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Abstract

This paper contains a data discussion, which is an extension of earlier work (Müller, 2002, 2004). The paper contains a sketch of an analysis of depictive secondary predicates that preserves the merits of my earlier analysis (Müller, 2004), but can be extended to languages like English, in which adjuncts attach to complete verbal projectoins.

1 Introduction

This paper deals with depictive secondary predicates, examples of which are given in (1):

(1) a. Er ißt das Fleisch, roh.,
    he eats the meat raw

b. Er ißt das Fleisch nackt.,
    he eats the meat naked

In German, uninflected adjectives and prepositional phrases may appear as depictive predicates, as the examples in (1) and (2) show.

(2) Ich habe ihn (gestern) im dunklen Anzug getroffen.¹
    I have him yesterday in the dark suit met
    ‘I met him in a dark suit yesterday.’

Depictives say something about a state that holds for a participant of an event during the event.

Depictives pattern with adjuncts in terms of Focus Projection (Winkler, 1997, p. 310) and linearization in the so-called Mittelfeld (Müller, 2002, Chapter 4.1.4).

To establish the predication relation between the depictive predicate and its antecedent, Müller (2002) suggests a coindexing analysis, in which the subject of the depictive is coindexed with an element of the argument structure of the modified verb. Since the depictive is not necessarily adjacent to the verb and

¹†I thank Christoph Schroeder for comments on an earlier version of this paper.

This paper was presented in 2005 at the International Symposium Descriptive and theoretical problems of secondary predicates in Oldenburg. I thank all participants of the symposium for the discussion.

The analysis that is sketched at the end of this article is an improved version of an earlier analysis that was presented at the HPSG 2004 conference (Müller, 2004). I want to thank two anonymous reviewers of HPSG 2004 for comments on an earlier version of Müller, 2004. I also thank all participants of HPSG 2004 and in particular Berthold Crysmann and Tibor Kiss for discussion. In addition, I want to thank Shravan Vasishth for discussion.

¹See Helbig and Buscha, 1972, p. 556 for a similar example.
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since the argument structure is usually not projected, Müller (2002) suggests an analysis that makes use of discontinuous constituents.

Considering new data with multiple constituents in front of the finite verb, I developed an analysis of German clause structure which makes discontinuous constituents superfluous for accounting for verb placement and constituent serialization (Müller, 2005a,b).

In the following paper I develop an analysis of depictive secondary predicates that does not require discontinuous constituents, but nevertheless uses binary branching structures and that fits into the general fragment of German that is outlined in Müller, 2005a.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, I discuss the phenomenon of depictive secondary predicates in more detail. I will then give a brief sketch of the analysis in Section 3.

2 The Phenomenon

In what follows, I show that reference to non-overt\(^2\) antecedents (Section 2.1) and oblique antecedents (Section 2.2) is possible. The reference to non-arguments (Section 2.3) and to elements inside of arguments (Section 2.4) is excluded. In Section 2.5, I discuss the linearization of depictive secondary predicates with regard to their antecedents.

2.1 Non-Overt Antecedents

(3) shows that reference to unexpressed subjects is possible:\(^3\)

\[(3)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } \text{daß das Buch nackt gelesen wurde}^4 \\
\text{that the book naked read was} \\
\text{‘that the book was read naked’}
\end{align*}\]

\(^2\)Theories differ in the way they analyze phenomena like the suppression of the agent in the passive and optional arguments. But irrespective of the particular analysis, semantic arguments that do not correspond to phonologic material in an utterance are called non-overt. Sometimes a phonologically empty pronoun is assumed for such non-overt elements and sometimes a deletion process is assumed that maps representations of a certain kind onto other representations. Still others do assume that such elements are not represented at all in syntactic structures. Throughout this paper I use the terms non-overt and unexpressed synonymously.


\(^4\)See Müller, 2002, p.177 for a similar example.
2.1 Non-Overt Antecedents

b. daß das Buch nackt zu lesen ist
   that the book naked to read is
   ‘The book is to be read naked.’

Example (3a) is a passive construction and in (3b) we have a modal infinitive.

