claim that this surface semantic effect is directly related to predication: the specific/unspecific nature of the subject will determine the options as to the mode of judgement associated with the sentence, which will have an effect in establishing the conditions for the assignment of a truth value to the syntactic object, TP, that is obtained as a consequence of its merging in the structure. Those conditions are in part based on the particular mode of judgement associated with the sentence, which will in turn be in consonance with the requirements of the lexical predicate. Hence, if the predicate is such that it can only form sentences expressing a categorical judgement, an unspecific subject is rejected; that was the case with the examples of Spanish impersonal constructions in (28), *tough*-constructions like (29), copular purpose sentences like (30), sentences with a stative predicate like those in (31), and both the Spanish copular sentences in (23)c and (24)c and the English ones in (32) ((31)a and (32), with their respective judgements, are taken from Kiss (1998)):

(31)

- a. *Athletes*<sub>SPEC (GENERIC)/\*UNSPEC</sub> impress boys [Kiss (1998):(43b)]
- b. *Unas señoras*<sub>SPEC/\*UNSPEC</sub> admiraron la sinceridad de Pedro



depictive may be the *primary lexical basis of predication*, with the sentence expressing a categorical judgement. When this is the case, remember, the depictive can only be subject oriented,

i.e. oriented to the constituent that ends up in (Spec,T) - in that case, we can safely say that the sentential subject is primarily predicated of the depictive, and the fact that this nominal makes the sentence categorical is not surprising, since it is *the constituent in (Spec,T)* that is in charge of establishing an actual subject-predicate relation in the sentences we have seen so far. The existence of two independent lexical predicates in the lexical domain allows, as we have seen, the prevalence of any of them as the lexical basis of predication (except for the cases of I-L depictive constructions, where the adjectival predicate must be prevalent). So the subject in subject oriented depictive constructions must satisfy the conditions the prevalent predicate imposes on it, if any.

Before leaving the topic of subjecthood, I would like to consider examples of Clitic Left-Dislocated Constructions (CLDC) like the ones in (37), where the left-dislocated nominal is coreferential with an object clitic, to which an I-L depictive is oriented:

(37)

- a. A Enrique lo mandaron a la guerra *humilde*<sub>I-L</sub>  
 (to) Enrique him sent-3P-PL to the war humble

*Enrique is said to have shown the property of humbleness insofar as a participant in the transition denoted by the event of their having sent him to the war.*

- b. Este paraguas tu amiga me lo vendió *azul*<sub>I-L</sub>  
 This umbrella your friend to-me it sold-3P-SG blue

*This umbrella is said to have been blue as a participant in the transition denoted by the event of your friend selling it to me.*

I have chosen I-L depictives in these examples in order to force the prevalence of this predicate and try to check if this prevalence may stay operative beyond the limits of TP. If this is the case, the I-L predicate should force a categorical judgement for these sentences, with the dislocated nominal as its lefthand term: as we can check in the glosses below the examples, that's actually the only interpretation they allow. We observe that the left-dislocated constituent is acting as the subject of predication exactly as 'canonical' subjects do in sentences with no dislocation, with the depictive as its *primary lexical basis*<sup>4</sup>. Remember that, significantly, I-L depictives cannot make the sentence categorical *if object oriented*.

For this kind of sentences, I will assume that the left-dislocated constituent merges as a Specifier of a Topic head with an EPP feature. Having an EPP feature, the head Top forces merging in its Spec. This brings about a kind of surface semantic effect equivalent to the merging of a constituent in (Spec,T) in sentences with no dislocation, with the qualification that clitic left-dislocation seems to give rise to sentences expressing a categorical judgement only. The point I wanted to make is that, if left-dislocated constituents truly show subjecthood properties, the examples in (37) should make it necessary to extend the concept of subject to include them. The following characterization is wider enough in this respect<sup>5</sup>:

<sup>4</sup> Notice also that the left-dislocated constituent must be specific: *A un hombre*<sub>SPEC/\*UNSPEC</sub> *lo mandaron a la guerra (humilde)*. Nevertheless, I leave for further research the investigation of the extent to which a left-dislocated constituent in a CLDC behaves as a true subject.

