

Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder (eds.), *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16). Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2008. xvi + 449 pages, ISBN 978-3-8142-2133-5, EUR 16.80. <http://oops.uni-oldenburg.de/volltexte/2009/921/pdf/schsec08.pdf>

Reviewed by UTA REINÖHL and NIKOLAUS P. HIMMELMANN,
Universität zu Köln

Secondary predication covers such adjuncts as the depictive *raw* in *He ate the meat raw*, the resultative *blue* in *She painted the door blue*, and circumstantials such as *empty* in *Empty I can carry it*. All these adjuncts are participant-oriented in that they add a second predication with regard to one of the participants involved in the main predication, in contrast with event-oriented adjuncts such as the adverbial *quickly* in *He ate the meat quickly* which modifies the event expressed by the main predication. While reasonably clear in prototypical examples such as the ones just given, the distinction between participant- and event-orientation is often difficult to draw, and languages abound with constructions which straddle the line between the two, as amply illustrated and discussed in Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005 and the volume under review.

This present volume derives from the conference “Descriptive and Theoretical Problems of Secondary Predicates with Emphasis on Middle and Eastern European Languages”, held in Oldenburg, Germany, in December 2005. It consists of twenty chapters, six in German and fourteen in English, devoted to a broad range of languages and constructions. The bulk of the languages are Slavic, but Finno-Ugric, Baltic, Turkic, Caucasian and Balkan languages, German and English, as well as the more distant Moroccan Arabic and Classical Aztec are also covered. With regard to constructions, the contributions occasionally go well beyond the realm of the monoclausal ones just sketched to include multiclausal constructions involving non-finite participial or converbal ones such as *Having unusually long arms, he can reach the ceiling* (also known as “strong free adjuncts” in the semantics literature).

The chapters are in alphabetical order, with the authors mainly from Germany, but also from Slavic-speaking countries, the Netherlands, Finland, Norway, and Lithuania, often specializing in the respective philologies. We will review them by way of a rough tripartite arrangement, starting off with chapters primarily offering general overviews of secondary predicate constructions in one or several languages, then turning to contributions which focus on one or several more specific, formally defined construction types, and ending with such chapters whose primary concern is with matters of theory, including typological generalizations.

The broadest surveys are given by Ljiljana Šarić on Croatian (pp. 295–325) and Thomas Menzel on Old Russian (pp. 233–253) who contrast depictive constructions with nominal attributes, adverbs, circumstantials, predicative complements, or multiclausal constructions. The impressively ambitious scheme of Šarić’s chapter is in part carried out at the expense of a careful and precise presentation of the individual phenomenon and a well-conceived composition. For Menzel, the relation between depictives and participial subordinated clauses is of particular relevance, as he here suspects a stylistic contrast. It is especially religious texts written in a particularly elaborate style which display a propensity towards condensed, but separate subordinated clauses, while secular texts favor the even more condensed strategy of depictive secondary predicates.

The other authors of general survey chapters restrict their attention more narrowly to depictives. This includes the contributions by Hauke Bartels on Lower Sorbian (pp. 19–39), Irina Nevskaya on South Siberian Turkic languages (pp. 275–294), Elena Kalinina on languages of Daghestan (pp. 141–165), and Marja Leinonen on Finnish (pp. 167–187). Bartels’ very readable and instructive chapter deals with the wide semantic range of Lower Sorbian depictives, which is attributed to contact with German as well as a correlation with a relatively flexible word order. Nevskaya’s equally readable and instructive chapter discusses depictive constructions from the South Siberian Turkic languages Tuvan, Khakas, Shor, and Altai, ranging from nominal (substantive or adjective, case-marked, or bare) and verbal (participles, converbs, deverbal postpositions) forms to numerals and combinations thereof. Particular attention is paid to the question of subject- or object-control as well as to the semantic domains covered by each construction. Kalinina claims that depictives in the Daghestanian languages Tsakhur and Archi formally converge with adverbials, but are distinct from what she terms “attributive expressions” which include possessive constructions and relative clauses and, later in the chapter, are identified as strong free adjuncts. The data here appear to be quite complex but one also wonders whether some of the complexities could not have been avoided by a more felicitous choice, and more rigorous handling, of terminology. Leinonen offers an instructive description of depictives in Finnish, starting off with the essive case-construction made known by Nichols (1978), which is then employed as the standard of comparison for other potential candidates, none of which fully meets Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt’s (2005) definition of depictives, as for example instances of *status constructus* or converbs.

