

On the classification of (non-resultative) predicative adjuncts*

1. Introduction

So-called depictives are currently the main focus of the linguistic-typological debate on secondary predicates (HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT (eds.) 2005). The term “depictive” is inconsistently used, however. On the one hand, it is used in a broader sense in opposition to “resultatives”, i.e. resultative secondary predicative elements; cf. for instance the German sentences *Er kochte die Eier hart* ‘he hard-boiled the eggs’ or *Man wählte Oldenburg als Tagungs-ort aus* ‘Oldenburg was chosen as the conference venue’. (Resultatives are not the subject of this study, however.) In this sense the term is used to cover not only depictives proper, but also a type of predicative adjunct, which NICHOLS (1981, 134ff) labels circumstantials. On the other hand, the term “depictive” – as used throughout this study – is understood in a narrower sense, i.e. in opposition to the term “circumstantial”. The following contribution discusses questions concerning the classification of such non-resultative predicative adjuncts, which we shall subsume under the generic term “(non-resultative) secondary predicates”. Characteristic of these predicates – as often noted (cf. AARTS 1995, 75) – is a “copular” relation to a participant (in a broader sense) of the clause in question, in which another element assumes the function of the primary predicate; e. g. in *Paul kehrte als Held zurück* ‘Paul returned a hero’, where the whole predication is constructed around the primary predicate *zurückkehren* ‘return’ and a secondary predication is thereby semantically implied *Paul war (dabei) ein Held* ‘Paul was (in this very moment) a hero’. (The subject phrase in this partial copular paraphrase, i.e. the phrase to which the secondary predicate refers, is referred to in the following as “controller”.) Besides the classification of such constructions, the problem of differentiating them from other constructions will also be discussed, as similar copular relations occur in constructions that are variously described in Germanistic linguistics as a subgroup of so-called loose appositions. These include either non-restrictive (i.e. “appositive” in a slightly

* This study closely follows the observations made in HENTSCHEL (2006), but contains a number of closer specifications and modifications.

different sense) or restrictive modifications of the controller; cf. *Peter als Arbeitsloser bekam eine Ermäßigung* 'being (as he was) out of work, Peter got a reduction', which can be paraphrased as *Peter bekam eine Ermäßigung, weil er Arbeitsloser war* 'Peter got a reduction because he was out of work', or *Frauen als Vorgesetzte sind meinem Freund suspekt*, literally 'Women as superiors are suspect to my friend' paraphrased as *Frauen sind meinem Freund suspekt, wenn sie Vorgesetzte sind* 'my friend finds women suspect when they are superiors' (cf. LAWRENZ 1993, 97-122). In the following, German constructions with *als* 'as' serve as an illustration, and for the purposes of clarifying certain questions on classification and distinction are compared with corresponding Polish *jako*-constructions.

2. Four basic classes

2.1 A first approach and first problems

Let us assume that there are four basic classes of non-resultative, secondary predicative adjuncts:

<i>Characteristics</i> <i>Type of secondary predicate</i>	A	B	C	D	E	F _{ger}	F _{pol}
depictive	+	+	+	+	-	-	-
temporal-circumstantial	-	-	+	+	+	-	+
conditional-circumstantial	-	-	-	+	+	+	+
causal-circumstantial	-	-	-	-	-	+	+

Table 1

This classification is based on the following criteria:

- A: The secondary predicate is within the scope of negation.
- B: The secondary predication is within the scope of the temporal and modal operators of the primary predicate when the discourse-pragmatic focus lies on the secondary predicate.
- C: The whole predication expresses only a temporal relation between the primary and secondary predication.
- D: The secondary predication differs from a strong free adjunct in the sense of STUMP (1985); see below for further details.
- E: The secondary predication restricts the validity of the primary predication (or proposition).
- F: In non-contrastive constructions the secondary predicate can occur adjacent immediately to the right of its controller in sentence-initial position.¹

The distinction between depictives and circumstantials is generally well-known and was already discussed by NICHOLS (1981), although she did not apply the term “depictive”. Depictives (in a stricter sense) roughly correspond to the “free non-circumstantial predicate nominals” assumed by Nichols and also some of those that she labels “bound predicate nominals”.² The main distinctive feature between depictives and circumstantials is generally seen in the fact that the former stand together with the primary predicate within the scope of the general (i.e. non-local) negation:

1 Criterion F has a different status to the other criteria. It refers to the linear positional behaviour of the individual classes in German and Polish, to regularities in individual languages. It is required here mainly for the discussion on distinguishing circumstantials and certain “loose” appositions.

