

THE FAMILY OF SECONDARY PREDICATIONS IN ENGLISH: AN FDG VIEW

J. Lachlan Mackenzie
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, ILTEC Lisboa

ABSTRACT

In descriptions of English and other languages, different constructions have been characterized as 'secondary predications'. Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt stand back from the description of individual languages and identify a family of secondary-predication constructions all of which involve both an addition to a simple predication and a semantic overlap with one of the participants in that simple predication. The present article re-interprets their typological categorization within the strict FDG system of levels and layers and shows, with reference to English, how the distinctions permitted by that system align with the formal properties of the respective constructions. The following constructions are treated: (a) strong free adjuncts; (b) weak free adjuncts; (c) depictives; (d) adverbial modifiers; (e) others, namely circumstantials, quasi-copulars and complementatives. It emerges that each construction has its own analysis within FDG, reflecting different degrees of integration of the 'secondary predication' into the primary one.

KEY WORDS: Functional Discourse Grammar, secondary predication, adjunct, depictive, focus, scope, modifier.

RESUMEN

En descripciones del inglés así como de otros idiomas, distintas construcciones se han caracterizado como "predicaciones secundarias". Himmelmann y Schultze-Berndt trascienden la descripción de lenguas individuales, identificando una familia de construcciones caracterizadas todas ellas por implicar tanto una adición a una predicación simple como una correspondencia semántica con uno de los participantes en dicha predicación simple. El presente artículo reinterpreta la categorización tipológica propuesta por los autores citados dentro del estricto sistema de niveles y estratos de la GDF y muestra, con referencia al inglés, cómo las distinciones permitidas por dicho sistema se alinean con las propiedades formales de las respectivas construcciones. Las construcciones analizadas son las siguientes: (a) las formadas por un complemento circunstancial libre fuerte, (b) las formadas por un complemento circunstancial libre débil, (c) las "depictivas", (d) las formadas por un modificador adverbial, (e) otras, concretamente, las formadas por circunstanciales de tiempo, las cuasi-copulativas y las "complementativas". Se desprende que cada construcción tiene su propio análisis dentro de la GDF, reflejando distintos grados de integración de la "predicación secundaria" en la primaria.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Gramática Discursivo-Funcional, predicación secundaria, complemento circunstancial, construcción depictiva, foco, ámbito, modificador.



1. INTRODUCTION

Functional Discourse Grammar (FDG; Hengeveld and Mackenzie), as the name suggests, takes a unitary view of the internal and external structure of discourse units.¹ Just as these are combined in the process of forming discourse, so they themselves can be internally composed of combinations of units. The combinations are described at four different levels of the grammar, which deal with the pragmatic, semantic, morphosyntactic and phonological properties, respectively, of each. The purpose of this article is to offer a first examination of the family of secondary predications in English, showing how an FDG analysis illuminates their combination into primary predications. In keeping with the typological orientation of FDG, which seeks to provide analyses that are adequate to the range of variation observed across languages, the article will take as its basic inspiration the lengthy introduction to Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt, which gives a reasoned cross-linguistic overview of various constructions that cluster around the notion of 'secondary predication'. The present article will, however, focus on English.

Sections 2 and 3 will provide an initial scouting of the field, gradually introducing the FDG notions of interpersonal and representational levels of analysis and elucidating the notational conventions of the theory. Section 4 then presents Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt's taxonomy of relevant constructions. The body of the article is found in Section 5, which, subsection by subsection, develops an FDG approach to each of the constructions. Section 6 offers a brief conclusion.

2. COMBINATIONS AT THE INTERPERSONAL LEVEL

The most elemental type of combination in discourse comes from the cooperative exchanges of interlocutors in dialogue. A greeting that provokes another greeting in response, a question that gets an answer, a rebuke that engenders an apology, each of these interactive pairings is dealt with at the Interpersonal Level of FDG as a combination of Moves (M_1 , M_2). Each Move, in turn, can consist of one or more Discourse Acts, as in (1):

- (1) Bill, you've slimmed down, haven't you?

¹ I gratefully acknowledge financial support from the grants INCITE09 204 155PR (XUGA) and FFI2010-19380 (MINECO) awarded by the Xunta de Galicia and the Spanish Ministerio of Economía y Competitividad, respectively. My thanks go to Miriam Taverniers for very useful bibliographical suggestions, to Casper de Groot for useful comments and to Jacques François for encouraging me to join him in a presentation of the ideas underlying this article to the Journées d'Etudes "*La Prédication : notion inutile ou indispensable?*" organized at the Université Lyon II, 17-18 January 2013.

