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Introduction. After a close look at the standard literature dealing with predicative APs it is possible to assert, I believe, that the core of the discussion regarding their properties, as well as their relevance for the understanding of natural language phenomena, has focused on the syntax of the construction. No central attention has been paid, however, to certain crucial semantic factors which constrain their licensing.

In fact, researchers on the topic of secondary predication have mainly analyzed three questions: (a) the direction (symmetric or asymmetric) of the c-command relation holding between the predicative adjective and its subject (cf. Williams 1980 and Demonte 1988); (b) the underlying structure of subject and object-oriented predicative adjectives, i.e., whether they are or are not both generated under VP, and the precise configuration in which they surface (cf. Williams 1980, Rothstein 1983, Roberts 1988, McNulty 1988, and Demonte 1988); and (c) the categorial nature of the predicate: whether it is a small clause and, if so, what kind of small clause (cf. Williams 1980, Chomsky 1981, and Stowell 1987, among others).

However, the licensing of predicative adjectives is not only formally constrained. As a first hint, observe that the examples in (1) show that a transitive verb such as conocer 'to know' appears normally to allow a subject-oriented secondary predicate, while an object-oriented one is precluded in the constructions in which this verb appears.
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2 Three brief but important exceptions in this regard are Simpson (1983) on resultatives; Rothstein (1983), which examines the properties which can be characterized through depictive and resultative predicates; and Hernanz (1988), which attempts to account formally for the perfection nature of the adjectives which occur as secondary predicates. Another larger and more recent exception is Napoli (1989). As she asserts, her work 'is in part an attempt to pull linguistic discussions of predication back into the arena of semantics' (Napoli 1989:1) in letting theta-role assignment to be the key to the subject-predicate relationship. In spite of its interest, we will not follow these lines in this work.
It is my purpose here to explain contrasts similar to those exhibited in (1), (2) and (3). It will be shown that there is a close interrelation between the aspectual class to which the verb belongs and its possibility of co-occurring with certain secondary predicates. More interestingly, the existence of these restrictions and the way they interact with the syntax of the sentences in question will allow us to provide a serious argument in favor of the thesis that knowledge of the lexicon implies knowledge of the structure of a given predicate in terms of the 'sub-events' which it comprises. At the same time, it will also corroborate the supposition that the event structure of a predicate needs to be identified by some syntactic expression, either one element of the thematic structure or a 'special' adjunct.

I will proceed as follows. First, empirical generalizations concerning the distribution of depictive and resultative predicates with regard to verbs classified according to a modified version of Vendler-Dowty's aspectual classification will be delimited and illustrated. Second, following Grimshaw and Vikner's (1989) hypothesis on the substructure of events, it will be shown that object-oriented predicative APs are state predicates modifying the internal or final state of the structure of subevents developed by the verb. More strictly, while depictive predicates 'modify' the internal or medial state, resultative predicates 'express' a final state. In this sense, the presence of a resultative predicative adjective can change the reading of a verb which intrinsically does not define a final state. This contrast will be formally explained, assuming that resultatives are specifiers of VP while object-oriented depictives are adjuncts to the VP. Depictive subject-oriented predicatives, on the other hand, are independent of the event structure as they are generated outside of the VP. Third, following an idea which can be traced to Dowty (1972), arguments will be provided for the conjecture that depictive predicative APs are actually T(ense) P(hrases) dominating an AspP P(hrase) node; resultative predicates, nevertheless, do not project up to TP but up to AspP. Finally, the way the Tense and Aspect heads of the adjunct predicative adjectives interact with the correlating heads in the matrix sentence will be examined in a preliminary way.

1 The distribution of secondary predicates and the aspectual constraint

1.1 The semantic properties of the predicate. Early studies on secondary predicates, beginning with Simpson (1983) and Rothstein (1983), have made a distinction between so called 'depictive' predicates such as (4) and 'resultative' ones such as (5).

(4a) Luis paseaba contento. 
'Luis walked happy.'
b. Enrique bebe la leche fría.
‘Enrique drinks the milk cold.’

(5) Juan pintó la casa roja.
‘Juan painted the house red.’

It has also been observed that there is a semantic distinction between these two subclasses of predicates. Resultative predicates appear to refer to final states, or those which show up when a given action is completed (Fabb 1984). In contrast, depictive predicates characterize situations that could be called temporary: they depict the state of the object or entity at the moment the action takes place. Examples (6a) and (6b) are paraphrases of (4a) and (5), respectively, and they illustrate the distinction just made.

(6)a. Luis pasaba cuando/y estaba contento.
‘Luis was walking when/and he was happy.’

b. Juan pintó la casa y (como consecuencia de ello) la casa está roja.
‘Juan painted the house and (as a consequence) the house is red.’

A second semantic property attributed to secondary predicates concerns the necessity of their being [+stative] adjectives with certain associated properties. To be more precise, Rothstein (1983: 153) noticed that the attribute described by the predicate ‘must be at the same time an intrinsic property of the subject and a transitory one.’ If the property is temporary, we add, it can be characterized as a state. Thus, in (7) (from Rothstein 1983), ‘raw’ describes an intrinsic and at the same time variable property of carrots, while ‘orange’ would not be a property describable as transitory, which is the reason for its ungrammaticality.

(7) We eat carrots raw / *orange.

While denying the idea that the attributed property has to be an intrinsic one, McNulty (1988) reformulates the previous assertion, saying that adjunct predicates attribute, in fact, ‘subjective’ properties to their subjects (cf. McNulty 1988: chap.4, section 4). Evidence in favor of this idea is provided by (8), where grammaticality increases when the subjectivity of the adjunct predicate is made explicit.

(8) Mary left the party *beautiful / more beautiful than I have ever seen her.

In sections 2 and 3, I will reconsider this impressionistic approach to the semantic nature of the adjective predicate through its analysis as a Tense Phrase connected in some way to the Tense of the matrix sentence. The properties mentioned by Rothstein and McNulty will follow from this analysis.

A parallel approach to the semantic nature of adjective predicates appears in Hernanz (1988). On the basis of Spanish data, this linguist restates the previous issue establishing that only [+perfective] adjectives can be secondary predicates. She observes that the adjectives which can only be predicated with the Spanish verb ser ‘to be’ are not accessible to secondary predication, as in (9a); on the contrary, those compatible with estar ‘to be [+state]’ are accessible, as in (9b).

(9)a. *Juan habló temerario. (cf. *Juan está temerario)
‘Juan spoke brave.’

b. Juan habló aburrido. (cf. Juan está aburrido)
‘Juan spoke boring.’

The generalization that she formulates is that the adjectives lacking the aspectual feature [+perfective] can not be predicates because they cannot identify (in Higginbotham’s 1985 terms) the event argument present in the thematic grid of the matrix term. Hernanz’s generalization is interesting in trying to relate the semantics of the predicate to the semantics of the main verb, and in locating the properties of the adjective in a more general framework (i.e., the theory of the functional node ASPECT), but it is not sufficient, in my opinion. Nevertheless, I will be following the spirit of Hernanz’s work and I will try to relate the occurrence of secondary predicates to the semantic properties of the main verb. As a minor observation regarding Hernanz’s main hypothesis, it has to be said that there are certain intrinsically [-perfective] adjectives which can be predicated secondarily, as in (10). This kind of data suggests that the perfectivity of the adjective (not questionable in general terms) has to be included in a more general context.

