

Könyvismertető

Imola-Ágnes Farkas

Marcel den Dikken & Hideki Kishimoto (eds.): Formal Perspectives on Secondary Predication

Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2024, 417 pp.

The linguistic phenomenon generally known as ‘secondary predication’ has attracted the attention of countless scholars, thus, it has been the subject of thorough investigation over the last few decades, occupying a prominent place in linguistic theory, and raising important questions for (morpho)syntax, (lexical) semantics, argument structure or event structure. Moreover, secondary predicate constructions have been the focus of much research from the perspective of both Generative Grammar and Construction Grammar. Consequently, the question arises as to whether an international symposium on this broad topic can still bring together researchers who focus on the problematic or still unexplored aspects of these structures and who can present a cutting-edge perspective on this topic of central interest in the field. Another question that naturally arises is whether an edited volume containing the earlier versions of the papers presented at such an event would still be of interest to linguists and scholars working on this topic. As demonstrated by the chapters included in the volume under review here, there are still some prominent and debatable predication issues that raise important syntactic or semantic questions cross-linguistically.

This is the most recent volume in and addition to The Mouton-NINJAL Library of Linguistics series of scholarly monographs and collections, which publishes in English on Japanese linguistics and its related fields. As is evident from the chapters included in this volume, the research results summarized here go beyond Japanese, as secondary predication is an intense topic from a cross-linguistic perspective. The book is divided into eleven chapters, which are preceded by *Series preface*, *Preface*, *Contents* and *Contributors*.

The introductory chapter (*Formal perspectives on secondary predication – An introduction*, pp. 1–16), authored by the two editors of the volume, provides a brief overview of the development of formal approaches to secondary predication. As the main target of investigation is secondary predication, it is impossible not to mention at this point Halliday’s (1967) feature called ‘attributive’, which must be specified as a system of two contrasting features: depictive (*eat the meat raw*) and resultative (*hammer the metal flat*). This chapter also introduces and discusses the most relevant predication issues of the individual chapters, summarizes the contributions of the present volume, justifies the order in which these contributions are included in the volume and lays out some new lines of research connected to each of the contributions.

The next chapter, *The syntax and semantics of indirect predication in French* (pp. 17–49), by Lieven Danckaert and Fayssal Tayalati, concerns two, seemingly unrelated and dissimilar constructions from modern French, but which turn out to be unifiable, to a certain extent, precisely

because they both instantiate a type of so-called ‘indirect predication’. The *tough*-construction (e.g. *Jean est difficile à convaincre* ‘John is tough to convince’) and the restrictive partitive construction (e.g. *Jean est petit de taille* ‘John is short/(lit.) short of stature’) differ, at first sight, both syntactically and semantically, but they also seem to be connected, on a deeper level, by a well-known and largely discussed phenomenon found in Modern Standard Arabic. This type of predication is called indirect because in a configuration such as $XP_1/DP_1 - AP - XP_2/DP_2$ the adjectival predicate (*petit* ‘short’) first combines with XP_2/DP_2 (*de taille* ‘of stature’) and then this complex predicate, which features the order predicate–subject, combines with XP_1/DP_1 (*Jean* ‘John’), giving rise to two predicate relations. The analysis focuses on the status of XP_2/DP_2 as a restrictor, on its omissibility and ontological status, as well as on the status of the functional element heading it (*à* and *de*). Taking both the syntactic and the semantic similarities and differences into account, the authors give a well-balanced analysis of the two French predicate constructions, on the one hand, and these two Romance structures and the indirect predication structures in Modern Standard Arabic, on the other hand. What is particularly noteworthy in this contribution is precisely the connection between the different predicate constructions in the two geographically diverse languages.

In Chapter 3 (*On the syntax of psychological expressions in Japanese: their predicative and adjunctive nature*, pp. 51–93), Kaori Miura and Hideki Kishimoto focus on so-called psychological expressions derived from either adjectives (e.g. *omosiroi* ‘interesting’) or nominal adjectives (e.g. *kyoomisinsin* ‘curiosity’). The bulk of the discussion revolves around the syntactic status of these Japanese expressions, which turn out to be secondary predicates when embedded under epistemic verbs, and adverbial modifiers when accompanied by non-epistemic verbs. In the former case, the order of the two building blocks of the small clause is fixed, the Anti-Locality Principle preventing the (nominal) adjective from being scrambled over the accusative argument. Moreover, RP, projected by R(elator), hosts the two elements of the small clause in its specifier (subject) and, respectively, sister of the head R position (predicate). In the latter case, however, the same (nominal) adjective can appear either in a pre- or post-nominal position, and, as it is semantically related to either the subject or the object, it adjoins to either VP or vP. The argument is based on solid evidence from subject honorification and negative focus, which confirms that the (nominal) adjective undergoes LF movement to form a relation with an argument, which will be identified as its experiencer.