In interactional terms, (1) functions as a Move (by the Speaker, directed at Bill). The three Discourse Acts that make up the Move have distinct functions (Vocative, Declarative, Interrogative), with the second being Nuclear and the first and the third Dependent: the Vocative serves to prepare Bill for the essence of the Move and the ‘checking tag’, the form of which is entirely dependent on that of the preceding clause, serves to elicit a reaction to the Speaker’s observation. In FDG, the presence of multiple Discourse Acts within a Move at the Interpersonal Level is shown as follows:

$$(2) \quad (M_I: [(A_I)_{Dep} (A_J)_{Nucl} (A_K)_{Dep}] (M_I))$$

Here the Move, with the subscript ‘I’, is introduced and then, after the semi-colon, is specified as consisting of three Discourse Acts, symbolized as A, with the subscripts ‘I’, ‘J’ and ‘K’ respectively. The three Discourse Acts form a configuration (always enclosed within square brackets) and each is marked for its rhetorical function as either Nuclear or Dependent. FDG is interested in how such dependencies are expressed, seeking correlations between the structures posited at the Interpersonal Level and aspects of the structures identified at the Morphosyntactic and Phonological Levels. In the case of (1), it is the morphosyntax that will take care of the form of (A_K), through the application of agreement processes (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 350-352), while the phonology will ensure the separation of the three Discourse Acts into three Intonational Phrases, each with its own characteristic prosody.

The principles of analysis explained here apply throughout the FDG approach to grammar. Each Discourse Act, for example, consists of a configuration of—in the case of a fully developed Discourse Act like (A_J)—Illocution (F), Speaker (P_I), Addressee (P_J) and Communicated Content (C), and the Communicated Content in turn consists of a configuration of Subacts. These Subacts come in two types, Subacts of Reference (R) and Subacts of Ascription (A): in (A_J), ‘you’ corresponds to a referential and ‘slim down’ to an ascriptional subact. All this is represented as follows:

$$(3) \quad (A_J: [(F_I: DECL (F_I)) (P_I) (P_J) (C_I: [(T_I) (R_I: (P_J) (R_I))] (C_I))] (A_J))$$

Here the Discourse Act is introduced and then specified after the semi-colon as a declarative Illocution (F_I: DECL (F_I)), as involving Speaker and Addressee and as having a Communicated Content that involves one Subact each of ascription and reference; the reference in this case is to the Addressee (P_J).

What has been exemplified here relates to the Interpersonal Level of analysis, which deals with all the grammatically relevant aspects of verbal interaction, notably such matters as the exchange of Moves in dialogue and the articulation of discourse activity into discrete Acts, illocution, reference and predication (known in FDG



as ‘ascription’).² The Nuclear vs. Dependent relation exemplified in (2) above can also apply at each of the lower layers of analysis that we have distinguished, now analysed as a matter of modification. One way in which modification can manifest itself is through the addition of adverbials. For example, the style of a Discourse Act can be indicated by an adverbial like *in a word*; the honesty of an Illocution by an adverb like *sincerely*; or the speaker’s commitment to a Communicated Content by an adverb like *really*, cf.

- (4) a. *In a word*, fantastic.
b. *Sincerely*, you’re looking so much better.
c. He *really* should get that work done.

Modifiers are represented after a further semi-colon. The Illocution in (4a), for example, will be shown as ((F_i: DECL (F_i): in_a_word (F_i))

One type of modifier that has attracted some special attention within FDG occurs where the speaker relays information that comes from some other source than the speaker’s own cognition; s/he uses the modifier to indicate that s/he is not responsible for the information (cf. Hengeveld and Dall’Aglio Hattner §3.2). These are modifiers like *allegedly*, *reportedly*, *it is said*, or *according to Petra*. They are taken in FDG to apply at the Communicated Content layer, reflecting a particular type of evidentiality called reportativity. If a dependent unit contains a reportative modifier, that unit must be analysed as a Communicated Content and must therefore be in a relationship to its nucleus that is specified at the Interpersonal Level. We will return to this point when considering the data in §5.1 below.

3. COMBINATIONS AT THE REPRESENTATIONAL LEVEL

Whereas, as we have seen, the Interpersonal Level deals with all the formal aspects of a linguistic unit that reflect its role in the interaction between the Speaker and the Addressee, the Representational Level deals with all the remaining aspects of meaning, those that reflect how the language under description organizes denotation. This level of analysis is organized hierarchically into layers in the same way as the Interpersonal Level, with each layer having its characteristic modifiers. The layers of the Representational Level are as follows, with modifiers typical of each layer:

- (a) Propositional Content (p)—*clearly*
(b) Episode (ep)—*yesterday*

² The fact that the term ‘predication’ only applies within FDG at the Interpersonal Level and then under the name ‘ascription’ means that the expression ‘secondary predication’ is not particularly suitable from an FDG perspective (although of course, as Casper de Groot reminds me, both the primary and the secondary predications involve ascription). Nevertheless, it will be retained here because of its familiarity.