(10) José compró el coche verde y lo vendió marrón (i.e., José compró el coche cuando era /*estaba verde y lo vendió marrón)
‘José bought the car green and sold it brown (i.e., José bought the car when it was green and sold it brown).’

To be more precise: according to Hernanz the e argument of the AP (which is only present when the adjective is [+perfective]) discharges (by identification) on the e position of the main verb.
More importantly, this analysis does not account for the sharp difference in productivity between subject- and object-oriented predicates, and predicates that both kinds of predicates will be possible with the same type of verbs, insofar as the predicate takes an e argument. This is not the situation as we will show.

1.2 Aspects of verbs and the occurrence of secondary predicates. As I have said, while certain semantic properties of the adjective predicates have been put forward and briefly analyzed, no substantive claims appear in the literature regarding the intrinsic semantic properties of the verb which co-occur with the various subclasses of predicates, except for temporal observations in Simpson (1983), Demonte (1988), and Rothstein (1983).

In this subsection, I will make explicit certain descriptive generalizations showing that the inherent semantic-aspectual properties of the matrix verb correlate in a significant way with the possibility or impossibility of occurrence of secondary predicates. At the same time, I will try to incorporate these generalizations within the framework of a plausible hypothesis about the internal structure of the event. In sections 2 and 3, I will elaborate a formal explanation for the facts treated here.

To begin, we need to recall that, traditionally, it has been accepted that a distinction has to be made between Tense or external time (i.e., the time of the situation related to another time, frequently the moment of speaking) and the internal temporality of the situation described by the main verb. This second conception of time in language is what is usually called 'Aspect' or Aktionsart. As is well known, this notion covers two different properties of the verbal sequence: the distinction between the imperfective and perfective nature of the action, sometimes marked in the morphology as a feature apparently associated to Tense, as in Spanish; and the fact that verbs, by their inherent meaning, can be described as event, result, or state predicates, or as punctual, continuing, stative or resultative ones. It is also commonly accepted that both notions of aspect cannot always be separated in a clear way. Here I will not question in a detailed way this reductionistic approach and I will, in general, consider aspect 'the different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation' (Comrie 1976: 3). However, it is the second notion of aspect that I will address. My analysis will show that the tense/aspect distinction perfective-imperfective is connected to other aspects of the syntax of the sentences and that it is not operative in the licensing of predicates.

It was Vendler (1979) who first attempted to separate four distinct subclasses of verbs by their restrictions on time adverbials, tenses and logical statements. He distinguished 'states', 'activities' (sequences of homogeneous intervals), 'achievements' (in fact, achievements without an associated task) and 'accomplishments' (i.e., achievements with an associated task and sequences of heterogeneous intervals). Dowty (1979) extended the characterization of these four aspeclual classes of predicates analyzing, in detail, the syntactic contexts in which they occur.

Since I will be using Vendler-Dowty's terminology, although not their core distinctions, I would first like to recall and illustrate the basic axis of their classification. As a matter of comparison and clarification, observe that in this classification what is meant by accomplishment is what Grimshaw and Vikner (1989) name 'constructive accomplishments', namely, those events in which the Theme does not exist until the entire event has occurred. On the other hand, in 'nonconstructive' accomplishments ('destroy', 'record', 'transcribe', or 'break'), which mainly correspond to activities in Vendler-Dowty's framework, the Theme is involved in the activity from the very beginning. Samples of possible members of each class appear in (11):

(11) a. STATES: saber 'to know', poseer 'to posses', creer 'to believe', desear 'to wish', amar 'to love', existir 'to exist', equivaler 'to be equivalent', crecer 'to grow', tener 'to have', etc.

b. ACTIVITIES: trabajar 'to work', caminar 'to walk', comer 'to eat', escribir 'to write', reir 'to laugh', comerciar 'to trade', pensar 'to think', empujar 'to push', etc.

Rothstein (1983: 350) notes that 'resultative predicates are permitted only with verbs which describe a change of state occurring to the patient argument. The predicate describes the state which the verb causes, and predicates this of the object.' Simpson (1983) postulates that only 'change of state verbs' can be constructed with resultative predicates. Demonte (1988: 3) says that 'an adjective is interpreted as a resultative only when it co-occurs with perfective verbs like pintar 'to paint', cortar 'to cut', or cerrar 'to sif'. Depictives, on the other hand, are found with imperfective verbs like comer 'to eat'. As we will see, none of the previous observations is sufficient to describe the semantic restrictions on the occurrence of resultative and depictive predicates since they are not based on a clear analysis of the character of the verbal action which appears to play a decisive role in the licensing.

8 When the two notions are combined, certainly, a move which early structuralists in the Jakobsonian and Slavic tradition do not make.


An insightful criticism of Vendler's aspectual classification is found in Verkuyl (1989). This author shows that Vendler confused some of his criteria: 'he did not distinguish very well between criteria based on (some sort of) agentivity and criteria based on purely temporal properties of situations such as boundedness, uniqueness, etc' (op.cit.: 41).
c. **ACHIEVEMENTS:** reconocer 'to recognize', descubrir 'to find out', vislumbrar 'to glimpse', encontrar 'to find', morir 'to die', darse cuenta 'to realize', alcanzar 'to reach', etc.

d. **ACCOMPLISHMENTS:** construir una casa 'to build a house', pintar un cuadro 'to paint a picture', hacer una silla 'to make a chair', escribir una novela 'to write a novel', trazar una línea 'to draw a line', correr un kilómetro 'to run one kilometer', etc.

If we want to propose an approximate definition of these four classes leading to the criteria on which we will base the characterization of the manner of the action, we could try to represent them through the features [± activity, [± result]. These features imply, on the one hand, that a given event can have or not have a deliberate causation and, on the other, that the developed activity can give or not give a visible result (an object which results from the activity). Given these features, the verbs in (11) can now be classified as in (12).

(12) a. **ACCOMPLISHMENTS:** [+activity, +result]

b. **ACTIVITIES:** [+activity, -result]

c. **ACHIEVEMENTS:** [-activity, +result]

d. **STATES:** [-activity, -result]

Departing now from Vendler and Dowty's work, although in the same spirit, I would like to include the impressionistic classification of (12) in a more comprehensive theory of lexical meaning: that which assumes that a semantics based on events is able to apprehend significant generalizations not captured by other traditional approaches to meaning. I will follow, then, lines traced by Pustejovsky (1988), Grimshaw (1990), and Grimshaw and Vikner (1989) and assume that the analysis of the argument structure of lexical items (mainly of verbs and adjectives) includes the characterization of their event structure in terms of a substructure of events.

Following Pustejovsky (1988), let us assume that the grammar should specify three primitive event types: 'states', 'transitions', and 'processes', and let us define these event types as objects with a subevent structure. Approximately, 'states' are obviously the states in (11) and (12); 'processes' roughly correspond to the activities (but these can imply also achievements and non-constructive accomplishments); and 'transitions' include certain achievements and constructive accomplishments. Now, if, by hypothesis, we characterize processes and certain transitions as branching event structures which could include sets of periods (the initial one, an internal sub-period, and a final one), it appears that we have a conceptual basis sufficient to formulate certain empirical generalizations regarding the occurrence of secondary predicates. The distributional rules are shown in (13), (15), and (17), while the relevant examples are shown in (14), (16), and (18), respectively.