In rounding off the general survey chapters, we turn to the contributions on Classical Aztec by Thomas Stolz (pp. 359–380) and on the West Caucasian language Adyghe by Arseniy Vydrin (pp. 423–445). Stolz and Vydrin explore whether these languages AT ALL employ secondary predication (Classical Aztec) or, more specifically, depictives (Adyghe). Stolz takes up Launey’s (e.g., 1994, 2004) omnipredicativity analysis for Classical Aztec, from which

it follows that secondary predication does not arise since we find either bare predicates or predicates in combination with arguments, but not complex clause structures due to a weak noun-verb distinction. Vydrin applies Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt's (2005) criteria for depictives to various potential candidates in Adyghe, which, too, displays a weak noun-verb contrast, with the meager result of exactly five adjectives qualifying for depictive status. In both languages, morphological integration ("incorporation" or "compounding" for Classical Aztec, a highly developed agreement morphology for Adyghe) appears to cover the functions conveyed by secondary predicates in other languages.

We now give an overview of such chapters which concentrate on specific constructions in one or several languages, often focusing on one particular aspect of the construction. Sabine Anders-Marnowsky (pp. 1–18) makes a case for prepositional phrases in non-S/A/O-function to be able to figure as controllers of German depictive *als*-phrases, where control is widely thought to be restricted to core arguments (but see also the chapter by Stefan Müller below). Anders-Marnowsky cites several interesting cases with, among others, a locative or instrumental controller. Many of her examples however pertain to prepositional phrases which arguably are in O-function, which somewhat reduces the number of relevant cases.

Anatoli Strigin (pp. 381–400) extends the secondary predicate analysis of the Russian instrumental to include practically all uses of this case form. The instrumental, he claims, constitutes a secondary predicate "by default" (p. 389) and, in his view, "[a]ny referent of the primary situation may serve as a referent of the secondary predicate if this can plausibly be inferred" (p. 391). The very broad understanding of "referent" surfaces when Strigin includes, besides depictive usages, also other types, as for example temporal adverbials or other kinds of adjuncts, e.g., the "instrumental of 'instrument' " in *Ivan hit Peter with a stick* (ex. 23). In view of Strigin's very broad understanding of secondary predication, the functional width diagnosed fails to make a strong impression.

Claus Schönig (pp. 327–338) offers a concise overview of a small number of gerund constructions pervading selected Turkic languages, which appear to be valid candidates for secondary predication.

Dejan Matić (pp. 215–231) proposes a semantic analysis inspired by set theory for the optional occurrence of "predicative particles", roughly equivalent to English *as*, in Albanian and Greek. He claims that predicative complements which include the predicative particle signal only semantic "approximate inclusion" of the controlling participant in the complement predicate, whereas a bare predicative complement indicates "inclusion proper", that is, a complete semantic integration. In this way, he is able to offer a very neat and persuasive analysis of this hitherto unexplained variation in both Albanian and Greek. The fact that Matić's analysis takes off from data of primary copular predications

and deals with constructions which are rather borderline cases, if at all, of secondary predication, could, however, be thought to stray too far from the general scope of the volume.