- (c) State-of-Affairs (e)—*after dinner*
- (d) Configurational Property (f^c) —*with a knife*
- (e) Lexical Property (f^l)—*extremely*
- (f) Individual (x)—*large*
- (g) Location (l)—*very* (as in ‘the very top of the tree’)
- (h) Time (t)—*very* (as in ‘the very moment I arrived’)
- (i) Manner (m)—*very* (as in ‘very neatly’)
- (j) Quantity (q)—*generous* (as in ‘a generous dose of medicine’)
- (k) Reason (r)—*apparent* (as in ‘the apparent reason for his leaving’)

The relations among (a) to (d) are hierarchical, whereas those among (e) to (k) are configurational. Thus (5) will be analysed at this Level as (6):

- (5) He clearly attacked her yesterday after dinner with a knife.
- (6) (p_i: (Past ep_i: (e_i: (f^c_i: [(f^l_i: attack (f^l_i)) (x_i)_A (x_i)_U] (f^c_i):—with a knife—(f^c_i)) (e_i): —after dinner— (e_i)) (ep_i: yesterday (ep_i)) (p_i): clear (p_i))³

The hierarchical structure shows the layer at which each of the modifiers is situated, while the relation among the lexical property (f^l_i) and the two individuals (x_i) and (x_i) is shown to be configurational and is enclosed between square brackets, just as in (2) and (3) above.

Where what is being communicated is, as in (5), a meaning that may be true or not and which is subject to modifiers like *clearly*, which emphasizes the obviousness of the truth, then all the layers seen in (6) must be present. This can also apply where the unit is embedded inside another unit, as in (7):

- (7) We believed that he had clearly attacked her the day before after dinner with a knife.

However, FDG also allows for the possibility that embedding, the inclusion of one semantic unit inside another, involves the embedded element having less than the full structure shown in (6). The impossibility of using a modifier that is typical of a particular layer is taken to indicate that the entire layer is absent. Consider (8), in which the extraposed subject of *happen* (italicized in the example) cannot be analysed as a Propositional Content, as is evident from the impossibility of adding *clearly*:

- (8) It happened that he (*clearly) attacked her yesterday after dinner with a knife.

³ As is standard in FDG, segments of analyses that (in the interests of clarity) are not fully developed are placed between dashes (cf. Hengeveld and Mackenzie 43).



In the corresponding FDG analysis, the italicized section will be analysed as (9), with no (p)-layer:

- (9) (Past ep_i : (e_i : (f_i^c : [(f_i^f : attack (f_i^f)) (x_i)_A (x_i)_U] (f_i^c):—with a knife—(f_i^c)) (e_i): after dinner— (e_i)) (ep_i): yesterday (ep_i))

This principle applies throughout the Representational Level, and the acceptability of modifiers is one way of telling whether layers need to be stripped off and, if so, how many. This will also be important for the analysis of the family of secondary predications.

4. HIMMELMANN AND SCHULTZE-BERNDT'S CLASSIFICATION OF 'PARTICIPANT-ORIENTED ADJUNCTS'

The major overview to date of secondary predications is that offered by Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt. They identify a cluster of constructions, which they call 'participant-oriented adjuncts' and which all involve:

- (a) an addition to a simple predication—hence the terms 'secondary predication' and 'adjunct';
- (b) a semantic overlap with one of the participants in the simple predication—hence the term 'participant-oriented'.

Let us consider an example:

- (10) The teacher left the room *angry*.

Here the 'secondary predication' (indicated in italics) is an addition to the simple predication *The teacher left the room*; one of the participants in the simple predication is also a semantic argument of *angry*; and *angry* depicts the state in which the teacher was. Notice, a point that will reveal its importance in §5.5.1, that in this construction the state is temporary (**The teacher left the room bald*) and, another point that will come back in §5.5.1, that in certain constructions the overlapping participant is not always the subject of the simple predication:

- (11) The teacher ate the meat raw.