(13) Subject-oriented secondary predicates occur in all kind of sentences, irrespective of the aspectual properties of the main verb.\[11\]

(14)a. (Yo) vi el cuadro incómodo. (state)\[12\]
'I saw the picture uncomfortable.'

b. Los reyes se enamoran de sus hijas, las aman con látigos de hielo, posesivos, feroz, obscenos y terribles... (L.A. de Cuenca). (state)
'The kings fall in love with their daughters. They love them with icy whips, possessive, fierce, obscene and terrible...'

---

\[11\] Obviously, there is a general constraint on secondary predication in the sense that only verbs which take subjects that can be attributed a stative property appear in these contexts. For this reason, verbs with expletive subjects or those with propositional subjects are incompatible with depictive predicates:

(i) 'La lluvia (proposition) es imprescindible rápida.
'The rain is necessary rapid'

(ii) Vi este cuadro! / Siente esta tela!
'Me this picture!' 'Feel this cloth!'
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c. Pedro ama deprimido. (state)
   'Pedro loves depressed.'

d. Mientras alguien regrese derrotado a su cuarto...
   (L.A. de Cuenca) (activity)
   'While somebody returns defeated to his room...'

e. Luis siempre trabaja sonriente. (activity)
   'Luis always works smiling.'

f. Enrique se dio cuenta sereno de lo complejo de la
   situación. (achievement)
   'Enrique realized calm how complex the situation was.'

g. Luisa reconoció asustada que su madre había envejecido mucho.
   (achievement)
   'Luisa recognized scared that her mother has gotten much older.'

h. El pintor dibujó una naturaleza muerta feliz.
   (accomplishment)
   'The painter painted a still life happy.'

i. Los arquitectos construyeron el puente deseosos de
   aliviar los problemas de la zona. (accomplishment)
   'The architects built the bridge eager to alleviate with
   the problems of the area.'

(15) Only verbs of action which denote an internal state (in other
   words, [+ activity, -result] verbs, or processes and
   nonconstructive accomplishments) admit object-oriented
   secondary predicates, whether depictive or resultative.

The corresponding examples are in (16).

(16)a. Colgó los cuadros juntos. (activity, resultative)
   '(S)he hung the pictures together.'

b. Pedro devolvió el libro roto. (activity, depictive)
   'Pedro returned the book broken.'

c. *María sabe el teorema válido.' (stative, depictive)
   'María knows the theorem valid.'

d. *Comprendió la noticia correcta en su formulación.
   (achievement, depictive)
   '(S)he understood the news correct in its formulation.'

(17) A verb denoting an internal state becomes a verb denoting a final
   state (i.e., a 'culminating transition' (Pustejovsky 1988), or a
   constructive accomplishment) when it takes a resultative predicate.

(18)a. Mastica/masticó la carne cruda. (depictive)
   '(S)he chew/chewed the meat raw.'

b. Mastica/masticó la carne chiquillita. (resultative)
   '(S)he chew/chewed the meat very little.'

Observe that (18a) describes an action which can be habitual, while (18b)
characterizes one which is completely ended. Moreover, an important
difference between (18a) and (18b) is that the depictive predicate describes
a state which is simultaneous (and can be previous or subsequent) to the
moment of the action of the main predicate, while the state described by the
resultative occurs after the action of the main verb has been developed. In
this line of analysis, 'resultative predication' has to be defined as the
expression of a state which follows the almost completion of a change, while
'depictive predication' is the expression of a state which goes along with the
affectation of an object.

Note also that a significant implication of (17) is that resultative
predicates should not be compatible with constructive accomplishment verbs.

15 Observe that there are many sentences similar to this one (i.e., sentences with a state main
verb) which are completely grammatical with a VP internal predicate:

(i) Lo sé contento con la noticia.
   'I know him happy with the news.'

(ii) Te imagino severo, un poco triste. (J.L. Borges)
   'I imagine you severe, a little sad.'

(iii) Quizé a Luis destrazado por el recuerdo.
   'I want Luis destroyed by the memories.'

They do not represent a problem for generalization (15), however. Note that (ii), for
instance, cannot be interpreted as 'I imagine you while you are severe', but it means 'I imagine
that you are severe'. It appears, then, that these verbs take a subcategorized small clause but not
depictive secondary predicates.
That is, since constructive accomplishment verbs develop an event structure with a final state, a resultative will not be possible in this context. This situation is illustrated in (19a, b). Observe that (19b) is grammatical only when the adjective is interpreted as a manner adverbial; it cannot mean 'he drew the circle until it was distorted'.

   '(S)he washed the shirt white.'

b. *Trazó el círculo torcido.
   '(S)he drew the circle twisted.'

c. *Pintó el cuadro colorido.
   '(S)he painted the picture colored.'

However, there appears to be an important counterexample to the generalization illustrated in (19). As Bosque (1990) has noticed, there is in colloquial Spanish a very productive construction in which, let us say, a cognate participle of the main verb obligatorily preceded by intensifiers like bien, muy or más, occurs. This cognate participle can co-occur with all kind of verbs:

(20)a. Lavó la camisa bien lavadita.
   '(S)he washed the shirt well (washed).'

b. Trazó el círculo bien trazado.
   '(S)he drew the circle well (drawn).'

c. Haz la carne muy hecha.
   'Cook the meat well (done).'

d. Pica el tomate más picadito.
   'Chop the tomato more (chopped).'

e. Caminó los tres kilómetros bien caminados.
   '(S)he (really) walked (the) three kilometers (well walked).'

f. Pensó sus palabras muy bien pensadas.
   '(S)he thought out his/her words very well (thought out).'

g. Reconoció sus errores bien reconocidos.
   '(S)he (really) recognized his/her errors (well recognized).'

I will return to this construction in section 2.1 after considering the underlying representation of resultatives.

Summarizing, it appears that the crucial criterion to establish relevant generalizations regarding the distribution of secondary predicates is the way in which the main verb of the sentence develops its event structure. It is interesting to point out also that the notion of having arrived or not arrived at a final state in the development of a process has a crucial importance in this regard. In this sense, generalizations (13), (15) and (17) do not match one-to-one with any classification in Vendler-Dowty's style. Observe, for instance, that achievements, which standardly describe a momentaneous (result of an) action, are the typical candidates not to accept secondary predication. However, a specific achievement like encontrar 'to find', while denoting a sequence of nonhomogeneous states of searching, also accepts modifiers of an internal state: Encontré el coche roto 'I found the car broken'. In parallel, a standard (constructive) accomplishment will not accept any predicate denoting a subsequent state (a resultative) unless this state can be interpreted as a modulation of the extent of the event. These were the cases in (3), which we will reexamine in section 2.

In section 2, I will also try to provide a formal explanation for generalizations (13), (15), and (17). I will deduce the fact that only object-oriented predicates are aspectually conditioned from the property of their being generated internally to the VP, becoming in that way strictly related to the subevent structure of the verb. I will also discuss the differences between resultative and depictive predicates and reformulate the traditional view that resultative predication is a lexical process (cf. Simpson 1983), that is, that they are a projection of the subevent structure of the verb and, in this sense, a kind of obligatory adjunct (cf. Grimshaw and Vikner 1989). Subject-oriented predicates, however, are independent of the manner of the action.

2 Resultative and depictive predicates and the structure of event

2.1 Functional heads and the projection of secondary predicates. Let us take from the standard hypothesis on the underlying structure of secondary predicates the idea that the three subclasses of these predicates appear to be adjoined to different nodes of the sentence14 and that the maximum

14 Roberts (1988) claims that subject predicates are sisters of the subject of the sentence generated internal to the VP; object predicates are under V'.
expansion of a structure with secondary predicates is one equivalent to (21),
where the only acceptable order is the unmarked [resultative, depictive of the
object, depictive of the subject].