Éva Kardos’s joint work with Andrea Szávó (*Event lexicalization in Hungarian*, pp. 95–126) is the first in a series of contributions dedicated to the resultative secondary predicate construction. Although the primary focus is Hungarian, the paper presents the most important syntactic and aspectual features of this predicate structure in a wide variety of (unrelated) languages. More importantly, the claims it makes are theoretically relevant as they question the typological classification of Hungarian as a strong satellite-framed language in the sense defined by Acedo-Matellán (2016). It is shown, thus, that this Finno-Ugric language bears a striking similarity to Slavic rather than Germanic languages in the way it realizes event lexicalization. This approach receives theoretical support not only from the typology of the primary predicate, but also from the morphology of the secondary predicate (PP rather than AP). In addition, but not less significantly, change-of-state and change-of-location predicates such as verbal particles and result phrases, functioning as event-maximizing elements, are claimed to occupy a VP-external position and take scope over the domain they linearly precede and c-command in visible syntax, in much the same way as quantifiers, adverbs and adverbial adjuncts do on the left periphery of the Hungarian sentence. Unfortunately, the authors neither exemplify nor illustrate the way these latter elements take scope over their domain in the higher

functional part of the sentence. Although two sources are adequately cited here, it seems likely that space constraints prevented footnote 4 from being extended into an entire (sub)chapter. However, the chapter's central claim, that Hungarian may not be a classic example of a strong satellite-framed language, is likely to draw the attention of the members of the (Hungarian) linguistic community, encouraging further discussion and investigation and, ultimately, a more nuanced analysis of satellite-framed constructions.

The chapter entitled *Precise standards license adjectives in the English resultative construction* (pp. 127–149) discusses the semantic constraints on the adjectival result predicate in English. Taking Wechsler's (2005) Maximal Endpoint Hypothesis as the starting point for the proposal but without disregarding or totally invalidating the event-argument homomorphism model of telicity, Cass Kramer puts forth a slightly modified version of the above thesis. As such, according to the so-called precise standard hypothesis, the endpoint of the resultative is specified not by the maximal bound on the property scale of the adjective but by the standard of comparison. This also takes into account the contextual factors which are involved in setting an adjective standard, an aspect that earlier proposals failed to capture. Furthermore, the standard of the adjective must be precise rather than vague. This explains and confirms the earlier predictions concerning the discrepancy in the distribution of the three classes of adjectives. On the one hand, maximal endpoint adjectives (e.g. *flat*) are freely licensed in resultatives because they have inherently precise standards. On the other hand, minimal endpoint (e.g. *wet*) and open-scale gradable adjectives (e.g. *tall*) are severely restricted because they have inherently vague standards, but they can, exceptionally, occur in these predicate constructions, provided context reduces or eliminates the vagueness of their standard. The entire chapter is based on a solid theoretical foundation, and the gathered data is examined cautiously. Special mention should be made of the corpus examples carefully selected from COCA, as well as the tables illustrating different adjectives and their relative frequency. Once again, this study sheds light on the importance of context in resultatives, already emphasized in the literature, albeit from a different perspective (see, for instance, Verspoor 1997 or Boas 2013), as some adjectives that are not – theoretically – expected to occur in these structures in a context-neutral environment do become acceptable precisely because they are placed in a proper context.

A somewhat similar structure is discussed in the next contribution (Hideki Kishimoto & Yile Yu, *The syntax of resultative V-V compounds in Chinese*, pp. 151–194). Although there is a relatively rich literature on Chinese resultative verb compounds, the novelty value of this chapter lies in the fact that it provides a syntactic account for the interpretative facts of these structures, an account which proves to be conceptually superior to some earlier, lexical-semantic accounts and has some further advantages over them. The central claim is that the syntactic positions of arguments and their thematic relations are determined first and foremost according to how they are assigned theta roles in syntax. More precisely, in the resultative V-V compound the two arguments of the two verbs can receive distinct roles from the verbs and they can be realized in different positions, hence giving rise to multiple interpretations. For instance, the agent argument of the first verb is semantically interpreted as an affected theme by the second verb and can be realized in an object position. This is syntactically explained by A-movement, which can raise nominals into theta positions. As the details of the discussion are carefully introduced and the arguments are presented step by step, even non-native syntacticians can follow the discussion, which becomes, as expected, very technical at certain points.