The family of participant-oriented adjunct constructions (POA constructions) identified by Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt has five members, which they identify as follows: (a) strong free adjuncts; (b) weak free adjuncts; (c) depictives; (d) adverbial modifiers; (e) others, including 'circumstantial' and quasi-copular constructions. Here, with the POAs identified in italics, are examples of each; (16c) has been added on the basis of a suggestion by Van der Auwera and Malchukov (407):



- (12) **Strong free adjunct:** *Irritated by management's attitudes*, the trades union negotiators abandoned the meeting.
- (13) **Weak free adjunct:** *Angry* (,) he cannot be trusted.
- (14) **Depictives:** The negotiators abandoned the meeting *angry*.
- (15) **Adverbial modifiers:** The negotiators abandoned the meeting *angrily*.
- (16) (a) **Circumstantials:** He drinks his coffee *lukewarm*.
 (b) **Quasi-copulars:** He lay *dead* in the next room.
 (c) **Complementatives:** I saw the teacher *angry*.

From an FDG perspective, all of these phenomena (with the exception of (16c), as we shall see) can be regarded as modifiers. The question that immediately arises is: modifiers of what? Modifiers at which level and at which layer? As was mentioned in §2 above, one way for an FDG analyst to answer these questions is through the addition of further adjuncts whose modifying scope has already been determined.

5. ANALYSING THE PARTICIPANT-ORIENTED ADJUNCT CONSTRUCTIONS

5.1. STRONG FREE ADJUNCTS

Let us begin by considering the modifier *allegedly*, which is independently known to modify Communicated Contents at the Interpersonal Level. Application to the data in (12) to (16) shows that addition of *allegedly* can only be applied to (12), see (17) and—as an example which can stand for all the remaining PAO constructions—(18):

- (17) *Allegedly irritated by management's attitudes*, the trades union negotiators abandoned the meeting.
- (18) **Allegedly angry*, he cannot be trusted.

Notice that *allegedly angry* is not in itself an impossible combination, but that the combination cannot serve as a strong free adjunct. What (17) indicates is that the relation between the strong free adjunct applies at the Interpersonal Level and more specifically that the modifier applies to the Communication Content, as shown in (19):

- (19) $(A_I: [(F_I: \text{DECL} (F_I)) (P_I) (P_I) (C_I: [(T_I)_{\text{Foc}} (R_I) (R_I)])] (C_I): (C_J: [(T_J)_{\text{Foc}} (R_K)]) (C_J): \text{alleged} (C_J)) (C_I)] (A_I))$

This analysis shows (17) to express a single Discourse Act (A_I), the single Communicated Content of which, (C_I), contains a modifying Communicated Content (C_J), which itself contains the modifier 'alleged'. Notice that (C_I) is not in the scope of 'alleged', which correctly indicates that the speaker of (17) is relaying the



allegation that the negotiators were irritated but is stating on his/her own authority that they abandoned the meeting. The conclusion from (19) is that the FDG analysis of (12) at the Interpersonal Level is as follows, i.e. (19) without the modifier of (C_j):

- (20) (A_i: [(F_i: DECL (F_j)) (P_i) (P_j) (C_i: [(T_i)_{Foc} (R_i) (R_j))] (C_j: (C_j: [(T_j)_{Foc} (R_k))] (C_j)) (C_j)) (A_j))

The reader will have observed that the identity between the understood argument of the subact of ascription ‘irritated’, corresponding to (T_j) in (20), is absent. In other words, (R_i), corresponding to ‘the negotiators’, does not return in (C_j); (R_k) is a reference to ‘management’s attitudes’. This is because in FDG, the Interpersonal Level represents what the speaker does, not what s/he means (cf. Hengeveld and Mackenzie 109). The semantic overlap referred to above is shown at the Representational Level, where each of the Communicated Contents is analysed as a Propositional Content. Justification for the analysis of the ‘strong free adjunct’ as a Propositional Content can be gained from (21), in which it has its own propositional modifier:

- (21) Clearly irritated by management’s attitudes, the negotiators abandoned the meeting.
- (22) (a) (p_i: (Past ep_i: (e_i: (f_i^c: [(f_i¹:—irritated by management’s attitudes—(f_i¹)) (mx_i)_U] (f_i¹)) (e_i)) (ep_i)) (p_i: clear (p_i))
- (b) (p_j: (Past ep_j: (e_j: (f_j^c: [(f_j¹: abandon (f_j¹)) (mx_j: (f_k¹: negotiator (f_k¹)) (x_i)_A) (e_j: (f_i¹: meeting (f_i¹)) (e_j)_U] (f_j¹)) (e_j)) (ep_j)) (p_j))

(22a) and (22b) co-exist but are not linked through modification or in any other way at the Representational Level; as we saw, ‘strong free adjuncts’ are attached at the Interpersonal Level. As one might predict, it is possible to add *allegedly* to the adjunct, giving (23):

- (23) Allegedly clearly irritated by management’s attitudes, the negotiators abandoned the meeting.