Beata Chachulska (pp. 41–68), Axel Holvoet (pp. 125–140), and Loreta Vaičiulytė Semėnienė (pp. 401–421) choose an almost identical scope of investigation for Polish on the one hand, and Lithuanian and Latvian or only Lithuanian on the other. All three authors study the variation between agreement marking, instrumental case (Holvoet) as well as analytical constructions comparable to English *as*-phrases (Chachulska and Vaičiulytė Semėnienė). Chachulska approaches the data from a diachronic perspective, exploring the factors which induce relics of instrumental usage such as infinite verbal forms, primary predication in contrast with secondary predication or predicative complements, as well as a principled correlation with only substantive forms today. The two chapters on Baltic languages, on the other hand, focus on the interplay of instrumental marking with predicative complements, as well as adverbial uses and cases on the border to argument status in the chapter by Vaičiulytė Semėnienė. Both Holvoet and Vaičiulytė Semėnienė discern tendencies for instrumental marking in secondary rather than primary predication and object- rather than subject-controlled secondary predicates. Vaičiulytė Semėnienė adds a bias for occurrence with infinite verbal forms and with non-present and non-indicative TAM verbal features, while Holvoet also discerns a preference for substantives rather than adjectives as well as for resultatives rather than depictives. This last distribution forms the core interest for Holvoet who tries to answer the question whether resultatives should be considered as (optional) modifiers or (obligatory) complements in terms of Zwicky 1993. At first, he asserts that at least spoken Lithuanian has grammaticalized a distinction of modifier (marked by agreement) vs. complement status (marked by the instrumental), and that the general tendency is for resultatives to be marked by the instrumental. However, Holvoet argues on the basis of resultatives semantically “making more explicit what is already implied in a less specific way by the verb itself” (p. 131) that they should be considered modifiers. Against this background, Holvoet suggests that resultatives be considered semantically intermediate between adverbials and depictives, as they display a stronger event-orientation than depictives through this very implicitness in the verbal semantics. It appears, however, that at least semantically defined resultatives in fact vary with respect to (obligatory) complement or (optional) modifier status, judging on the basis of Holvoet’s examples from English given at the outset, *make someone happy* vs. *paint the door red* (pp. 125–126).

Given its more general theoretical aspirations, Holvoet’s chapter could also have been grouped with our last set of chapters which we now turn to. These contributions propose general theoretical or typological claims with regard to

secondary predication, though mostly ones being based on the comparison of a few constructions in a single language or a few closely related ones.

Caspar de Groot (pp. 69–96) suggests the addition of a fourth type to the established inventory of depictives in Hungarian (nominal constructions with special suffixes or adpositions, depictively used converbs, numerals), namely adverbially marked adjectives in participant-oriented usage. Having established this further type, de Groot attempts to put into typological perspective the various form–function mappings between adverbial or depictive marking and event- or participant-oriented semantics. In order to do so, he draws on Geuder’s (2002) distinction between depictives, (pure) manner adverbials, and “transparent” adverbials. A “transparently” used adverbial, apart from its event-orientation, also gives information on the inner state of the nominal participant, as in *Peter angrily read the review* (p. 90). De Groot observes that, while all three functional domains share one formal realization in Hungarian as adverbials, this is not so in English, Dutch, and Polish where form and function align differently. He goes on to suggest that the transparent type takes an intermediate position as it is either also covered by adverbial marking (English), or, alternatively, shares a marking strategy with depictives (Polish). The third option is that the adverbial strategy is used for all three cases as in Hungarian, or, by contrast, that there is no marking whatsoever and the bare adjectival type covers all types from attributive, manner, and transparent to depictive as in Dutch. It would be a highly intriguing continuation of this study to try and replicate these results for a larger language sample.

Utz Maas (pp. 189–214) compares a nominal and a verbal strategy in Moroccan Arabic for the expression of depictive meaning, the latter being the more widespread. In comparing the respective syntactic structures, he claims that the nominal strategy constitutes a “hybrid” of a superimposed secondary predicative relation on the core clause. On the other hand, the verbal strategy displays complete integration of the coverbal element into the clause. Maas mentions tendencies induced by language contact with, on the one hand, European languages, as educated speakers make stronger use of nominal depictives, and with Moroccan Berber on the other. The latter employs paratactic constructions for comparable functions, which, in Maas’s view, pairs up with the Moroccan Arabic nominal strategy as a generally Maghrebian (“gemein-maghrebinisch”, p. 213) feature of only loosely integrated secondary predications.

Gerd Hentschel (pp. 97–123) renews his earlier proposal (2006) to revise Nichols’ (1981) differentiation of the category of circumstantials into temporal, conditional, and causal subtypes instead of temporal, conditional, and concessive. He claims that the meaning of concessives can be analyzed as either “counter-reason without effect” or “counter-condition without effect” (p. 103), hence being derivative of either causal or conditional semantics. This undoes the clear demarcation between strong free adjuncts, equivalent to Hentschel’s

“causal circumstantials”, and circumstantials or weak free adjuncts for the reason that the former do not truth-conditionally restrict the main predication (for details see Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt 2005: 20–21). Hentschel proceeds to also question other categorial distinctions, suggesting a graded “syntactico-semantic integration of secondary predicative elements into a primary predication” (p. 121) with predicative complements as the most integrated, followed by depictives, temporal, conditional, and finally causal circumstantials. This hierarchy is based on several formal and functional overlaps between the various subtypes, which seemingly render sharp delineations obsolete. For instance, in German, temporal circumstantials (*Als Rentner werde ich viel reisen*, p. 117) share with depictives a ban from appositive position adjacent to the controller. The fact that both temporal and causal circumstantials remain outside the scope of the modal operator of the main clause exemplifies a functional overlap.