<sup>5</sup> I believe that this characterization of subject is valid for a large range of data from a variety of languages, although I do not want to commit myself as to its universal pervasiveness until I examine different language types.

(38) *Characterization of subject*

The subject in a sentence is the constituent merged in the Specifier position of a head with an EPP feature, i.e. in a left-peripheral position which belongs to the functional domain of the sentence above vP.

- (a) The merging of the subject brings about a surface semantic effect having to do with the mode of judgement expressed by the sentence: it will mark the sentence as expressing athetic or a categorical judgement:
  - (i) If the subject is in (Spec,T) and it is specific, the sentence will have the option of expressing any of the two possible judgements.  
If the subject is in (Spec,T), and it is unspecific or an expletive, the sentence will necessarily express athetic judgement.
  - (ii) If the subject is in a Spec position above the domain of T, the sentence will be necessarily categorical.
- (b) The subject constituent represents an individual (type <e>) which saturates a monadic function from individuals to truth values (<e,t>), the object obtained being of type <t>.

## 5. The syntax of depictive constructions

Having rejected a small clause analysis for these constructions, the simplest alternative is direct external merge of the two predicative constituents. This merge operation will reasonably take place in the lexical domain of the sentence, where it is assumed that the lexical aspectual information is encoded.

But what is it exactly that merges? What exactly constitute the terms of this first merge of predicative constituents? And, finally, what is the base position for the argument that behaves as a common argument?

### 5.1. Building a depictive construction: (i) lexical domain

Let us begin with the last issue: where is the common argument generated? The following examples with the floating quantifier *todo* (Engl. *all*) in (39) and (40) indicate that the common argument is first merged as the Specifier of the depictive adjective:

(39)

- a. *Los hijos de Pedro* salieron de la escuela *todos* bilingües  
The children-M-PL of Pedro went-out of the school all-M-PL bilingual-PL
- b. *Tus amigos* caminaban por esta calle *todos* preocupados por ti  
Your friends-M-PL walked along this street all-M-PL worried-M-PL about you

(40)

- a. Saqué *a tus alumnos* de la clínica *todos* vacunados contra la gripe  
I-took-out (to) your students-M-PL from the clinic all-M-PL vaccinated-M-PL against the flu
- b. Metí *las bicis* en el garaje *todas* listas para la carrera  
I-put-in the bikes-F-PL in the garage all-M-PL ready-M-PL for the race

If we make the standard assumption that floating quantifiers belong to the structure of the nominals in a raised position, and may be left stranded in the position where the nominal is

---

The possibility that different positions exist in the syntax of a sentence, one for subjects of 'thetic sentences', and a higher one for subjects of 'categorical sentences' has been proposed in Cardinaletti, (1997) (who argues for the splitting of Agr), and Kiss (1998) (who introduces RefP, a projection above IP for topics).

generated, then their occurrence right before the depictive, and following the prepositional complement of the verb, would indicate that they are first merged as arguments of the adjective, as in (41) and (42)<sup>6</sup>:

(41)

- a. *Los hijos de Pedro*<sub>i</sub> salieron de la escuela [<sub>AP</sub> [*todos* *t<sub>i</sub>*] bilingües]  
 b. *Tus amigos*<sub>i</sub> caminaban por esta calle [<sub>AP</sub> [*todos* *t<sub>i</sub>*] preocupados por *t<sub>i</sub>*]

(42)

- a. Saqué *a tus alumnos*<sub>i</sub> de la clínica [<sub>AP</sub> [*todos* *t<sub>i</sub>*] vacunados contra la gripe]]  
 b. Metí *las bicis*<sub>i</sub> en el garaje [<sub>AP</sub> [*todas* *t<sub>i</sub>*] listas para la carrera]]

If we adopt Hale and Keyser's (1993) proposal that the base position of a nominal determines its thematic interpretation, the proposed generation position simply places the nominal in a configuration with respect to the adjective that allows it to be understood as a 'property holder', i.e. the kind of THEME argument typically associated with adjectival predicates (I borrow the term from Kratzer (1996)).