This kind of multiple modification is often used in FDG as an analytical tool (cf. Hengeveld and Mackenzie 313, for a representative example). The expectation is that Interpersonal Level modifiers will occupy a more peripheral position at the Morphosyntactic Level than Representational Level, and this is borne out by (23); cf. **Clearly allegedly* ...

The conclusion from this analysis of strong free adjuncts is that the relationship between the modifier and the modified is a rhetorical rather than semantic one. As is shown in (20), each Communicated Content has its own Focus (a pragmatic function shown by the subscript Foc). Correspondingly, the semantic restrictions that characterize more intimately linked adjuncts do not apply, for example the requirement that the modified predication be dynamic, compare (24) and (25):



- (24) *Irritated by management's attitudes*, the trades union negotiators felt hopeless.
(strong free adjunct)
- (25) a. The trades union negotiators abandoned the meeting irritated. (depictive)
b. *The trades union negotiators felt hopeless irritated.

5.2. WEAK FREE ADJUNCTS

Let us now apply the principles exemplified above to the analysis of the next member of the family, the weak free adjunct. Here and in all the remaining cases, the intonational separation that is characteristic of strong free adjuncts is absent: at the Phonological Level, the adjuncts in question are integrated into the ambient Intonational Phrase, appearing as at most a Phonological Phrase. This greater integration reflects the fact that—as evidenced by the impossibility of adding *allegedly* with scope over the adjunct only—the relation between the adjunct and its host is semantic. The question that arises, then, is to which layer of the Representational Level the different adjunct types should be ascribed.

With the weak free adjunct, exemplified in (13), repeated here for convenience, the comma may be either present or absent in writing (cf. Himmelmann and Schulze-Berndt 22), but the fact that in phonological terms the adjunct is part of the same Intonation Phrase supports the analysis of all of (13) as a single Discourse Act at the Interpersonal Level:

- (13) *Angry* (,) he cannot be trusted.

Turning to the semantics, we observe that *angry* indicates a temporary characteristic and the combination indicates that when that temporary characteristic applies the situation in the main clause also applies. The relationship is thus one of Time (one of the semantic categories distinguished above). Since the times of the anger and the untrustworthiness are simultaneous, the relation is one of 'relative tense' (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 173-174) and therefore applies at the State-of-Affairs layer of the Representational Level. The proposed analysis is therefore as in (26):

- (26) $(p_i: (\text{Pres } e_p: (\text{sim neg } e_i: (f_i: [(f_i^1: \text{---can be trusted---}(f_i^1)) (mx_{i,U})] (f_i^1)) (e_i): (t_i: (\text{sim } e_j: (f_j: [(f_j^1: \text{angry } (f_j^1)) (x_{i,U})] (f_j^1)) (e_j)) (t_{i,L}) (e_i)) (ep_i)) (p_i))$

This indicates that the absolute time is that of the present tense, and that within the episode marked as Pres, the state-of-affairs (e_i) of 'his not being trustworthy' is located (subscript L) at a time (t_i) characterized by another, simultaneous state-of-affairs (e_j) of his being angry. The semantic function L(ocation) is left unexpressed but the combination ($t_{i,L}$) may also be expressed as *when*, as in (27), which is semantically equivalent to (13):

- (27) *When angry* (,) he cannot be trusted.



Note, too, that the state-of-affairs (e_i) is negated by the operator *neg* while the state-of-affairs (e_j) is not. This means that trustworthiness has negative polarity when *angriness* has positive polarity, which is exactly how (13) is understood.

5.3. DEPICTIVES

We now move on to depictives,⁴ which are generally never separated off by a comma and are prosodically integrated into the ongoing Intonation Phrase, as illustrated in (14), repeated here for convenience:

(14) The negotiators abandoned the meeting *angry*.

With this construction, negation acts quite differently. Any negation of the state-of-affairs automatically extends to the secondary predication. Consider the interpretation of (28):

(28) The negotiators didn't abandon the meeting *angry*.

There are two possible understandings here: (a) the negotiators did not abandon the meeting despite being angry; (b) the negotiators did abandon the meeting but not because they were angry. In both understandings it is the combination of 'abandoning the meeting' and 'being angry' that is negated and therefore both will be analysed in the same way at the Representational Level. The difference between (a) and (b) lies in the assignment of Focus at the Interpersonal Level: a negative operator is always understood as applying to the elements in Focus, so that the interpretation results from the two levels operating in concert. The inclusion of both elements under the negation of the state-of-affairs is possible only if the depictive is integrated into that state-of-affairs.