(21a) Inés, mastica la carne, chiquitita, cruda, agotada. 
'Inés chew the meat very little raw exhausted.'

I will incorporate to this conception the idea that X-bar projections can
be headed by two kinds of heads, lexical and functional ones (Fukui and
Speas 1986), and I will also adopt standard proposals regarding the order and
dominance of the functional projections within IP. With these provisos, I
will slightly depart from the standard hypothesis and claim that secondary
predicates are generated in a configuration such as that in (22), which I
assume represents the unmarked order in (21).

McNulty (1988) asserts that depictive predicates are both adjoined to VP, subject-oriented
adjoined to the upper node (actually they are adjoined to VP*, the maximal projection, V*
being a segment of a maximal projection); object-oriented depictives, on the other hand, are
adjoined to V; resultatives are part of a complex verb and theta-assigning XP's.

The questions I would like to answer through a configuration like (22),
are the following:
(i) How can we deduce that resultative predicates add a final state to the
subevent structure of the verb and, in this sense, convert a transitional
activity or process verb into an accomplishment one?
(ii) How can we deduce that object-oriented depictive predicates are
related to the internal or medial state in the subevent structure of the verb?
(iii) How can we explain that subject-oriented predicative APs are
independent of the subevent structure of the verb?
(iv) How is it that both classes of depictive predicative APs are temporally
independent while resultative predicates are temporally dependent? (Cf.
Roberts 1987, for this distinction) In the same line: is there Tense in
depictive APs?

The basic hypotheses encoded in (22) are, first, that D-structure is a
projection of the event-argument structure of the verb and that all the
members of this structure are linked within the VP through theta-marking,
theta-marking taking place under government.15 In line with Koopman and
Sporiche (1989), I also maintain that the thematic subject (or D-structure
subject) is the specifier of a V*16 small clause whose predicate is VP. At
the same time, I am assuming, following Fukui and Speas (1986), that

---

15 See Demonte (1989) for an approach to prepositional verbs along these lines.
16 Actually, the highest VP in representation (22).
lexical categories can infinitely iterate specifiers as long as those specifiers are fully licensed and can be interpreted at LF. When the concepts are established in this way, it appears that in the maximal projections of lexical categories there is no distinction between adjuncts and specifiers, and that the notion of base-generated adjuncts becomes not a formal but a semantic notion. In a stipulative way, I will claim, however, that only the highest specifier (the canonical D-structure subject of the sentence) is an A-position, while the others (the resultative and the depictive) are A'-positions.

Second, I will follow Grimshaw's (1990) supposition that the elements of the event structure are identified through syntactic expressions and, at the same time, that a given argument can encode one or more states of the aspectual substructure.

Third, (22) asserts, that secondary predicates, which are always marked as [+stative], are generated within this structure with a double possibility: they can be specifiers-adjuncts, as assumed in the standard analysis, but they can also develop the subevent structure. In this second option, they have to appear in the positions relevant for the linking rules. To be more concrete, I assume that resultative predicates, being the closest-to-the-head right-generated A-bar specifiers of the VP, are the only ones which are accessible to the linking rules. Obviously, this is the only solution in accordance with a unitary approach to the formal analysis of predicates. However, there is another possibility, perhaps more perspicuous from a technical point of view. In fact, it can be thought that resultative predicates occupy the deep-structure position in which usually indirect objects or locative arguments of three-argument taking verbs appear. Now, if a configuration à la Larson (1988) is adopted, there will then be a way to distinguish structurally between depictive and resultative predicates. Evidence in support of this supposition comes from the fact that there are no resultatives in constructions with indirect objects, while depictives are possible in such configurations: Le devolvió el coche roto a María 'He returned the car broken to Maria'. This solution, moreover, is coherent with the idea, sometimes assumed in the literature, that resultatives are subcategorized by certain verbs and should be generated in complement position. We will leave this dilemma open here.

Fourth, I also take as a basic hypothesis Tenny's (1988) proposal that internal arguments express a crucial aspectual property of verbs, in that they 'measure out' over time the event described by the verb: 'the verb's direct internal argument may be thought of as being converted into a function of time at some level of representation' (op. cit: 4). I would like to revise and briefly extend this idea and assume that the direct internal argument is the one which delimits the event insofar as it expresses that state which we have called the 'medial' or 'internal' state. The presence of the internal argument marks an end point in time, but its realization does not imply that there cannot be a following state really expressing the closing of the situation. I want to imply, then, that to change a state does not mean to be in a final state. In other words, both activities and nonconstructive accomplishments can affect the object, changing its state, but only constructive accomplishments express directly the existence of this final state. In the sentences of (23), for instance, the presence of the internal argument indicates that the event has a temporal limit; the addition of the phrases in parentheses, however, makes more precise this temporal limit since it manifests overtly the state in which the object affected by the action remains after the action is completely closed.

(23)a. Give a letter (to John).

b. Comer la manzana (masticadita).

   'Eat the apple (well chewed).'

c. Cortar el árbol (hasta la mitad).

   'Cut the tree (half-way through).'

2.1.1 With these hypotheses in mind, let us return to (22) and consider, first, the licensing of resultative predicates. Suppose that a verb like masticar 'chew' is projected from the lexicon as an item with two positions in the event structure: a Cause or initial state and a medial state. If by hypothesis the internal argument is always a projection of the medial state, the direct internal argument will then be the one projecting this position of the event structure in configuration (22). Chomsky (1989) has proposed that the agreement features of the heads are always a reflection of a specifier-head agreement relation. Now if the resultative secondary predicates are in the specifier position of the VP, the stative feature of the predicate will be

---

17 Moreover, according to Fukui and Speas, only specifiers of functional categories can close off projections.

18 Cf. Chomsky (1986), Demonte (1988), and Rizzi (1990) in this regard. The adjunct condition of secondary predicates explains their behavior under extraction. In the framework adopted here, this behavior will have to be attributed to the number of barriers which are crossed.


20 This is coherent with the notion that predication implies mutual c-command between the subject and the predicate. In this configuration the subject of the predicate, the direct internal argument, does c-command its predicate and vice-versa.
shared, through coindexation, by the verb when Spec-head agreement takes place. This relation of agreement taking place within the VP will modify the reading of the verb which, having projected an internal state, can now add the only one which follows it: the final state. It is obvious that only in an underlying configuration like this can the secondary predicate serve to saturate the event-argument structure since, as is usually assumed, event-argument structure as a whole is projected within the VP. Observe that if the verb had projected the internal argument as a realization of a set of two states, internal and final (this will actually be the case in the constructive accomplishment constructions), the state indicated by the secondary predicate could not now be added, and ungrammatical sentences such as those in (19) (repeated below as (24)) would appear.

(24a). *Lavó la camisa limpia. *(S)he washed the shirt clean.'

b. *Trazó el círculo torcido. *(S)he drew the circle twisted.'

c. *Pintó el cuadro colorido. *(S)he painted the picture colored.'

The existence of the productive construction with a cognate participle, illustrated through the examples in (20), does not falsify our analysis, however. Notice that this is a construction compatible with all kinds of verbs (irrespective of their aspectual properties) and observe, crucially, that only when the verbs are activities or accomplishments can the cognate participle refer to a final state. Otherwise, they are manner adverbials. In (25) I repeat the examples in (20) and give the relevant interpretation; the new example (25h) shows that this kind of predicate can be also primary.