The AP is formed independently of the structure associated with the verb in the sentence, as an independent subtree. Now, the point in the derivation at which they merge together must be that immediately preceding the position where either the agent or the theme associated with the verb should merge in order to be in the appropriate configuration with respect to the verb itself. For the examples in (10)a and (25)b ((43)a and (43)b below), the derivations corresponding to their lexical domains are given in (44) and (45):

(43)

- a. Jorge caminaba *pensativo*<sub>S-L</sub> (= (10)a)  
 Jorge walked-3P-SG meditative-M-SG  
 b. Félix metió *unas galletas* en la lata *rotas*<sub>S-L</sub> (= (25)b)  
 Félix put-3P-SG some cookies-F-PL in the can broken-F-PL

(44)

- a. [<sub>VP</sub> *v* caminaba ], [<sub>AP</sub> *Jorge pensativo*]  
 b. [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> *v* caminaba ] [<sub>AP</sub> *Jorge pensativo* ] ]  
 c. [<sub>VP</sub> **Jorge** [<sub>V'</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> *v* caminaba ] [<sub>AP</sub> *t<sub>Jorge</sub> pensativo* ] ] ]

(45)

- a. [<sub>VP</sub> metió en la lata ], [<sub>AP</sub> *unas galletas rotas*]  
 b. [<sub>VP'</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> metió en la lata ] [<sub>AP</sub> *unas galletas rotas* ] ]  
 c. [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> *unas galletas*] [<sub>V'</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> metió en la lata ] [<sub>AP</sub> *t<sub>unas galletas</sub> rotas*] ] ]  
 d. **v**, [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> *unas galletas*] [<sub>V'</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> metió en la lata ] [<sub>AP</sub> *t<sub>unas galletas</sub> rotas*] ] ] ]  
 e. [<sub>VP</sub> **v** [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> *unas galletas*] [<sub>V'</sub> [<sub>V'</sub> metió en la lata ] [<sub>AP</sub> *t<sub>unas galletas</sub> rotas*] ] ] ] ]

<sup>6</sup> The generation of the common argument as (Spec,A) doesn't imply a predication relation between them, as it does not in the case of external arguments of verbs. The facts in (39)-(40) seem to suggest a base configuration akin to that of a small clause, with the adjective and its external argument forming a constituent. This impression is misleading, however: on the one hand, the nominal does not show subject properties; on the other, the AP cannot be taken to be clausal.







### 5.3. Multiple Agree and constraints on the orientation of the depictive

The derivation for depictive constructions presented so far (in (44),(49) and (45),(50)) still misses two fundamental aspects of their syntax:

- (i) The syntactic agreement between the depictive and the argument it is oriented to: they show overt agreement in  $\phi$  features, gender and number, features that are uninterpretable for the depictive; as I have mentioned, this agreement has been taken as a manifestation of the predication relation that the two constituents are assumed to maintain - but, since we have seen facts indicating that there is no such a direct predication relation between them, strictly speaking, it is necessary to account for the agreement pattern in different terms.
- (ii) The limitation as to the orientation of the depictive. Why is it the case that only sentential subjects and objects may be the common argument?