It is here that the configurational property (f^c) comes into play. In FDG, every state-of-affairs (e_i) is expanded as either a lexical property (f^l)—as with 'meeting' in (22b)—or as a configurational property (f^c), where the state-of-affairs involves a configuration, typically a configuration of an n-place property and its n arguments. If the depictive is analysed as a configurational property, then the hierarchical structure of the Representational Level will ensure that it is included inside the scope of any negative operator on the state-of-affairs, as (29), the analysis of (28), makes clear:

⁴ See Hengeveld and Mackenzie (209) for an initial analysis of depictives. See also De Groot for an FDG approach to depictives in Hungarian, where it is claimed that they constitute separate Discourse Acts, much as has been proposed here for strong free adjuncts in English.



- (29) $(p_i: (Past\ ep_i: (neg\ e_i: (f_i^c: [(f_i^l: abandon\ (f_i^l)) (mx_i: (f_i^l: negotiator\ (f_i^l)) (x_i)_A (e_i: (f_i^k: meeting\ (f_i^k)) (e_j)_U] (f_i^c)) (e_j: (f_i^c: [(f_i^l: angry\ (f_i^l)) (x_i)_U] (f_i^c)) (e_i)) (ep_i)) (p_i))$

As was observed above, (28) has two senses, according to the distribution of Focus; thus, corresponding to (p_i) at the Representational Level, there will be (C_i) at the Interpersonal Level with two distributions of Focus:

- (30) a. $(C_i: [(T_i)_{Foc} (T_j)_{Foc} (R_i) (R_j)_{Foc} (C_i)])$
 b. $(C_i: [(T_i) (T_j)_{Foc} (R_i) (R_j)] (C_i))$
 where $(T_i) = \text{'abandon'}$
 $(T_j) = \text{'angry'}$
 $(R_i) = \text{'the negotiators'}$
 $(R_j) = \text{'the meeting'}$

One prediction following from the analysis exemplified in (29) is that any modifier of the state-of-affairs will include the depictive in its scope. Event quantification (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 179-180), for example *usually*, has been established as modifying states-of-affairs. We therefore can predict—correctly—that *usually* in (31) takes the depictive in its scope, since the meaning is that is normal for the teacher to be drunk when driving home:

- (31) The teacher usually drives home drunk.
 (32) $(p_i: (Pres\ ep_i: (e_i: (f_i^c: [(f_i^l: drive\ (f_i^l)) (x_i: (f_i^l: teacher\ (f_i^l)) (x_i)_A (l_i: (f_i^k: home\ (f_i^k)) (l_i)_L] (f_i^c)) (e_j: (f_i^c: [(f_i^l: drunk\ (f_i^l)) (x_i)_U] (f_i^c)) (e_i: (f_i^m: usual\ (f_i^m)) (e_i))$

5.4. ADVERBIAL MODIFIERS

It has often been observed that there is a rather close relation between depictives and manner adverbials. In Dutch and German, there is no morphological marking of adverbs; in fact, Hengeveld and Mackenzie (228) only recognize a lexical class of 'modifiers' in such languages (languages with parts-of-speech system 3) rather than distinguishing between adjectives and adverbs. Thus examples (14) and (15), repeated here for convenience, cannot be distinguished in Dutch and German (cf. Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt 2-3):

- (14) The negotiators abandoned the meeting *angry*. (depictive)
 (15) The negotiators abandoned the meeting *angrily*. (manner adverbial)
 (33) De onderhandelaars verlieten *woedend* de vergadering.
 (34) Die Unterhändler verließen *wütend* das Treffen.

In English, the difference is a matter of what 'angry' applies to: in the depictive it applies, as (29) and (32) make clear, to the individual; in the manner adverbial, however, it applies to the full configurational property. In (14) it is the negotiators'



inner emotional state that is being described, while in (15) one can imagine them throwing their papers on the floor and slamming the door! This is supported by the fact that (15), but not (14), entails (35):

(35) The negotiators' abandonment of the meeting was angry.

This suggests that the correct representation of (15) is as in (37), which is subtly but crucially different from the analysis of (14) in (36)—the difference is indicated in bold:

- (36) (p_i: (Past ep_i: (e_i: (f_i: [(f_i: abandon (f_i)) (mx_i: (f_i: negotiator (f_i)) (x_i)) (e_i: (f_k: meeting (f_k)) (e_j))_U] (f_i)) (e_i: (f_j: [(f_i: angry (f_i)) (x_i))_U] (f_j)) (e_i) (ep_i)) (p_i))
- (37) (p_i: (Past ep_i: (e_i: (f_i: [(f_i: abandon (f_i)) (mx_i: (f_i: negotiator (f_i)) (x_i))_A] (e_i: (f_k: meeting (f_k)) (e_j))_U] (f_i)) (e_i: (f_j: [(f_i: angry (f_i)) (**f_i**)_U] (f_j)) (e_i) (ep_i)) (p_i))

Corresponding differences will apply in Dutch and German, but without any effect at the Morphosyntactic Level (where *-ly* is affixed in English).⁵

Combinations of depictives and weak free adjuncts are (at least theoretically) possible, as in (38):

(38) He always leaves meetings angry drunk.