Zifonun (1997, p. 1803) claims that depictive predicates cannot refer to the logical subject of the passivized verb and gives the following example:

(4) Die Äpfel wurden ungewaschen in den Keller getragen.
   the apples were unwashed in the basement carried
   ‘The apples were carried to the basement unwashed.’

That the reading in which the depictive refers to the agent of the carrying is hardly available is probably due to a preference rule that makes readings where a depictive refers to an non-overt antecedent dispreferred. However, if the reading in which the depictive refers to the logical object of the main verb is semantically implausible, the reference to the logical subject of the main verb is fine as the examples in (3) show.

Jaeggli (1986, p. 614)—following Chomsky (1986, p. 121)—makes a similar claim for English. As the translations of the examples in (3) and the examples discussed below show, this claim is as wrong for English as it is for German. Chomsky claims that only a syntactically present element can be the subject of adjectival predication. This includes PRO but excludes predication over passive subjects.

Baker, 1988, p. 318 gives examples for English, Italian and North-Russian. Baker’s example for English are given in (5).

(5) a. This song must be sung drunk.
   b. Such petitions should be presented kneeling.

Chomsky (1986, p. 211), claiming that predication over non-overt elements is excluded (p. 121), cites the following examples from unpublished work by Roeper:

(6) The game was played barefoot (nude).

Following a suggestion of Rizzi, Chomsky assumes that barefoot and nude are adverbials rather than adjectives, despite their morphologic marking. However, although there are English adverbials like hard that are not morphologically marked as adverbials, there is a clear difference in meaning between the adverbial and the depictive use:

(7) a. He works hard.
   b. He works naked.
(7a) does not mean that he is hard during the event of working, while (7b) does have the depictive meaning. Since the example in (6) clearly has a depictive meaning and predication of the unexpressed subject is involved, it is unclear in what sense it would help to recategorize the adjectives into adverbs since the theoretical problem of predication over unexpressed subjects in passive constructions remains.

A reviewer reported about the judgments of English speaking informants regarding the examples in (8):

(8) a. This book was read awake.
    b. This car was driven drunk.
    c. This book is to be read fully awake.

According to him, the examples in (8a–b) were judged ungrammatical with the reading with reference to the unexpressed agent, while (8c) was judged okay.

As the examples from Baker, Roeper, Chomsky, and the following corpus examples show, the reading with reference to the unexpressed subject has to be made available by the grammar in principle. One could then think about reasons for the unacceptability of particular examples. For instance, one reason for the judgments of (8a) could be that normally it is a prerequisite for reading books that one is not sleeping. The sentence in (9), which provides a plausible context, is rated prefect.

(9) The first book was read by me half-awake but this second book was read fully awake.

The examples in (10) – (13) are corpus examples from various sources that show that depictives can predicate over unexpressed subjects. The examples in (11) are instances of driven drunk—the pattern mentioned in (8b)—although the arguments that are realized with drive differ from the ones in (8b).

(10) a. I didn’t want to be seen naked on anyone’s coffee table
    b. As he said at the time: ‘I’ve never been seen naked in any bed, never.’

(11) a. One in 100 drivers will drive with a BAC of .08 or greater. About 16 billion miles will be driven drunk in a year.
    b. “We would like to eventually run a shuttle between Radford and Blacksburg. Price’s Fork, the main route, is an awful road to be driven drunk—all are, but especially that one,” he says.

---

7http://www.police.txstate.edu/Presentations/alcohol.pps
8http://www.vtmagazine.vt.edu/sum02/feature3.html
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2.1 Non-Overt Antecedents

(12)  
  a. Later everyone got very drunk, volleyball was played naked in the mud.  
  b. The sport of Rugby is almost identical to an ancient greek ball game, which was played naked, for an audience composed entirely of elderly aristocrats.  
  c. Golf would be more interesting to watch if it was played naked.  
  d. “Recorded naked to be played naked.”  
  e. Seriously, shouldn’t Quidditch be played naked?

(13) Not to mention continuing the delusion that Finnegans Wake was written to be read drunk, and other such nonsense.