There has been a long-standing debate on the precise syntactic structure of resultative constructions, with various syntactic models having been proposed over the years. As such, some propose that the predication relation holding between the two postverbal elements supports the

small clause analysis (Hoekstra 1988). Others consider that the semantic interaction between the primary and the secondary predicate favours the complex predicate approach (Neeleman 1994). Still others argue that the postverbal DP and the result predicate are sisters of the verb within a ternary branching VP (Roberts 1988). As opposed to these uniform syntactic analyses, a fourth direction of study tries to account for the contrasting behaviour of different resultatives in a certain language or in different languages by resorting to a non-uniform treatment (Yamada 1987). Chapter 7, entitled *(Re)sultatives*, by Michael Wilson and Tom Roeper (pp. 195–232), is the latest contribution to these hybrid treatments of resultatives. The main argument is based on the English verbal prefix *re-*, which is acceptable with transitive verbs (e.g. *to re-hammer the metal flat*) but ungrammatical with intransitive verbs (e.g. **to re-run oneself thin*). As this prefix carries an internal argument requirement, it sheds light on some further structural differences between transitive and intransitive resultatives. As in the former – but not the latter – resultatives, *re-* can modify either the [V–DP] or the [DP–Res] constituent, the solution offered to the structural difference between the two subclasses of predicate structures is multidominance, which allows the DP to merge with the transitive V and Res in the same structure, thus being both the object of the verb and the subject of the secondary predicate. The chapter brings forth interesting and novel data from English, which is further supported by Dutch and Japanese. Whereas one cannot disregard the syntactic facts presented in the chapter and the fundamental differences between transitive and intransitive resultatives in light of the data illustrated here, the question arises as to whether this type of non-uniform treatment of resultatives can be tenable also in the case of comparative analyses going beyond English.

The following contribution is dedicated to Japanese secondary predicates (Hideki Kishimoto, *On the forms of secondary predicates: A Japanese perspective*, pp. 233–294) and makes a smooth transition from the previous chapters on resultatives to the following section on depictives by focusing on the form of the two secondary predicates in Japanese. The claim that lies at the heart of the argument is that depictives derived from nouns and resultatives derived from nouns, regular adjectives and nominal adjectives are all syntactic adjuncts; they all have the same underlying predicate structure comprising vP and containing an invisible PRO subject as well as an invisible copular verb. Crucially, the difference between them does not lie in their external but rather in their internal syntax: (i) the type of the argument that controls PRO (external in depictives, and internal in depictives and resultatives) and (ii) the nature of the copular verb (stative *aru* ‘be’ in depictives and inchoative *naru* ‘become’ in resultatives). In sharp contrast to this, depictives derived from regular adjectives and nominal adjectives are not secondary predicates but adverbial modifiers, they do not have a predicate structure comprising vP, and contain neither an invisible PRO subject nor an invisible verb. The entire chapter is characterized by carefully presented data, solid evidence and a large number of examples, which all facilitate the understanding of the arguments and the overall discussion of the chapter.

The following three chapters are devoted to the depictive secondary predicate structure. First of all, Chapter 9, *Depictive predicates with not so complex structures: An empirical argument for functional projections*, by Masashi Yamaguchi (pp. 295–338), is a natural continuation of the previous chapter as it focuses on the question of how the depictive particle *-de*, already discussed in the previous chapter, is similar to or different from the same particle found in locatives. Although the homophonous particle is found with other phrases as well, it is only in these two structures that it gives rise to either a subject- or an object-oriented interpretation. As convincingly argued by the author, the two syntactic adjuncts behave similarly with respect to a set of syntactic tests but their semantic properties are different. More precisely, the depictive *de*-particle is claimed to be the realization of the functional Dep head projecting DepP, while the locative *de*-

particle is the realization of the functional P head projecting PP, a postposition denoting the location of one of the arguments. In both cases, the specifier of the functional phrase hosts an implicit argument PRO. The analysis is carefully conducted, it manages to shed light on some previously ignored differences between the two *de*-phrases, but it also leaves some questions for future research, such as why the two *de*-phrases differ with respect to their presuppositions and some further restrictions when the two co-occur.

Federico Silvagni's chapter (*Spanish depictives and aspectual consecutio in non-verbal environments*, pp. 339–382) tackles the issue of depictive predicates in copular clauses and the phenomenon called aspectual *consecutio* in Spanish. According to this requirement, there must be an aspectual equivalence between the primary and the secondary predicate in the sense that both of them must be stage-level predications or, exceptionally, in the latter case, individual-level predications coerced into a stage-level interpretation. Whereas this rules out, for instance, individual-level verbs as primary predicates (e.g. **know Spanish sitting*) and individual-level adjectives as depictive predicates (e.g. **read the book intelligent*), the latter type of candidate for the depictive secondary predication and, more generally, the phenomenon of coercion are more challenging not only in non-copular but also in copular sentences. Meant to fill in the gap left by previous studies, the alternative proposal put forth here analyzes the aspectual requirement between the two predicates in terms of an agreement operation between the uninterpretable [uStage] feature on the stage-level depictive predicate and the interpretable [iStage] feature on the c-commanding copula. What is more, it is this latter feature on the copula that triggers the coercion of the interpretation of the c-commanded individual-level depictive into a stage-level reading. In harmony with the previous chapters (see especially Yamaguchi's contribution), depictives, syntactically considered adjuncts, are non-verbal predications with an implicit argument PRO in the specifier of the functional phrase they are part of.