FDG predicts that a more peripheral syntactic position of a modifier correlates with a higher position in the hierarchy of the Representational Level (Hengeveld and Mackenzie 313-316). This correlates with the less peripheral placement of the configurational-property-modifying depictive *angry* than of the state-of-affairs-modifying weak free adjunct *drunk*. *He always leaves meetings drunk angry* could correspondingly only mean that when he is angry he always leaves meetings in an inebriated condition.

5.5. OTHERS

It remains for us to consider the constructions exemplified in (16), repeated here for convenience:

(16) (a) **Circumstantial:** He ate his meat *raw*.

⁵ That the difference is real in Dutch and German is suggested by the fact that in subordinate clauses the depictive generally cannot occupy medial position: ... *dat de onderhandelaars woedend de vergadering verlieten* and ... *dass die Unterhändler wütend das Treffen verließen* can only be understood as involving a manner adverb.



- (b) **Quasi-copulars:** He lay *dead* in the next room.
 (c) **Complementatives:** I saw the teacher *angry*.

5.5.1. *Circumstantials*

Circumstantials may appear similar to weak free adjuncts (and are in fact identified with them by Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt 3), but in my view they differ, as do depictives, in answering the question ‘How?’ rather than ‘When?’ Notice, correspondingly, that the word *when*—which can be added to weak free adjuncts—cannot be added to a circumstantial: **He ate his meat when raw*. Rather, the closest similarity seems to be to depictives. There is a tendency for depictives to overlap semantically with the Actor (abbreviated as A in the representations) and circumstantials with the Undergoer (abbreviated as U),⁶ but this tendency is not failsafe, consider (39) and (40):

- (39) Gareth painted his wife naked. (depictive)
 (40) Agnes drove the car uninsured. (circumstantial)

Uninsured and *naked* here could relate to either Actor or Undergoer.⁷ The difference, I would submit, has to do with an aspectual feature of the participant-oriented adjunct. As mentioned in §4 above, depictives indicate temporary properties, known in the literature since Carlson as ‘stage-level’; circumstantials, by contrast, indicate characteristic, or ‘individual-level’, properties—they typify the individual to which they apply. Properties like *naked* and *angry* are typical stage-level properties, while *raw* and *uninsured* are individual-level. Of course, meat could cease being raw by being cooked and a person or car could cease to be uninsured by getting insurance, but the property is not presented as a temporary one. The adverb *temporarily* can be added to depictives but not to circumstantials:

- (41) The teacher left the room temporarily angry.
 (42) *He ate the meat temporarily raw.

If this is correct, then the difference between depictives and circumstantials resides at the lexical property level (f'). Let us provisionally represent the aktionsart feature stage-level/individual-level as subscripts SL and IL respectively on the lexical property. This then yields the following analysis for (16a):

⁶ This is reflected in the generative literature, which has tended to analyse depictives and circumstantials as subject-oriented and object-oriented secondary predications respectively (cf. Legendre).

⁷ Consider also Ardid-Gumiel’s (1) Spanish example *El veterinario me devolvió el gato enfurruñado* (The vet gave me the cat back sulky). Her article contains an excellent study of the individual-level/stage-level contrast in Spanish.



- (43) (p_i: (Past ep_i: (e_i: (f_i: [(f_i: eat (f_i)) (x_i)_A (x_j:—his meat—(x_j)_U] (f_j)) (e_j: (f_j: [(f_j: raw_{IL} (f_j)) (x_j)_U] (f_j)) (e_j)) (ep_j)) (p_j))

And the following revised analysis for (14):

- (44) (p_i: (Past ep_i: (e_i: (f_i: [(f_i: abandon (f_i)) (mx_i: (f_j: negotiator (f_j)) (x_j)_A (e_j: (f_j: meeting (f_k)) (e_j)_U] (f_i)) (e_j: (f_j: [(f_j: angry_{SL} (f_j)) (x_j)_U] (f_j)) (e_j)) (ep_j)) (p_j))

5.5.2. Quasi-copulars

The construction seen in (16b), repeated here for convenience, is qualified as quasi-copular because what appears to be the participant-adjunct, *dead*, is felt not to modify *lay* but rather to be the major property attributed to the subject:

- (16b) He lay dead in the next room.