As far as German is concerned, reference to non-overt logical subjects is also possible with intransitive verbs:

(14)  
  a. Auf dem Land fahren alle betrunken.  
     on the country drive all drunk  
     ‘Everyone drives drunk in the country.’  
  b. Auf dem Land wird auch betrunken gefahren.  
     on the country is also drunk driven  
     ‘There is also driving drunk in the country.’

According to Bresnan (1982, p. 416–417) similar examples in Icelandic and Norwegian are ungrammatical. Bresnan derives this from a theory that predicts that the passivization of intransitive verbs whose subject functionally controls a predicate complement is impossible. Functional control implies sharing of syntactic information like case and of semantic information. To account for (14) Bresnan had to assume that the relation between German state predicates and their antecedents is anaphoric control rather then functional control as in Icelandic and Norwegian. Anaphoric control implies coreference of the controller and controllee without identification of syntactic information. Alternatively, she could assume that state predicates are not complements in German. As was mentioned in the introduction, focus projection data suggests an adjunct analysis and in Section 2.2, I show that sharing of syntactic information between the subject of the depictive predicate and its antecedence is not appropriate. That is, the data only allows for a non-complement, anaphoric control analysis.

---

9 http://www.textfiles.com/magazines/EUTHANASIA/e-sermon.3  
12 Tragic Mulatto’s “Hot Man Pussy” album 1989.  
14 http://www.cosmoetica.com/B206-DES147.htm
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Depictive predicates can also refer to the unexpressed subject of an adjectival participle:

(15) die \[ N^* \rightarrow [\text{AP nackt schlafende}] \text{Frau}\]  
the naked sleeping woman  
‘the woman who is sleeping naked’

In (15) \text{Frau} is coreferent with the syntactic and the logical subject of \text{schlafende}. \text{Frau} is not syntactically realized in a projection of the deverbal adjective.

In the same vein, depictives may refer to unexpressed subjects in infinitival constructions. Since the subject of the controlled verb \text{schlafen} in (16) is coreferent with the dative object of the controlling verb (\text{ihr}), the element the depictive predicate refers to is visible at the surface.

(16) Er hat ihr geraten, nackt zu schlafen.  
he has her advised naked to sleep  
‘He advised her to sleep naked.’

However, the dative object of \text{raten} is optional, that is, it can be left implicit as in (16) or it can be realized as in (17):

(17) Er hat geraten, nackt zu schlafen.  
he has advised naked to sleep  
‘He gave the advise to sleep naked.’

If we omit the object, we get another example without an overt antecedent for the depictive predicate.

Grewendorf (1989, p. 129; 1993, p. 1313) and Haider (1997, p. 6) discuss the examples in (18a) and (18b), respectively.

(18) a. Der Doktor untersucht _ nur nüchtern.  
the doctor examines only sober

b. Dieser Arzt\(_i\) untersucht (Patienten\(_j\)) nur unbekleidet\(_{i/j}\).  
this doctor examines patients only undressed

Grewendorf assumes the non-overt subject of \text{nüchtern} to be the empty pronominal element pro. Haider (1997, p. 28) assumes that depictive predicates are generated adjacent to the DP they predicate over. Therefore he is forced to assume some empty referential element in cases like (18b)\(^{15}\) and also in passive examples like (3). However, in GB-theory it is usually assumed that the passive participle does not assign a theta role to its logical subject (Chomsky, 1993, p. 124). Grewendorf (1993, p. 1311) assumes that the subject of impersonal passives as in (14) is an expletive pro. Haider (1993, p. 134) assumes that there is no subject in impersonal

\(^{15}\)In Haider, 1993, p. 180, he assumes that the omitted argument in (18) is treated as an implicit argument and not as an empty, pronominal element. This is the view that I adopt in the following.
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2.2 Reference to Oblique Antecedents

The examples in (1) show that depictives may refer to subjects and to accusative objects. In this subsection I want to discuss the possibility of depictives to refer to more oblique elements.

Haider (1985, p. 94) observes that the predication over a dative object in (19b) is marked in comparison to predication over accusative objects. In (19a) both reference to the subject and to the accusative object is possible, while the reading with reference to the object is hardly available in (19b).