The point I would like to start with is a general comment about agreement: agreement in  $\phi$ -features is a syntactic phenomenon that is, of course, not always related to predication. It is not so, for instance, in the case of the agreement between a determiner and the noun it combines with (52), or between certain adjectives and the noun they modify (53), and it is not so either in the case of the agreement found between the past participle and its object in passive sentences (54):

(52)  $la_{F-PL}$   $chicas_{F-PL}$   
the girls

(53)  $la_{F-PL}$   $presuntas_{F-PL}$   $asesinas_{F-PL}$   
the alleged murderers

(54)  $La_{F-PL}$   $chicas_{F-PL}$   $fuero$   $enviadas_{F-PL}$   $t_{las chicas}$   $a$   $París$   
The girls were sent to Paris

We would not say that *girls* is predicated of *the* in example (52), or that *alleged* is predicated of *murderers* in (53). In the case of (54), the past participle *sent* establishes an Agree relation with its internal argument *the girls*, at the point they merge together: along the lines of Chomsky (*DbP*), within VP, the  $\phi$ -features of *sent*, acting as probes, match the goal  $\phi$ -features of *the girls*, so that the uninterpretable gender and number features of this verb can delete. That agreement between the participle and its internal argument cannot be said to be a manifestation of a predication relation in any reasonable sense.

I will then adopt the stance that the nominal-depictive agreement is a fact equivalent to that of e.g. T-subject agreement, i.e. there are uninterpretable features on an element (the depictive) that, according to Chomsky (*BEA*:13), have to be valued under Agree (for the narrow syntactic derivation to converge), must be transferred to the phonological component  $\Phi$  (since some of them have a phonological reflex), and must be eliminated from the derivation. Those uninterpretable features will thus have to act as probes in an Agree relation: in the case of gender and number, the clear candidates to act as goals are the valued gender and number features on the depictive's external argument.

Actually, we find a number of uninterpretable features in a depictive construction: those listed in (55):

- (55)
- a. uninterpretable features on T:
    - i.  $\phi$  features: *person*, *gender* and *number*
    - ii. *EPP* feature

- b. uninterpretable features on v:  $\phi$  features: *person, gender* and *number*
- c. uninterpretable features on the common argument nominal: *Structural Case* feature
- d. uninterpretable features on the depictive adjective:
  - i.  $\phi$  features: *gender* and *number*
  - ii. *Structural Case* feature

Of these features, there are two that, to my knowledge, have not been proposed for the syntax of Spanish and related languages, namely the gender feature on T, and the Case feature on the adjectival depictive. If present, as I'm going to assume, they have no phonological realization in Spanish. Nonetheless, there exist languages, as is well-known, where they are phonologically overt. I will only present Russian data, simply because the two types overtly missing in Spanish can be found in the grammar of this language (Case inflection on adjectival predicates is typologically more widespread (Déchaine (1993))).

The Russian verb (when in the past) inflects for feminine and neuter, so it agrees with the subject in gender: masculine (no suffix), feminine (-*a* suffix) and neuter (-*o* suffix) (see (56)):

(56)

- |              |                                  |              |                                   |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| a. ja pisal  | 'I was writing' (male subject)   | c. ty pisal  | 'you were writing' (male subject) |
| b. ja pisala | 'I was writing' (female subject) | d. ty pisala | 'you were writing' (male subject) |
|              | e. on pisal                      |              | 'he was writing'                  |
|              | f. ona pisala                    |              | 'she was writing'                 |
|              | g. ono pisalo                    |              | 'it was writing'                  |

[examples transliterated from Wade (1992)]

If, as we see, T, responsible for Nominative checking, has a complete set of  $\phi$ -features, we can hypothesize that its counterpart v, responsible for Accusative checking, also has its own complete set of  $\phi$ -features.

As for the Case feature of adjectives, the examples of Russian depictive constructions are illustrative in this respect: the depictives may inflect for the same structural Case as the argument they are oriented to: for Accusative in (57)a, and for Nominative in (57)b.