2 In a cross-classification, Nichols distinguishes “bound” and “free” secondary predicates, whereby circumstantials are principally free. It is the non-circumstantials which according to Nichols can be distinguished as bound (*On šel veselyj* ‘He went merrily [along]’) and free (*On spit odetyj* ‘He sleeps fully dressed’). She does qualify, however, that bound secondary predicates are not complements (in a strict sense), i.e. do not belong to the valency of the primary predicate. Her division into “governed – bound – free” explicitly (p. 11) follows ZOLOTOVA’s (1973, 52ff.) division into “governed – weakly governed – non-governed”. For the purposes of our discussion here, the “bound/free” distinction of the non-governed secondary predicates, i.e. those with adjunct status, is of no relevance.

- (1) Er kehrte nicht *als Held* nach Moskau zurück. (Er ist nie zurückgekehrt und ein Held war er auch nicht.)
 ‘He did not return to Moscow as a hero.’ → ‘He did not return to Moscow and was not a hero.’³

This is different with circumstantials:

- (2) *Als Kind* wohnte er nicht in Moskau.
 ‘He did not live in Moscow as a child.’ → ‘When he was a child he did not live in Moscow.’

In (2) with a temporal circumstantial the affirmation of the second predication ‘he was a child’ is not affected by the negation, but is presupposed. The same is true of other classes of circumstantials. This fundamental distinction between depictives and circumstantials must not be discussed further here; the focus of this chapter will be on other questions concerning classification and distinction. First of all, two aspects of the “inventory” of subclasses will be discussed: the first is that this classification deviates from the much-cited classification of NICHOLS (1981)⁴ insofar as firstly, this approach adopts a new subcategory of causal circumstantials and secondly, it rules out a separate class of concessive circumstantials.

2.2 The problem of causal circumstantials

Secondary predicative *als*-phrases that express the reason for the state of affairs of the primary predication are not regarded by NICHOLS (1981) as a particular class of “causal circumstantials”. Some examples, which suggest a causal reading, are categorised by her as conditionals (p. 137): [...] *kak predstavitel' svoej sredy on pital ljubov' k francuzskoj kulture* ‘as a representative of his social background he fostered sympathies for French culture’. A common feature of causal secondary predicates and conditionals is that they both stand not only in a certain temporal, but also in a so-called “factual” relation to the primary predication. Conditional and causal constructions (corresponding adverbials or adverbial clauses, and also corresponding circumstantials) are verbalizations of

3 With a contrastive intonation on *als Held* ‘as a hero’ only the depictive would be negated: ‘he returned to Moscow, but not as a hero’ This would be an instance of a so-called partial negation, which some authors (cf. HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2005, 17) take as diagnostic for a depictive, too. This seems questionable, as in principle any constituent can be negated alone, even circumstantials, as in a sentence homonymous with (2), but again with a different intonation: *Als Kind wohnte er nicht in Moskau (sondern als Student)* ‘He didn't live in Moscow as a child (but as a student)’.