(19) a. Er
\text{nom} saw~\text{acc} sie
\text{j} nackt
\text{j}.
\[
\text{he} \text{nom} saw~\text{acc} naked
\]
b. Er
\text{nom} half~ihr
\text{j} nackt
\text{dat}.
\[
\text{he} \text{nom} helped~\text{dat} naked
\]

Haider concludes that depictive predicates can refer to NPs with structural case only. According to Haider, only nominative and accusative are structurally assigned cases in verbal environments while dative is not. As Haider notes, the contrast in (19) could be explained easily by the assumption that the subject of the predicate and the NP it refers to are identical. The fact that in German, NP subjects always have structural case explains why a depictive element cannot refer to a dative NP, because dative is taken to be a lexical case.

Wunderlich (1997, p. 131) develops an analysis for depictives that posits two different subanalyses: one for depictives that refer to the subject (VP-adjects), and another one for depictives that refer to the direct object (V-adjects). Datives (including dative objects of verbs like helfen) are assumed to be indirect objects. Therefore he predicts that reference to dative NPs is not possible. Kaufmann and Wunderlich (1998, p. 9) claim that the predication of depictive and resultative predicates over indirect objects is excluded in all languages.

While these statements refer to syntactic case, similar claims can be found with regard to semantic roles. Discussing (20), Rothstein (1985, p. 85) assumes a restriction that allows depictives in English to refer to agents and patients, but not to goals.\footnote{Rothstein (2004, p. 156) discusses a parallel example with give and an additional example provided by Fred Landman involving sell and claims that adjunct predicates cannot refer to indirect objects.}

(20) The nurse
\text{i} gave John
\text{j} the medicine sick
\text{i/j}.
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A similar claim is made by Koch and Rosengren (1995, p. 80), who claim that only reference to agent or theme is allowed.\(^{17}\) That the reference to thematic roles is not suited for the explanation of the possible antecedents was noted by Koizumi (1994, p. 46–48). His examples are given in (21a, b). Simpson (2005) provides the additional example in (21c):

(21)  
   a. They gave the patients\(_j\) the drugs drunk\(_j\).
   b. The patients\(_j\) were given the drugs drunk\(_j\).
   c. After being given the drugs drunk\(_j\), the patients\(_j\) complained.

That the exclusion of reference to datives is not a hard constraint is shown by examples like (22):

(22)  
\[
\text{Man, half ihm erst halbtot}\_i/j.\text{\textsuperscript{18}}
\]
\[
\text{one}\_\text{nom helped him}\_\text{dative only half dead}
\]
\[
\text{‘One helped him only half dead.’}
\]

In (22) the context favors the reading with reference to the dative object: since it is implausible that half dead people help others, the subject is not a plausible antecedent candidate in (22). In general, it can be said that the reference to dative NPs improves considerably if the reference to the nominative is excluded by world knowledge (Plank, 1985, p. 175).

As Christoph Schroeder (p.c. 2006) pointed out to me, the use of the indefinite pronoun \textit{man} in (22) is also a factor that improves the reference to the dative, since the subject NP is less prominent. The reference to the dative in (19b) improves further, if we passivize the sentence: In (23) the reference to the dative NP is considerably better than in (19b), where another candidate for coreference appears at the surface.

(23)  
\[
\text{Ihr, wurde nackt}\_i/j geholfen.}
\]
\[
\text{her}\_\text{dative was naked helped}
\]
\[
\text{‘She was helped naked.’}
\]

Of course, the sentence in (23) has an additional reading where the helper is naked. This reading is indicated by the \(i\)-index at \textit{nackt}, which does not appear anywhere else in the sentence.

Simpson (2005) notes that changing the polarity and modality to force a generic conditional interpretation improves reference to recipient/goal arguments. Her English example can be translated to German:

\[\text{\textsuperscript{17} On page 4 they make this claim with reference to grammatical functions, i.e. subject and direct object.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{18} Plank, 1985, p. 175.}\]
2.2 Reference to Oblique Antecedents

(24) Du kannst ihnen keine Spritzen geben.
you\textsubscript{nom} can them\textsubscript{dat} no injections\textsubscript{acc} give
‘You can’t give them injections unconscious.’