In the closing chapter, *On the merger and antecedence of depictive secondary predicates* (pp. 383–413), Marcel den Dikken offers a fresh syntactic perspective on depictive predicate constructions by viewing them as a case of specificational asyndetic coordination structures. Thus, a relationship is established between a depictive predicate structure (*eat the meat_i [_{sc} PRO_i raw]*) and the corresponding *when*-/while-clause (*eat the meat [_{CP} when/while it is raw]*), where the CP in the latter is, roughly speaking, the paraphrase of the PRO-type of small clause in the former. The author postulates the existence of a silent element in the syntax of these predicate structures, with the depictive specifying the content of this silent element, represented by *so*, in the other conjunct. That depictive constructions – at least in English and Dutch – should syntactically be analyzed as a type of correlative structure gets further support from the behaviour of these predicate structures with respect to a set of syntactic tests such as long- and short-distance extraction, linear order and constituency. In addition, the analysis proposed here can also provide answers to some antecedence-related restrictions in diverse object depictives. The main claims, the novel generalizations and proposals are presented explicitly in the introductory section and then they are summarized at the end of the chapter.

The chapters summarized and presented here bring forward a large amount of predication-related phenomena in a wide variety of genealogically unrelated and typologically distinct languages, and take a scientific approach to different predicate constructions. Each chapter is based on a solid theoretical foundation, the gathered data is examined very carefully, the results are based on careful observations and the conclusions are drawn from a body of evidence. These chapters not only open new directions of research but they also leave issues for future (cross-linguistic) research. From the ideas mentioned by the editors of the volume in the opening

chapter, I am particularly looking forward to those future studies that focus on double secondary predicate – i.e. resultative and depictive – constructions (e.g. *paint the door blue white*).

Overall, the book is well-organized and the ordering of the chapters is logical. Although, as expected, the discussion in most chapters is rather technical in nature, it is not very challenging to follow the material as each chapter has an introductory section and a final conclusion. The individual chapters, through the way in which they are connected, gradually unfold and bring out the intimate connections between different predicate structures. While the chapters have their own indubitable merits (see above), I believe that the two editors of the volume deserve all the credit for taking the individual chapters and turning them into a coherent unit.

The volume under review here proves, once again, that there are indeed some prominent and debatable predication issues that still raise important syntactic and semantic questions in a wide variety of languages. With its rich empirical details covering the phenomenon of predication in a large number of languages and with the long list of references collected at the end of each chapter, this volume proves to be an impressive and valuable contribution to the study of (secondary) predication from a cross-linguistic perspective.

In conclusion, this is a welcome addition to the growing number of research dedicated to the domain of (secondary) predication.

References

- Acedo-Matellán, V. (2016): *The Morphosyntax of Transitions. A Case Study in Latin and Other Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198733287.001.0001>
- Boas, H. C. (2003): *A Constructional Approach to Resultatives*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1967): Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Part I. *Journal of Linguistics* 3, 37–81. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700012949>
- Hoekstra, T. (1988): Small Clause Results. *Lingua* 74.2-3, 101–139.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841\(88\)90056-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0024-3841(88)90056-3)
- Neeleman, A. (1994): *Complex Predicates*. Doctoral Dissertation. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Roberts, I. (1988): Predicative APs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.4, 703–710.
- Verspoor, C. M. (1997): *Contextually-Dependent Lexical Semantics*. Doctoral dissertation. Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh.
- Wechsler, S. (2005): Resultatives Under the ‘Event-Argument Homomorphism’ Model of Telicity. In: Erteschik-Shir, N. & Rapoport, T. (eds.): *The Syntax of Aspect: Deriving Thematic and Aspectual Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 255–273.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280445.001.0001>
- Yamada, Y. (1987): Two Types of Resultative Constructions. *English Linguistics* 4, 73–90.
<https://doi.org/10.9793/elsj1984.4.73>

Imola-Ágnes Farkas 

Babeş-Bolyai University, Faculty of Letters, Department of English Language and Literature
 400202 Kolozsvár
 Horea 31
 imola.farkas@ubbcluj.ro