(25a). Lavó la camisa bien lavadita. (accomplishment, resultative) *(S)he washed the shirt well (washed).'

b. Trazó el círculo bien trazado. (accomplishment, resultative) 'He drew the circle well (drawn).'

c. Pica el tomate más picadito. (accomplishment, resultative) 'Chop the tomato very thin (chopped).'

d. Haz la carne muy hecha. (activity, resultative) 'Cook the meat well (cooked).'

e. Caminó los tres kilómetros bien caminados. (activity, resultative) *(S)he (really) walked the three kilometers (well walked).'

f. Pensó sus palabras muy bien pensadas. (state, manner) 'He thought out his words well (thought out).'

g. Reconoció sus errores bien reconocidos. (achievement, manner) 'He (really) recognized his mistakes (well recognized).'

h. El paquete está atado y bien atado. (copulative, manner) 'The packet is tied and well tied.'

At this point, it has to be said, however, as a qualification to the implication of generalization (17) (recall the examples in (19)), that even if constructive accomplishments do not accept resultative predicates describing a state different from that described in the main verb, they do accept either resultative cognates or they accept a predicate describing an extension of the final state. The first possibility is illustrated in (25a,b), the second was the case exemplified in (3). In (3) it was shown that the reading of accomplishment verbs with resultative predicates improves when the predicate is modified by a degree adverb. Observe that examples similar to those in (3) can be constructed with verbs like cortar 'to cut' or picar 'to chop':

(26a). ??Pica el tomate fino. 'Chop the tomato thin.'

a'. Pica el tomate muy fino. 'Chop the tomato very thin.'

b. ??Corta la cebolla gruesa. 'Slice the onion thick.'

b'. Corta la cebolla más gruesa. 'Slice the onion thicker.'

The resultatives like those in (3), (25d), and (26a'and b') can now be reinterpreted as the reduplication or extension of a state already expressed by the internal argument. In other words, insofar as a secondary predicate generated within the VP can add a state to the event structure of a change of

---

21 I owe the second part of this observation to María-Luisa Rivera.
state verb, it can also make more explicit a state already expressed by one of the elements of the argument structure of the verb. Under this condition, the cognate participle construction (which, perhaps, is only an epiphenomenon, and serves various and different purposes) will be apt to be understood as a secondary predicate.

2.1.2 The licensing of the object-oriented depictive secondary predicate proceeds in the normal way. In this configuration the object NP is in a structural relation of mutual m-command (and Spec-head agreement) with the stative predicate, the locality condition that has to be satisfied for the predication rule to apply (cf. Chomsky 1986 and Demonte 1988, among others). The diagram in (27) illustrates the coindexation for predication which results from our proposals in 2.1.1 and 2.1.2:

(27)

With the proposals developed up to this point, my analysis now has to confront an important problem. It appears that if predicates are VP specifiers, Spec-head agreement between the verb and each of these specifiers will ultimately result in all the specifiers being indexed with each other. This result is in fact desirable with the subject NP and the depictive of the object AP. What is to be avoided, however, is the subject NP and the resultative being coindexed. I think that there is a way to distinguish structurally between the subject specifier and the predicative specifiers: the former, being in a small clause, is adjoined to VP, while the latter are adjoined to V. Under such conditions, the highest NP under VP will not m-command any of the elements under V and the structural relation necessary for the predication rule to apply will not be satisfied.

As a tangential but interesting consequence of the previous considerations, observe that the analysis that I have proposed makes a distinction between those aspectual properties related to the perfective-imperfective tense/aspect dichotomy and those linked to the manner of the action, expressed through the sub-event structure in the lexical entry of the verb. My analysis really implies that the AspP in the main sentence is not relevant for predication. This appears, in fact, to be the case: while there are syntactic processes clearly constrained by the perfective-imperfective nature of the action, such as the formation of se impersonal sentences (cf. de Miguel 1990), no distinctions in the Tense/Aspect perfective-imperfective area appear to have a role in the licensing of secondary predication.

(28)a. Antiguamente no se llamaba de tú a los padres.
   'In old times, parents were not called with tú.'

b. *Antiguamente no se llamó/ha llamado de tú a los padres.
   'In old times nobody called tú their parents.'

(29)a. Juan ha comido/come/comió la carne pasada.
   'Juan has eaten/eats/ate the meat done.'

b. Juan ha clavado/?clava/clavó los clavos juntos.
   'Juan has nailed/nails/nailed the nails together.'

c. *Juan ha corrido/corre/corrió la carrera fácil.
   'Juan has run/runs/ran the run easy.'

The examples in (28) (from de Miguel 1990: 252) show that the perfective or imperfective nature of the event has to combine with the tense/aspectual condition of the verb in order to license the generic interpretation associated with certain of the Spanish impersonal se constructions. Thus, (28b) is ungrammatical because the perfective nature of the event voids the generic interpretation which is possible in the imperfective context (28a). The cases in (29) (cf. especially (29c)) show that it is only the aspectual nature of the event, its Aktionsart, that constrains secondary predication.

2.1.3 The analysis proposed in (22), on the other hand, distinguishes between subject and object predicates and claims that the former are connected to the TP of the sentence and are independent of the structural

[Recall that it is usually assumed that object-oriented predicative APs reanalyze with the main verb. With an extended coindexation, the result is that the subject will, in fact, be coindexed with this 'complex' predicate.]
context in which elements of the event-argument structure are projected. To be more precise, after being theta-marked, the subject NP under the upper VP specifier in (22) and (27) will have to move to the Spec of IP (more strictly to the AgrSP) in order to receive Case. On its way to this Case position, it will stop in the Spec of TP, where it will be coindexed with the m-commanding predicative AP, thus satisfying the predication rule. This process is illustrated in (30).

(30)

```
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  XP

  \AgrSP'

  \AgrS

  \TP
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  \VP'
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  \V'

  \AP

  \V'

  \NP

  \V'

  \AP

  \V'

  \NP
```

Certain qualifications are in order after the foregoing statement. The simplest one is that since the specifier of the TP is a nonargument position, it can be thought that the thematic subject will not have to stop in this position to satisfy ECP requirements; moreover, it is not clear that anything independent licenses that position. Since I assume that movement out of its VP-internal position is crucial to licensing secondary predication of the subject, we can also think that movement of the subject directly to Spec of AgrSP will license this predication. Note that the predicative AP is assumed to be adjoined to TP and hence not dominated by it (Chomsky 1986). In this situation, the predicative will be in a position of mutual m-command with respect to an element in Spec of AgrSP.²⁴

More controversial, in view of standard analyses, is the claim that the predication rule applies once the subject is moved. Recall that in some of these standard analyses of secondary predication (cf. Williams 1980, Rothstein 1983, and Demonte 1988), it was assumed that subject-oriented predicative APs were generated under IP, deep subjects at that time being thought to be also under IP. Now, if, like all the elements of the thematic structure, underlying subjects are VP internal (cf. Fukui and Speas 1986 and Koopman and Sportiche 1989, among many others), the previous assumption will be difficult to maintain if we also want the predication rule to be a kind of theta-assignment, i.e., if we want it to hold only under mutual m-command, which is the step taken, for instance, in Roberts (1988; cf. footnote 14).