In the context of the present discussion the following example, which was provided by Plank (1985, p. 169) is interesting:

(25) Ich erinnere mich an ihn / seiner barthlos.
I remember self at him / his beardless
‘I remember him without a beard.’

This example shows that the structures in which a predicate predicates over a genitive or even an NP inside of a PP have to be licensed by a grammar. However, as far as the discussion of depictives are concerned, the example is not relevant, since it does not fall under the definition of depictives given above. The reason is that the adjective does not describe a property of the genitive object that holds during the event of remembering. The person who is remembered may be without a beard during the utterance time of (25), but this is not entailed by (25).

Corpus examples with reference to genitives or PPs are rather rare. The only example I could find is given in (26):

(26) Beim Betreten des Gehwegs sei er mit großer Wucht zu Boden geschleudert worden, wo er kurzzeitig das Bewußtsein verlor.
When he stepped onto the path he was violently thrown to the ground where he lost consciousness for a short period. While he was still on the floor he was kicked.

The rareness of such constructions is predicted by reference to the obliqueness hierarchy of Keenan and Comrie (1977): More oblique elements are more marked as antecedents of depictives. See also Nichols (1978, p. 120) on obliqueness and secondary predication.

From the data presented above it must be concluded that both the restriction on the case of possible antecedent phrases and the restriction on the thematic role of the antecedent phrase are not adequate. In what follows, I will therefore assume that the subject of the depictive predicate is coindexed, i.e. coreferent with, the antecedent phrase, rather than identical. Since datives can be antecedents of depictives, I do not assume that the subject of the depictive and the antecedent are identical, as was suggested by Haider.

\textsuperscript{19}taz, 10.06.2000, p. 21.
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2.3 Reference to Non-Arguments

NPs in adjuncts are excluded from the list of possible referents of depictives as (27) shows.

(27) a. weil Karl [neben Maria] nackt schlief.
   because Karl next Maria naked slept
   ‘because Karl slept next to Maria naked.’

b. weil [neben Maria] nackt geschlafen wurde.
   because next Maria naked slept was
   Intended: ‘because somebody slept next to Maria while she was naked.’

Even passivizing the sentence as in (27b) does not improve the reference to an element inside of the adjunct.

The following example is interesting, since it seems to contradict the statement above:

(28) Alkoholisiert geht alles viel schneller, weil bestimmte
    alcoholized goes everything much faster since certain
    Anstandsregeln außer Acht gelassen werden.
    good.manners.rules without regard let are
    ‘If one is drunk, everything happens much faster, since certain rules are
    disregarded.’

However, the sentence in (28) differs semantically from the ones involving depictive secondary predicates, as the translation indicates: the sentence does not say anything about the state of an individual during an action, that is, it does not mean that someone is drunk, while everything happens faster. The sentence in (29a) entails (29b), while the one in (30a) does not entail (30b):

(29) a. Er hilft ihr nackt.
    he helps her naked

b. Er hilft ihr.
    he helps her

(30) a. Alkoholisiert geht alles schneller.
    alcoholized goes everything much faster

b. Alles geht schneller.
    everything goes faster
    ‘Everything happens faster.’

This shows that examples like (28) belong to a different phenomenon and that they therefore do not falsify the statement that depictive secondary predicates cannot refer to non-arguments.
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2.4 Reference to Elements inside of Arguments

The reference to NPs that are internal to other NPs is also excluded, as is demonstrated by (31):20

(31) a. daß Jan [den Freund von Maria] nackt, traf.  
   that Jan the friend of Maria naked met  
   ‘that Jan met the (male) friend of Maria naked.’

   that Jan Maria’s father naked met  
   ‘that Jan met Maria’s father naked.’

   that Jan Maria naked and her friend met  
   Intended: ‘that Jan met Maria naked together with her friend.’