(57)

- |                             |                           |        |                                |                          |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Milicija privela         | <u>ego</u> <sub>ACC</sub> | domoj  | <u>pjjanogo</u> <sub>ACC</sub> | [Filip & Kennedy (2000)] |
| police                      | brought                   | him    | home drunk                     |                          |
| b. <u>On</u> <sub>NOM</sub> | zhenilsja                 | na nej | <u>pjanyj</u> <sub>NOM</sub>   | [Hinterhölzl (2000)]     |
| 'He                         | married                   | her    | drunk'                         |                          |

We will assume, then, that Spanish depictives agree with the common argument not only in  $\phi$ -features but also in structural Case features in the same way as Russian depictives do. Thus, assuming the system of feature checking proposed by Chomsky (*DbP, BEA*), for the derivation of depictive constructions to converge, the uninterpretable features of the adjective will have to be deleted too.

In the case of its  $\phi$ -features, the Agree relation that will provide values for deletion to be possible will be a probe-goal relation within the domain of the depictive, as in (59), which corresponds to the two sentences we were using above as examples (repeated as (58)):

(58) (=49)

- a. [TP Jorge [T caminaba [vP *t*<sub>Jorge</sub> [v' [v' V *t*<sub>caminaba</sub> ] [AP *t*<sub>Jorge</sub> pensativo] ] ] ] ]



As I have described above, the argument in the AP undergoes movement into a  $\theta$ -position in the lexical domain of the verb, becoming (Spec, v) in (60)a, and (Spec, V) in (60)b (so both get into an edge position, too). This operation gives the unit to be merged with T and v, respectively. The heads T and v are  $\phi$ -complete, with all  $\phi$ -features being uninterpretable, so they will have to establish a probe-goal relation to get values and delete.

In their search domain, they find a  $\phi$ -complete nominal, *Jorge* and *unas galletas*, which provide values and allow the deletion of the uninterpretable  $\phi$ -features on T and v (person, gender and number), while getting a value for their own uninterpretable Case feature (NOM if accessed by T; ACC if accessed by v). But they also find a matching set of  $\phi$ -features on the adjective in AP, which have been previously valued through their relation with the common argument. So T in (60)a and v in (60)b establish an Agree relation with this set of  $\phi$ -features on the adjective, providing it with a value for its Case feature.

The proposed Case feature on the adjective is the key, in this approach, to explain the constraints on the orientation of the depictive: this predicate is a goal for the same probes as the nominal arguments in charge of valuing the uninterpretable features of T and v by means of the Agree relation they maintain - the argument that becomes the subject and gets Nominative Case from T, and the nominal that becomes the object and gets Accusative Case from v. Since these two heads are the only two in the sentence structure that value Case features, the depictive will have to establish an Agree relation with one of them, which will be the same as the one that has accessed the nominal that the depictive is oriented to. This is the explanation for the constraints on the orientation of the depictive: it is the grammar of sentences associated with the need to eliminate uninterpretable features that reduces the options exclusively to the sentential subject and object.

If I am correct, two are the elements specifically regulating the syntax of depictive constructions: the conditions for aspectual compatibility between lexical predicates in (11), and the requirement that the uninterpretable features on the adjective be eliminated from the derivation (where the latter relies on the general mechanism of Agree, triggered by T and v in the structure)<sup>8</sup>.

## References

- Bowers, J.** (1993) The Syntax of Predication, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 24:4.  
**Bošković, Z.** (1994) D-Structure, Theta Criterion and Movement into Theta Positions, *LA*, 24:3-4 (pp.247-286)  
**Cardinaletti, A.** (1997) Subjects and clause structure, in L. Haegeman (ed.) *The New Comparative Syntax*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.  
**Chomsky, N.** (*DbP/2001*) Derivation by Phase, in M. Kenstowicz, *Ken Hale: a life in language*, Cambridge, Mass.:MIT Press.