Nevertheless, there are empirical reasons which support the idea that the predication rule coindexes subject-oriented predicatives with derived subjects. On the one hand, constituency tests which I will not reproduce here (but see Demonte 1988 against Roberts 1987 and 1988) suggest that subject predicates are outside the VP. More relevant to the present argument is the fact that in Spanish there appears not to be predication when the subject appears inverted (cf. Demonte 1986 in this regard).

(31) a. *Llegó María cansada.
   arrived María tired
   'María arrived tired.'

   b. *Ama Marta derrotada.
   loves Marta defeated
   'Marta loves defeated.'

²⁴ I owe this suggestion to Paula Kempchinsky.
c. Compró Luisa la casa agotada por la discusión.25
   bought Luisa the house exhausted by the quarrel
   'Luisa bought the house exhausted by the quarrel.'

Let us assume that 'inverted' subjects are sometimes VP internal subjects which haven’t been moved to [Spec,IP]. Let us suppose, more strictly, that in null subject languages the subject does not need to move obligatorily in order to receive Case since it can enter in a chain relation with a pro element licensed and identified by Agr in the Spec, AgrSP position. 'Inversion' in this sense will be the manifestation of this possibility of null subject languages. Now if this analysis is correct, the examples in (31) suggest that subject-oriented predicative APs are licensed under coindexation with a lexical subject once this is optionally moved to get Case, and are not VP internal. In section 2.2, I will provide independent evidence in support of the idea that they are TP adjuncts.

2.2 Tense and aspect in predicative APs. Traditional in the consideration of secondary predicates is the idea that these structures are in some way related to Tense and are not homogeneous from the temporal point of view. Dowty (1972) was the first to propose that what he calls ‘temporally restrictive adjectives’ such as those in The girl married young or in John saw Harry alive (and among which are not included result adjectives such as in John shot Harry dead) were contained in an independent sentence with a tense operator with the same reference as the tense operator in the matrix clause. Following Dowty (1972), Fabb (1984) postulated that postnominal and adjunct APs are clausal constituents with an inflectional element; in these constructions, the INFL of the adjunct clause is anaphorically related to the INFL of the matrix.26

I will adopt this approach to secondary predicates, revising it, and I will claim that depictive predicates (both subject- and object-oriented) are a TP, while resultative predicates project only as far as AspP. From this conception of both kinds of predicates we can derive why only depictives are anaphoric to the tense of the main sentence (our revision of the previous notion that they are ‘temporally independent’), while resultatives can only mean a given result (i.e., a state which starts precisely from the time of finishing of the action of the predicate).

In the following paragraphs I will provide justification for a TP analysis of depictive predicates and at the same time I will show that resultative predicates behave differently in relation to these pieces of evidence.

2.2.1 Negation. As (32) shows, depictive predicates are negated with no while the resultatives in (33) are not.

(32)a. María llegó [no contenta con lo que había hecho].
   'María arrived not happy with what she had done.'
   b. Encontró el coche [no destruido por los ladrones habituales].
   'He found the car not destroyed by the usual thieves.'

(33)a. Guisó la carne [no pasada por la parte superior].
   '(S)he cooked the meat not done in the upper part.'

2 Informants find (31c) considerably better that the two previous sentences. It appears that when the predicative has a modifier, the reading of inverted subject sentences with secondary predicates of that subject considerably improves. The longer the modifier is, the better they sound:

(i) Llegó Esther furiosa.
   arrived Esther furious
   'Esther arrived furious.'
   'Esther arrived very furious.'
   (ii) Llegó Esther muy furiosa.
   arrived Esther very furious
   'Esther arrived very furious.'
   (iii) Llegó Esther furiosa con sus colegas.
   'Esther arrived furious with her colleagues.'

So we can conjecture that in sentences like (ii) and (iii), Heavy AP shift has taken place. It is not clear to me, though, how this process interacts with the fact that inverted subjects can be either in their canonical D-structure position or adjoined to the VP if they were previously moved.

26 The AP in (32) is derived by Fabb (1984) from a configuration like (i).

(i) NP
   S=INFL
   -INFL'
   AP
   man
   PRO
   happy
   with his work

The PRO is controlled by the head of the noun phrase if the clause is a postmodifier, and by the NP if the element is a free adjunct.
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however, given that it allows me to show interesting contrasts which need to be explained.
structures are not TPs but perhaps only APs or AspPs; this assumption calls for a detailed
representation of the contrastive negation structures, which I am not providing. Moreover, my
an AP than the fact that it is allowed in contrastive negation structures. These facts, together
argument is circular since I do not have evidence for constituent negation other than the fact
of predicatives, as well as prenominal modifiers, can take phrasal or constituent negation. In this situation, illustrated through the examples in (34) and (34'), no contrast such as that in (32)-(33) appears and a contrastive reading is necessarily construed. 27

(34)a. María llegó no (muy) cansada (sino disgustada).
'María arrived not (very) tired (but dissapointed).'

(34)b. Colgó los cuadros no (muy) juntos (sino bien separados).
'(S)he hung the pictures not (much) together (but much separated).'

Imperatives also make this difference clear.

(34')a. Bebe la leche no fría sino caliente.
'Drink the milk not cold but hot.'

(34')b. Cuelga los cuadros no juntos sino bien separados.
'Hang the pictures not joined but well separated.'

Aside from the ungrammaticality flavor, observe that the sentences in (32) and (33) have different possible continuations. If, following Klima (1964), we define as instances of sentence negation those structures which permit, among other things, the occurrence of the 'either'-clause, we find again a contrast between (32) and (33) (notice the examples in (35)-(36)). The ungrammaticality of (35) -- where the sentences are conjoined through y 'and', and not through ni 'neither' -- suggests that the initial negative particle dominates the conjunction of two clausal constituents, since it licenses the polarity item no...eithery... /b... tampoco). The parallel improvement of (36)

(35)a. María llegó no contenta con lo que había aceptado
*y/ni tampoco con lo que había rechazado.
'María arrived not happy with what she had accepted nor with what she had rejected, either.'

(35)b. Encontró el coche no destrozado por los ladrones
habituelles y /ni tampoco por los desagradables vecinos.
'(S)he found the car not destroyed by the current thieves nor by the horrible neighbors, either.'

(36)a. Guisó la carne no pasada por la parte superior y
tampoco por los bordes.
'(S)he cooked the meat not done in the upper part nor at the edges.'

(36)b. Colgó los cuadros no separados de la pared y tampoco del armario.
'(S)he hang the pictures not distant from the wall nor from the closet.'

We will now discuss the properties of the configuration in which the nonphrasal negative element can occur. In recent analyses (Zanuttini 1990) it has been asserted that Neg in sentential negation constructions is a functional head which takes TP as its complement. There is certain evidence that this can be in fact the case. It happens, for instance, that negation cannot appear in absolute constructions (see (37)) which are possibly projections of Asp (cf. de Miguel 1990), nor can it appear in imperatives, which lack Tense (cf. Zanuttini 1990; see (38)). 28

(37) *No visitado el museo, los viajeros regresaron al hotel.
'Not having visited the museum, the travellers returned to the hotel.'

27 Obviously, throughout these examples, I am assuming, first, that in contrastive negation constructions, Neg appears independently of Tense and, second, that the predicative in these structures are not TPs but perhaps only APs or AspPs; this assumption calls for a detailed representation of the contrastive negation structures, which I am not providing. Moreover, my argument is circular since I do not have evidence for constituent negation other than the fact that the contrast disappears in these structures, and other proof in favor of this predicative being an AP than the fact that it is allowed in contrastive negation structures. These facts, together with another observation in footnote 28 seriously weaken my argument. I will maintain this claim, however, given that it allows me to show interesting contrasts which need to be explained.