While intriguing, Hentschel’s proposal is not without problems. For example, Hentschel himself demonstrates that the semantic derivation of concessives from conditionals or causals also works the other way round. This and the additional element of non-application of a condition or cause, as also the fundamental role of world- and context-knowledge in the interpretation of concessives needs to be accounted for. Regarding the hierarchy of “semantico-syntactic integration”, the formal and functional overlaps appear to be in part due to independent reasons, although the hierarchy does seem intuitively plausible. To give only one example, the fact that “causal circumstantials” share with temporal ones the characteristic of remaining outside the main-clause modal operator results from the semantic independence of causal circumstantials on the one hand, and the semantic divergence of temporal circumstantials in only the temporal feature on the other. Finally, the subcategories pair up in an impressively cross-cutting manner, calling into question the merit of arrangement along a linear hierarchy.

The chapter by Stefan Müller (pp. 255–273) is the only one employing a formal syntactic framework and offers an HPSG analysis of the effects of the syntactic positioning of depictives in German and English on possible controllers. In a way similar to the contribution by Anders-Marnowsky mentioned above, Müller argues for a wider range of possible controllers than hitherto assumed, namely covert as well as oblique ones as in *This song must be sung drunk* (p. 257) or *Man_i half ihm_j erst halbtot_{i/j}* (p. 263). This evidence causes him to reject a shared-identity account for the relationship between controller and antecedent of the depictive which would demand the former to be both overt as well as a structural case. Instead, Müller suggests that the relation is one of coindexing. He goes on to claim that, in German, only an “unrealized” nominal (i.e., one preceding the verb and hence external to the immediate projection of V) may figure as the controller as in *weil er_i die Äpfel_j ungewaschen_{i/j} isst* vs. *weil er_i ungewaschen_{i/*j} die Äpfel_j isst* (p. 266). Müller’s own earlier

(2002) discontinuous-constituent analysis of such examples is discarded as a too powerful device. In order to accommodate the fact that English also allows for “realized” controllers in contrast with German as in *John* $[[_{VP} \text{ate the apples}_i] \text{unwashed}_i]$ (p. 270), Müller revises the framework in a way that a verbal slot saturated by its argument is not deleted, but copied to the mother node, where it can still function as reference point for the depictive.

This chapter represents a persuasive and well-structured account of possible kinds of controllers as well as word order restrictions on the controller in German and English. The analysis is, of course, in part theory-dependent, as verb-initial sentences can only be made to fit the picture when the verb is understood as originating in sentence-final position. Müller furthermore points to focus movements as another challenge. Sometimes, an otherwise overt controller is labeled unrealized as in *die nackt schlafende Frau* (p. 260) since the immediate projection of the adjective [*nackt schlafend*] does not include it. This rather intricate type of example, incidentally, has not been dealt with so far in theories of secondary predication, for which it poses a number of challenges, as the depictive occurs within the same NP as its controller (though obviously not functioning as a direct modifier of it).

Last but not least, Christoph Schroeder (pp. 339–358) addresses the more pronounced grammatical differentiation of NP- vs. clause-level adjuncts in Turkish in comparison with German or English. Whereas different kinds of adjuncts in Turkish, with the exception of a small group of bare adjectives, can only either function as NP- or clause-level adjuncts, in German and English, adjectives, participles, and prepositional phrases occur on both levels. Schroeder suggests a correlation with Turkish being a verb-framed language and German or English as satellite-framed. Since verbs in Turkish already carry movement and path information, manner information is delegated to adjuncts. Germanic languages, by contrast, often include manner information in the verb (*path* being expressed by verbal particles, for instance), so that the semantic load on adjuncts to encode manner information is lower. In Turkish, the heightened reliance on adjuncts for the expression of manner is for Schroeder at the origin of their much more developed internal differentiation into NP- and clause-level types. The proposed correlation with verb- vs. satellite-framed language types appears to work well for the comparison of Turkish with German and English. A further exploration of this very interesting hypothesis as well as an application to a larger language sample seems highly desirable.