Arguably, examples like these show the greatest degree of integration of secondary predications, so much integration that the erstwhile main verb (*lay*) is reduced to a localizing copula (cf. Hengeveld, *Non-verbal* 242-243; Hengeveld, “Meaningless”). The result of the grammaticalization in question may be represented as in (45), where *lie* is assumed to be introduced at the Morphosyntactic Level, in keeping with the FDG approach to copulas as grammatical morphemes (cf. Hengeveld and Mackenzie 392):

- (45) (p_i: (Past ep_i: (e_i: (f_i: [(f_i: dead (f_i)) (x_i)_U] (f_i)) (e_j: (l_i: (f_i: -next room- (f_j)) (l_i)_L (e_j)) (ep_j)) (p_j))

5.5.3. Complementatives

Finally, the construction shown in (16c) and repeated here for convenience, is identified by Van der Auwera and Malchukov (406-409) as ‘complementative’ since what appears to be a participant-oriented adjunct here, *angry*, is omissible but also forms part of a complement, i.e. an argument of the verb *see*:

- (16c) I saw the teacher angry.

Such examples will accordingly not be given the same representation as depictives or circumstantials: *the teacher angry* will be taken to express a state-of-affairs seen by the speaker, as shown in (46):

- (46) (p_i: (Past ep_i: (e_i: (f_i: [(f_i: see (f_i)) (x_i)_A (e_j: (f_j: [(f_j: angry (f_j)) (x_i: (f_j: teacher (f_j)) (x_j)_U] (f_j)) (e_j))] (f_i)) (e_j)) (ep_j)) (p_j))



6. OVERVIEW AND CONCLUSION

This article has aimed to give a first overview of a range of constructions that share enough properties to be regarded as a ‘nuclear family’. Other constructions exist that may be seen as ‘cousins’, for example resultatives like *She painted the barn red*, positionals like *John arrived at work, keen to get started* or others like *They came running*, but these have had to be left out of consideration for reasons of space. It has emerged that those constructions that we have been able to treat each have their own analysis within FDG, reflecting different degrees of integration of the ‘secondary predication’ into the primary one. Whereas ‘strong free adjuncts’ are linked at the Interpersonal Level, all the others are linked at the Representational Level: ‘weak free adjuncts’ at the state-of-affairs layer (e-layer) and ‘depictives’ at the configurational property layer (f^c-layer). ‘Adverbial modifiers’ are also integrated at the f^c-layer, but differ in taking the configurational property (f^c) rather than an individual (x) as their argument. ‘Circumstantials’ were argued to differ from ‘depictives’ in terms of having individual-level rather than stage-level lexical properties (fⁱ). The argument has thus shown the strengths of FDG as displaying strong stratification in its meaning representations. What remains to be investigated, profiting from the rich vein of literature on this subject from various perspectives, are the semantic restrictions on each of the constructions.

WORKS CITED

- ARDID-GUMIEL, Ana. “The Syntax of Depictives, Subjects, Modes of Judgements and I-L/S-L Properties.” *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 26 (2001). Ed. Nina Zhang. <http://www.zas.gwz-berlin.de/fileadmin/material/ZASPIL_Volltexte/zp26/zaspil26-ardid-gumbiel.pdf>.
- CARLSON, Greg. *Reference to Kinds in English*. New York: Garland, 1977.
- GROOT, Casper de. “Oriented Adjuncts and Representational Frames: Depictives and Manner in Hungarian.” *Between West and East: Festschrift for Wim Honselaar, on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Ed. René Genis and Eric de Haard. Amsterdam: Pegasus, 2012. 217-239.
- HENGEVELD, Kees. “Meaningless Words.” *Alfinge* 9 (1997): 171-186.
- . *Non-Verbal Predication: Theory, Typology, Diachrony*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992.
- HENGEVELD, Kees, and Marize DALL’AGLIO HATTNER. “Four Types of Evidentiality in Native Languages of Brazil.” Forthcoming.
- HENGEVELD, Kees, and J. Lachlan MACKENZIE. *Functional Discourse Grammar: A Typologically-Based Theory of Language Structure*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
- HIMMELMANN, Nikolaus P., and Eva SCHULTZE-BERNDT. “Issues in the Syntax and Semantics of Participant-Oriented Adjuncts: An Introduction.” *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives*. Ed. Nikolaus P. Himmelmann and Eva Schultze-Berndt. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. 1-68.
- LEGENDRE, Géraldine. “Secondary Predications and Functional Projections in French.” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15 (1997): 43-87.



VAN DER AUWERA, Johan, and Andrej MALCHUKOV. "A Semantic Map for Depictive Adjectivals."
Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives. Ed. Nikolaus
P. Himmelmann and Eva Schultze-Berndt. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005. 393-421.