28 M.L. Rivera (p.c.) has observed that this is not true in many languages: Old Spanish and Bulgarian, for example, where imperatives can be negated. Moreover, there are certain tensed constructions in Old Spanish (Lería ha el libro 'He will read it, the book', see Lema and Rivera 1989 in this regard) which, however, cannot be negated. These facts suggest, against Zanuttini, a not very clear correlation between TP and Negation.
Zanuttini (1990), following Kayne (1989), claims that the Neg element, as a sentential operator, occurs only in front of a syntactic representation of Tense and observes that it has to be considered a head because the presence of a negative marker in the embedded clause interferes with the possibility of long clitic climbing. Note the contrast among No debo hablar ('I must not speak-to-you'), No te debo hablar ('I not to-you must speak' and **No debo no hablar** ('I to-you must not speak'). The explanation for this contrast, according to Zanuttini, is that the clitic cannot move out of a maximal projection which is a sister of no because Neg lacks the ability to L-mark its sister constituent which, not being so L-marked, would constitute a barrier to government. If this conception of negation is adequate, it implies that in the constructions in (32) there has to be a TP following the negative marker. In (33), on the contrary, no would not be possible because there would not be a syntactic representation of Tense.

2.2.2 Order and occurrence of time and aspect adverbs. Two relevant lines in the study of adverbs can be traced back to interpretive semantics as well as to the conception which views adverbs as variable-binding operators. Jackendoff (1972) proposes a two-way syntactic classification of adverbs: S-adverbs dominated directly by S and VP-adverbs dominated directly by VP; McConnell-Ginet (1982) distinguishes Adverbs, which are VP-internal or subcategorized, from Ad-Sentences, which are external to the VP or Ad-Sentences. Revising and extending these lines, Rivero (1990) distinguishes subcategorized adverbs, which can incorporate and are like complements of the head of the VP, and adverbs which do not incorporate and are true adjuncts. Manner, Direction, and what she names Aktionsart adverbs' belong to the first subclass, while Aspect and Time adverbs belong to the second. It is the distinction between Aspect, Aktionsart, and Time adverbs which concerns here.

To start with, let us recall that the hypothesis that clause structure includes a series of differentiated and syntactically active projections of functional heads allows us to reclassify adverbial constituents and establish differences among them. Moreover, with the adoption of the hypothesis of the subevent structure of lexical items, we are implicitly assuming that the distinction between a situation seen as 'a whole' vs. 'a continuum' or a situation seen as 'a durative state' vs. 'a series of iterated states' has relevant linguistic consequences. In fact, the first approach to the description of the situation translates linguistically into the morphological dichotomy perfective-imperfective; the second is lexically inscribed in the subevent structure of the lexical items which, as I have shown, expresses through subcategorization and theta-marking and, as Rivero (1990) has carefully demonstrated, underlies the process of adverb incorporation in certain languages.

Adopting Rivero's distinction between Aspect and Aktionsart adverbs, I will include among the class of aspertual adverbs forms such as: recién 'just', ya 'already', de una vez 'all at once', hace un momento 'a moment ago', todavía still, yet', continuamente 'continuously'; Aktionsart adverbs will be a menudo 'frequently', con frecuencia 'frequently', dos veces 'twice', muchas veces 'many times', siempre 'always', etc. Of course, items like ayer 'yesterday', hoy 'today', mañana 'tomorrow', esta tarde 'this evening,' or anoche 'last night' are Time adverbs. As the sentences in (39) illustrate, constraints in the order of occurrence of these listed adverbs in regular sentences with a single predicate suggest that, in fact, the adverbs belong to different projections, that the TP projection dominates AspP, and that Aktionsart adverbs are the most embedded ones since they are obviously VP adverbs (from my point of view, now, the preferred order is that in (39c), which would suggest that the Aktionsart adverb moves with the V when it raises to INFL).²⁹

(39) a. Teresa cantará mañana todavía dos veces.
   'Teresa will sing tomorrow still twice.'

   b.*Teresa cantará todavía mañana dos veces.
   'Teresa will sing tomorrow twice.'

   c. Teresa cantará dos veces mañana todavía.
   'Teresa will sing twice tomorrow still.'

The contrast in (40), on the other hand, indicates that depictive predicates (40a, b) allow both classes of adverbs (time and aspect ones) while resultatives (40c, d) allow only aspect adverbs, and it suggests that our hypothesis that depictives are TPs, and resultatives AspPs, can be considered descriptively adequate.

²⁹ Moreover, there do not appear to be constraints on the order between Aktionsart adverbs and time adverbs, and again the preferred order is with the former following the verb:
   (i) Pedro no bebió esta noche de nuevo ginebra.
   'Pedro did not drink tonight again gin'
   (ii) Pedro no bebió de nuevo esta noche ginebra.
   'Pedro did not drink again tonight gin'

I leave this problem open for further research.
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(40)a. Alquila las casas [ahora ya vacías].
'She rents the houses now just empty.'

b. La ansiedad me lleva a él [hoy totalmente rendida].
'Anxiety leads me to him today totally exhausted.'

c. Pegó las hojas [(ayer noche) completamente juntas].
'(S)he stuck the leaves yesterday night totally joined.'

d. Colocó a la muñeca [(ayer) parcialmente sentada].
'(S)he put the doll yesterday partially seated.'

In this sense, resultative predicates behave as regular perfective adjectives, which also project an AspP, according to Bosque (1990).

(41)a. Un vaso lleno (esta noche) hasta la mitad.
'A glass filled (tonight) half part.'

b. Una salsa medio espesa (hasta hoy).
'A dressing half thick (till today).'

2.2.3 Co-occurrence constraints on time adverbs. Dowty (1972) also noticed that a time adverb that occurs in the main clause 'can be moved to the adjective phrase with no change in meaning' (op. cit.: 53). According to him, the sentences in (42) should be synonymous.

(42)a. El sábado encontró la casa vacía.
'On Saturday he/she found the house empty.'

b. Encontró la casa vacía el sábado.
'On Saturday he/she found the house empty.'

Observe that in certain cases where there is an adverb modifying the main verb and the depictive AP takes its own time adverb, the predicative reading is not available, as in (43), and the AP is interpreted as a modifier of the noun.

(43) El sábado encontré el coche [robado el domingo].
'On Saturday I found the car stolen on Sunday.'

The examples in (42) and (43) taken together suggest that the Tense nodes of the main clause and the adjunct predicate are related and mutually constrained. The contrasts in (44), moreover, points to the same conclusion: in (44a) there is only a modifier reading, in (44b) the predicative interpretation reappears.

(44)a. Hoy tomé el café recalentado ayer.
'Today I drank the coffee reheated yesterday.'

a'. Lo tomé hoy recalentado ayer.
'I drank it today reheated yesterday.'

b. Hoy tomé el café caliente aún.
'Today I drank the coffee still hot.'

b'. Lo tomé hoy caliente aún.
'I drank it today still hot.'

The problem with (44a), in contrast to (44b), is that the presence of the adverb ayer 'yesterday' indicates that the state described by the predicate has finished before the time of the main action has started; aún 'still', on the contrary, says that the state is still active. As we will see, this is the way tense interaction between the verb and the predicative holds.