We will round off this review with a few general remarks. In the compilation of this volume, no major effort has been made to homogenize the scope of the chapters in terms of either theoretical outlook or phenomena studied, which range from detailed investigations of a single construction to broad overviews of the domain of secondary predication and related constructions in a group of related languages. Nearly all chapters make reference to the typological frame-

work proposed by Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann (2004) and Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005), but the respective interpretations vary considerably, and the use made of their terminology is far from consistent. Consequently, readers have to reorient themselves anew in each chapter as to what precisely is being meant by “depictive”, “secondary predicate”, etc.

This lack of consistency in theory and scope is compensated for by the breadth and wealth of the data presented and the theoretical issues raised. One of these issues is the varying semantic range of depictives, which is discussed in particular detail for Lower Sorbian (Bartels), Croatian (Šarić), and the Russian instrumental (Strigin), as well as by most other chapters which offer a general overview or concentrate on a specific construction-type. Another topic is the variation in terms of possible controllers, often diverging from the prototype of overt arguments, which figures especially in the chapters by Anders-Marnowsky, Müller, and Nevskaya. The chapters by de Groot, Kalinina, Leinonen, Menzel, once more Nevskaya, as well as Šarić, on the other hand, evince a particular focus on formal variation. A recurring concern is the demarcation (or dissolution of demarcation) of secondary predicates or depictives from neighboring categories such as circumstantials, resultatives, adverbials, attributes, strong free adjuncts, and complex predicates. This is treated in one way or the other by several authors including Chachulska, de Groot, Holvoet, Kalinina, Leinonen, Maas, Matić, Menzel, Šarić, Schroeder, Strigin, Vaičiulytė Semėnienė, and Vydrin. Besides issues of external demarcation, a number of authors strive for a more detailed understanding of subgroupings, for instance de Groot who includes Geuder’s transparent adverbial constructions as semantically intermediate between depictives and adverbials or Holvoet who defends the same claim for resultatives. Hentschel discusses the subdivisions of circumstantials and suggests the dissolution of categorial boundaries between predicative complements, depictives, circumstantials and strong free adjuncts. In short, we are certain that every typologist interested in secondary predication will find a rich source of data and much food for thought in this volume, although it may not always be easy to access.

Received: 5 May 2011

Correspondence address: Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Institut für Linguistik, Universität zu Köln, 50923 Köln; e-mail: sprachwissenschaft@uni-koeln.de

References

- Geuder, Wilhelm. 2002. *Oriented adverbs: Issues in the lexical semantics of event converbs*. Tübingen: Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen doctoral dissertation. <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bsz:21-opus-5462>

- Hentschel, Gerd. 2006. Zur Klassifikation sekundärer Prädikate am Beispiel von *als*-Phrasen des Deutschen und *jako*-Phrasen des Polnischen. In Tilman Berger, Jochen Raecke & Tilmann Reuther (eds.), *Slavistische Linguistik 2004/2005* (Slavistische Beiträge 453), 143–175. München: Sagner.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus P. & Eva Schultze-Berndt. 2005. Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: An introduction. In Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: The typology of depictives*, 1–67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Launey, Michel. 1994. *Une grammaire omniprédicative: Essai sur la morphosyntaxe du nahuatl classique*. Paris: CNRS 'Editions.
- Launey, Michel. 2004. The features of omnipredicativity in Classical Nahuatl. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 57. 49–69.
- Müller, Stefan. 2002. *Complex predicates: Verbal complexes, resultative constructions, and particle verbs in German*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1978. Secondary predicates. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4. 114–127.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1981. *Predicate nominals: A partial surface grammar of Russian*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Schultze-Berndt, Eva & Nikolaus P. Himmelmann. 2004. Depictive secondary predicates in cross-linguistic perspective. *Linguistic Typology* 8. 59–131.
- Zwicky, Arnold. 1993. Heads, bases and functors. In Greville G. Corbett, Norman M. Fraser & Scott McGlashan (eds.), *Heads in grammatical theory*, 292–315. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.