2.5 Linearization of Depictives with Regard to Their Antecedents

As Lötscher (1985, p. 208) pointed out, the antecedent of the depictive predicate has to precede the depictive:

(32) a. weil er, die Äpfel unwaschen, ißt  
   because he the apples unwashed eats  
   ‘because he eats the apples unwashed’  
   (He is unwashed or the apples are unwashed.)

b. weil er, unwaschen die Äpfel, ißt  
   because he unwashed the apples eats  
   ‘because he eats the apples unwashed’  
   (He is unwashed.)

c. * weil unwaschen er, der Mann, die Äpfel, ißt  
   because unwashed the man the apples eats

In example (32a) the adjective may refer to either er or to die Äpfel. In (32b) the reference to die Äpfel is excluded. Only the reading in which unwaschen refers to er is available. The example (32c) in which the depictive precedes both of the possible antecedents is ungrammatical.

There are examples like (33) that do not follow this pattern.

(33) a. weil betrunken, niemand hereinkommt  
   because drunk nobody in.comes  
   ‘because nobody gets in drunk’

20Neeleman (1994, p. 157) gives Dutch examples that are equivalent to those in (31a,b).
21von Stechow and Sternefeld, 1988, p. 466.
b. daß betrunken manchmal einer Fisch roh ißt
   that drunk sometimes someone fish raw eats
   ‘that somebody eats fish raw drunken sometimes’

Fanselow (2003, p. 227) notes that secondary predicates cannot be scrambled, but may be reordered due to a process of focus scrambling. As Haider, 1997, p. 29–30 points out the possibility of reordering of depictives is a nominative effect, that is, only depictives referring to nominatives can be placed in front of their antecedence. Since this paper does not deal with focus movement, I will ignore sentence like (33) for the rest of the paper.

### 2.6 Summary of the Data Discussion

The reference to subjects, direct objects, and indirect objects is possible. Therefore a raising analysis that identifies the subject of the depictive predicate with its antecedent is not adequate since the subject has structural case and dative objects bear lexical case. A coindexing analysis on the other hand is compatible with the data.

Reference to non-overt elements is possible and reference to adjuncts or elements embedded in arguments is not possible. So an analysis is needed that coindexes the subject of the depictive with one argument of the modified verb.

Finally, it was noted that the antecedent has to precede the depictive predicate.

### 3 A Sketch of the Analysis

I assume Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) as the underlying framework (Pollard and Sag, 1994). In HPSG a list (the SUBCAT list) is used to represent the valence information of a head. I follow Meurers (1999) and Przepiórkowski (1999) in assuming that syntactically realized elements are marked as realized, but that they are not removed from the valence list.23

As was shown in Section 2.5, the antecedent has to precede the depictive secondary predicate. This is accounted for straightforwardly, if we assume that the subject of the depictive predicate is coindexed with an unrealized element in the SUBCAT list of the verbal head it combines with. Assuming binary branching, we get the structures in (34) for the examples in (32):

---

22 Haider, 1997, p. 29

23 See also Higginbotham, 1985 and Winkler, 1997 for similar suggestions with regard to the representation of theta roles.
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(34) a. weil [er [die Äpfel [ungewaschen ißt]]].
   because he the apples unwashed eats
   ‘because he eats the apples unwashed.’
   (He is unwashed or the apples are unwashed.)

b. weil [er [ungewaschen [die Äpfel ißt]]].
   because he unwashed the apples eats
   ‘because he eats the apples unwashed.’
   (He is unwashed.)

c. * weil [ungewaschen [er / der Mann [die Äpfel ißt]]].
   because unwashed he the man the apples eats

In (34a) the depictive is directly combined with the verb and the SUBCAT list of ißt contains both the unrealized subject and the unrealized object. Therefore the account predicts that both elements are antecedent candidates for ungewaschen.

In (34b) the adjective is combined with a projection of ißt that contains the object of ißt. Therefore the object is not an unrealized element of the SUBCAT list of this projection and only the subject is a possible antecedent of ungewaschen. The analyses of the respective sentences are shown in Figure 1. The boxes mark

Figure 1: Analysis of daß er die Äpfel ungewaschen ißt and daß er ungewaschen die Äpfel ißt

identity and if a box is slashed, this represents the fact that the argument is realized.