Recapitulating the facts and discussion of this section, I conclude that the two semantic sub-kinds of predicative APs appear to be a projection of different functional heads: depictive predicates behave as a TP while resultative ones seem to be AspPs. If this conclusion is correct, the inventory of categories which can function as secondary predicates would be in fact reduced. As is well known, although I have constructed my arguments referring only to APs secondary predicates (which appears to be the canonical case), all kinds of projections of lexical heads can show up in this context: in (45a) the predicative is a PP, in (45b) an NP.

(45)a. Dejó a sus hijos [sin dinero por la noche].
'(S)he left his/her sons without money during the night.'

b. Nombró a su caballo [consul de Roma].
'(S)he name his/her horse "consul of Rome".'

Within the proposal for which I have provided support, these cases will have to be reformulated to say that these predicatives are projections of a Tense or Aspect head which takes any of the lexical projections as a complement. In view of my proposals, configuration (22) will be as in (46).
(46) Does this proposal have unexpected implications from a theoretical point of view? I think it does not. It is not surprising, first, that constructions which intuitively are a sort of truncated clause project only part of the nodes of a regular sentence. Second, it is coherent with the conception of grammar as a very reduced set of rules and principles to conclude that the apparently categorically heterogeneous set of secondary predicates is in fact one single construction whose minimal differences (being headed by Tense or by Aspect) follows from other modules of the grammar. From the theory of government it will follow, in fact, that depictives have to be Tense phrases; from the theory of theta-marking we could deduce the aspccual nature of resultatives. I will further extend these considerations in section 3, when speculating briefly on the behavior of Tense in predicative APs.

3 **Tense inclusion in predicative APs and other corollaries.** I have argued in the preceding section that certain predicative APs are temporal expressions. It is evident, on the other hand, that, similarly to infinitives, they lack the tense features usually associated with finite verbs: they do not refer overtly to past, present, or future. From this fact it follows also that the relation between the predicative TP and the tense of the matrix clause will not be submitted to any identification requirement for tenses such as the Anchoring Principle (cf. Enç 1987) or any other similar requirement.

In her exhaustive study on the syntax and semantics of tense in matrix, complement sentences, and relative clauses, Enç (1987) developed and articulated a set of anchoring conditions which explain why the truth of a tensed matrix sentence is relative to the speech time, and why complement tenses are linked to higher sentences that are linked either to even higher sentences or to the speech time (cf. op. cit.: 642). This linking is the condition which allows what are called 'shifted readings' and 'simultaneous readings' for a given complement tense, namely, a relation of either 'precedence' or 'identity' between tenses. For instance, in a sentence like (47) (taken from Enç 1987: 646) the verb complement in past tense has a shifted reading insofar as the state described by the complement precedes the event described by the superordinate clause.

(47) John heard that Mary was pregnant.

In Enç’s system, the shifted reading is obtained by anchoring the complement tense through its Comp. But in sentence (47), there is also a simultaneous reading in which John hears at a past time that Mary is pregnant at the time of hearing. The simultaneous reading is obtained when the complement tense is directly bound.

However, there is nothing equivalent to these two kinds of readings in the relation between the predicative phrase and the matrix tense, even if there is a tense relation between them, as has been frequently claimed. How can this temporal relation be characterized?

Taking the basic notion from Enç (1987), the temporal relation holding between the tense phrases in the constructions under study is one of ‘inclusion’. If we assume that predicatives, like the other temporal expressions (tenses and adverbs, for instance), denote intervals, we can characterize the relation between the secondary predicate and the matrix tense, asserting that the interval denoted by the matrix tense has to be included in the interval denoted by the predicate. In other words, a sentence like (48) will be true only if the interval denoted by the main tense is included in the interval denoted by the predicate. Observe that the possible continuations of (48) corroborate this interpretation: the state described by the predicate can begin at the moment in which the main event starts but can also precede it and may or may not follow it, the only condition for the truth of (48) being that the state described by the predicate must have held for some period preceding and extending up to the time of the main action.

(48) Pepe ascendió el Pichincha emocionado,

‘Pepe climb (the) Pichincha moved,

... pero antes estaba frío de pasiones,

‘... but previously he was cold of passions,’

... pero antes estaba frío de pasiones,
...tal como venía estando a lo largo del día,
'as he had been (feeling) all along the day,'
...e inmediatamente cambió de humor,
'and immediately he changed his mood,'
...y siguió así durante toda la tarde.
'and he remained in this mood the whole afternoon.'

From the property of being a TP and denoting an interval, the condition of referring only to intrinsic but transitory qualities (recall (7)) is included, and an 'antecedence of this tense' (relation that we are characterizing by assuming this notion of temporal inclusion) is satisfied to say that one of the cases where an expression to be interpreted prior to the expression depending on it. According to the procedure set forth in Heim (1982) and adopted again in Enç (1987), 'it will suffice to say that one of the cases where an expression α is interpreted before another expression β is when α c-commands β.' (Enç, 1987: 651).

Now if the procedure established in Heim-Enç's system for the interpretation of the temporal relation of inclusion is the correct one, it is obvious that it does not work in our representation of the syntax of depictive predicates (the one in (22) and (46)), except for the case of subject-oriented depictives. In our representation, the main tense β c-commands the tense in the object-oriented predicative α, but not vice versa, which is the expected relation of c-command.

A possibility which will have to be investigated, but that I will not pursue any further here, is whether depictive object-oriented predicates move in some way at LF in order to have c-command over the main tense.31

Regarding the 'temporally dependent' interpretation of resulative predicates, observe that our conclusion is that this interpretation is not related in fact to tense but to the internal temporality or aspect (or Aktionsart) of the predication relation. If the predicate defines a perfective state and if this state can make part of the event structure of the main predicate, it can only be interpreted, as I have said, as a final state. The reading of temporal dependence, therefore, is a collateral reading following from the aspectual properties of the construction, not a central part of the syntax and semantics of resultative predicates.

---

31 Actually, this is part of Enç's analysis for embedded present complements.
On the characterization of a class of ditransitive verbs in Spanish
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0 Introduction. One of the most productive lines of research in generative syntax over the last decade has been the attempt to derive the particular properties of the complementation structure of lexical heads from more general aspects of linguistic structure such as the direction of Case assignment and theta-role assignment, the interaction between Case assignment and theta-role assignment, and the interaction between lexical structure and syntactic mapping. One set of verbs in Spanish whose lexical and syntactic properties have resisted easy elucidation is the class of ditransitive verbs exemplified in (1).

(1) a. {Hemos obligado a los estudiantes/ Los hemos obligado} a que asistan a la clase.
   'We have obliged the students/ them (ACC) that (they) attend the class.'

b. {Convenci a mi amiga/ La convenci} de que debía consultar con un médico.
   'I convinced my friend/ her (ACC) that (she) should consult a doctor.'

c. Lola {animó a Pepe/ lo animó} a estudiar lingüística.
   'Lola encouraged Pepe/ him (ACC) to study linguistics.'

As we see in (1), the DP complement of these verbs is marked with accusative Case, while the clausal complement appears with a preposition, either a or de. Here I will argue that verbs like obligar 'to oblige' and convencer 'to convince' are generated at D-Structure with an empty verbal head with a VP complement; raising of the lower verb to the higher verbal head produces the observed surface order.

I will proceed as follows. First I will examine various possible D-Structure configurations for these verbs. I will then examine the facts of

---
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