---

<sup>8</sup> A remaining issue is that of why the accusative nominal acting as goal in a double object construction, in languages like English, cannot be the common argument. In forthcoming work, I argue that this follows from the structure associated with the kind of ditransitive verb occurring in the double object construction; the idea is that, if we adopt the decomposition analysis in Harley (1995) and elsewhere, the ungrammaticality of (i-a) must be linked to the ungrammaticality of (i-b); correspondingly, the grammaticality of (ii-a) must be linked to that of (ii-b):

- (i) a. \*I gave John the beer thirsty      (ii) a. I gave John the beer very cold  
      b. \*John had the beer thirsty            b. The beer was in the refrigerator very cold

Further, the ungrammaticality of (iii-a) must be based on the same factor as the ungrammaticality of (iii-b):

- (iii) a. \*I gave the beer to John thirsty      b. \*The beer was in the refrigerator dirty

- Chomsky, N.** (BEA) Beyond Explanatory Adequacy, ms.2001
- Chomsky, N. & H. Lasnik** (1993) The theory of principles and parameters, in J.Jacobs, A. von Stechow, W. Sternefeld and T. Vennemann (eds.) *Syntax, an international handbook of contemporary research*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Davidson, D.** (1967) The Logical Form of Action Sentences, in *Essays on Actions and Events*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Déchaine, R.-M.**(1993) *Predicate Across Categories: Towards a Category-Neutral Syntax*, doctoral dissertation, UMass/Amherst.
- Fernández Soriano, O.** (1999) Two Types of Impersonal Sentences in Spanish: Locative and Dative Subjects, *Syntax* 2:2 (pp.101-140).
- Filip, H. & C. Kennedy** (2000) The Semantics of Case in Russian Secondary Predicates, abstract of their talk at the *WOPC*, ZAS-Berlin.
- Hale, K. & J. Keyser** (1993) On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations, in K. Hale and J. Keyser (eds.) *A View from Building 20*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Harley, H.** (1995) *Subjects, Events and Licensing*, doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Hernanz, M.-L.** (1988) En torno a la sintaxis y la semántica de los complementos predicativos en español, *Estudis de Sintaxi, Estudi General*, 8 (pp. 7-29).
- Higginbotham, J.** (1985) On Semantics, *LI*, 16,4.
- Hinterhölzl, R.** (2000) Semantic Constraints on Case Agreement in Russian Adjectival Secondary Predicates, abstract of his talk at the *WOPC*, ZAS-Berlin.
- Hornstein, N.** (2001) *Move! A Minimal Theory of Construal*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Johnston, M.** (1994) *The Syntax and Semantics of Adverbial Adjuncts*, doctoral dissertation, UCSC.
- Kiss, K.** (1998) On Generic and Existential Bare Plurals and the Classification of Predicates, in S. Rothstein (ed.) *Events and Grammar*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kratzer, A.** (1989) Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates, in E. Bach, A. Kratzer & B. Partee, *Papers on Quantification*, Univ. of Massachusetts.
- Kratzer, A.** (1996) Severing the external argument from its verb, en J. Rooryck y L. Zaring (eds.) *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kuroda, S.-Y.** (1992) Judgement forms and sentence forms, in *Japanese Syntax and Semantics: collected papers*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Ladusaw, W.** (2000) Thetic and Categorical, Stage and Individual, Weak and Strong, in L.R. Horn & Y. Kato (eds.) *Negation and Polarity. Syntactic and Semantic Perspectives*, Oxford: OUP.
- Napoli, D.J.** (1989) *Predication Theory. A case study for indexing theory*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Pustejovsky, J.** (1991) The syntax of event structure, in B. Levin and S. Pinker (eds) *Lexical and conceptual semantics*.
- Pustejovsky, J.** (1995) *The Generative Lexicon*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rapoport, T.** (1991) Adjunct-Predicate Licensing and D-Structure, in S. Rothstein (ed) *Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*, Syntax and Semantics 25, Academic Press.
- Rothstein, S.** (2001) *Predicates and their Subjects*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Wade, T** (1992) *A Comprehensive Russian Grammar*, Oxford: Blackwell
- Williams, E.** (1980) Predication, *Linguistic Inquiry* 11 (203-238)

Ana Ardid-Gumiel

Dpto. de Filología Inglesa  
Facultad de Filosofía y Letras  
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid  
Campus de Cantoblanco  
28049 – Madrid / SPAIN