In the example (34c), der Mann die Äpfel ißt is fully saturated. The SUBCAT list of this projection contains only realized elements. Since there is no possible antecedent for the depictive, the sentence is rejected by the grammar.

Since I assume that verb initial sentences involve a verbal trace at the position that the finite verb would occupy in verb final sentences (Müller, 2005a,b), verb initial sentences with depictives can be analyzed in parallel to their verb last counterparts:

Draft of March 14, 2008, 11:29. Comments Welcome!
(35) Ißt [er [die Äpfel [ungewaschen _i]]]? 
er eats he the apples unwashed
‘Does he eat the apples unwashed?’
(He is unwashed or the apples are unwashed.)

Since both the subject and the object are elements of the SUBCAT list of the verbal trace, both are antecedent candidates of the depictive adjective. The analysis of a verb-initial sentence that corresponds to (34b) is shown in Figure 2.

As was pointed out in Müller, 2004, analyses that assume a different branching for verb first sentence cannot use this explanation for the linearization constraints. The reason is that the arguments of the verb are saturated in a different order. In
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the analysis of *ißt er ungewaschen die Äpfel?* in Figure 3, the description corresponding to *er* is marked as realized when *ißt er* is combined with *ungewaschen*.

The advantage of the analysis sketched above over the one suggested in Müller, 2004 is that it can be extended to English. Müller, 2004 assumed the classical mode of valance representation that is suggested by Pollard and Sag (1994). In Pollard and Sag’s treatment of valence representation arguments that are combined with their head are not represented in the SUBCAT list of the mother node. This means that maximal projections have empty SUBCAT lists. As a consequence of this the SUBCAT list of the VPs in (36) is the empty list, which means that there is no element left for coindexing.

(36) a. John [[VP ate the apples] unwashed].
   b. You can’t [[VP give them injections] unconscious].

However, in the approach presented above, both information about realized and unrealized arguments is contained in the SUBCAT list and hence, English examples like (36) can be analyzed as well. English and German differ as far as the requirements with respect to the syntactic realization of the antecedents of depictive predicates are concerned: while in German antecedents have to be unrealized, English allows both realized and unrealized elements as antecedents.

### 4 Conclusion

I developed an analysis of depictive secondary predicates that does not rely on discontinuous constituents as the one suggested in Müller, 2002. Since discontinuous constituents are a very powerful device, an approach that can avoid them is favorable.

The analysis can explain why antecedents have to precede the depictive predicates without referring to linear precedence rules, which were shown to be difficult to formalize (Müller, 2004), since coindexing of arguments is involved and reflexives may interfere. The analysis is an improvement of Müller, 2004, since it allows for extensions for languages like English.

The analysis is part of an implemented fragment of German, which can be downloaded at [http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/Fragments/Berligram/](http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/Fragments/Berligram/).
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of the secondary predicates in English and that Case Filter is satisfied by the transitive-like properties of the matrix verbs. In sum, the subjects of the secondary predicates in English are Case-marked and the case of these subjects is assigned/checked by the matrix verbs governing the subjects. 3 Small Clauses in Korean. Thus English and Korean may be parameterized with regard to the default Case strategy: English does not allow default Case strategy, while Korean does allow it. In the case of secondary predication, English employs Raising to Case position (see Bowers 1993, 1997, 2001) or Resultative Formation (see Kim and Maling 1997) to satisfy Case Filter. Korean does not employ these apparatuses since it allows default strategy. Two types: resultative and depictive predication - secondary predicates are aspectual modifiers introduce new event and define a relation between it and the event introduced by the main predicate. 1.2 Canonical cases of depictive and resultative predication. (1) a. John drove the car drunk b. Mary drank the coffee hot c. John painted the house red. (depictive) (resultative) (resultative). subject-oriented object-oriented object-oriented. all examples: Rothstein, 2004. 1.3 Object-predication vs. subject-predication. Simpson, 1983: resultatives can be predicated only of Odır, cf. (1c.) â†’ res