4 This classification is also adopted by HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT (2005).

cause-effect relationships. The principal difference between causal and conditional secondary predicative phrases is based on a contrast identified by STUMP (1985, 41-64) in his discussion of gerundial constructions. Stump first distinguishes “absolutes” (*His father being a sailor, John knows all about boats*) and free adjuncts (*Walking home, he found a dollar*). He goes on to further differentiate the latter, which alone are of relevance here (esp. pp. 41f. and 53ff.), into weak and strong free adjuncts. Weak free adjuncts as in *Standing on a chair, John can touch the ceiling* are read as conditional statements, as in ‘when he is standing on a chair...’, which modally restricts the validity of the main clause, or primary predication. A strong free adjunct as in *Having unusually long arms, John can touch the ceiling* is a causal statement, i.e. ‘because he has unusually long arms...’, which does not restrict the modal validity of the primary predication, but only specifies it further. HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT (2005, 19-24) emphasize the significance of this differentiation for the discussion of secondary predicates. They claim the following (p. 22):

“STRONG FREE ADJUNCTS are another type of participant-oriented expression which differs quite clearly from depictives and circumstantials in that it is not a part of the same clause as the primary predicate and hence not, strictly speaking, an adjunct (nor a secondary predicate). WEAK FREE ADJUNCT, on the other hand, appears to be simply another term for circumstantial secondary predicates.”

Without wishing to contest the significance of the differentiation made in Stump’s observations on gerundial constructions, Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt’s position appears to be an overinterpretation. Causals and conditionals differ, but also have commonalities that go beyond participant orientation. These will be discussed below.

2.3 The problem of concessive circumstantials

The motivation for rejecting a subclass of concessive circumstantials is that concessive circumstantials can be ascribed to two other, more fundamental subclasses of circumstantials. In the first place, attention has to be drawn to the close relationship between concessive and causal circumstantials. A secondary predicate that is interpreted as causal in an affirmative clause (3), when negated, can be interpreted as concessive (4):

- (3) Paul *als Schwerverletzter* liegt auf der Intensivstation. (causal)
 ‘Paul, heavily injured, is in intensive care’ → ‘because he is heavily injured’

- (4) Paul *als Schwerverletzter* liegt nicht auf der Intensivstation.
 (concessive)
 'Paul, heavily injured, is not in intensive care' → 'although he is heavily injured'

Concessivity is thereby signalled overtly, always orally by intonation⁵, and also frequently through the use of lexical indicators such as *sogar, selbst* 'even' and so on (*Paul liegt selbst als Schwerverletzter nicht auf der Intensivstation* 'Even though he is heavily injured, Paul is not in intensive care') or the co-text, e.g. through a preceding *stell dir vor* 'imagine' (*Stell dir vor, Paul als Schwerverletzter liegt nicht ...* 'Imagine – although he is heavily injured ...').

Conversely, a secondary predicate in an affirmative phrase that is interpreted as concessive (5) can be interpreted as causal when negated (6):

- (5) (*Stell dir vor, sogar*) Paul *als Kind* durfte in den Pub. (concessive)
 '(Imagine, even) as a child, Paul was allowed in the pub' → 'although he was a child'
- (6) Paul *als Kind* durfte natürlich nicht in den Pub. (causal)
 'As a child, Paul was of course not allowed in the pub' → 'because he was a child'

The dependency of the interpretation on the negation is based on various pragmatic premises, in this case common world knowledge: 'The severely injured belong in intensive care' and 'In Great Britain, children are not allowed in pubs'. Such concessive constructions as well as their causal counterparts with the opposite value of the polarity parameter (affirmation vs. negation) are thus variants of a first type, which we define as "causal" (see below). If causal circumstantials were not acknowledged as secondary predicates, then at least this type of concessive, which is the classic type, in the sense of expressing a "counter-reason without effect" (German: "wirkungsloser Gegengrund"), would also have to be rejected.

There is also a second type of concessive circumstantial that can be described as a variant of conditional circumstantials. Here, too, pragmatic premises are decisive for a conditional or a concessive reading. A "purely" conditional reading would be in (7):

5 Other circumstantial constructions, i.e. temporal, conditional and oral ones, seem to have the same, unmarked intonation pattern. The intonation of circumstantial constructions with a concessive reading is thus marked, which correlates with their status as marked instances of conditional or causal circumstantial constructions.

- (7) *Als Longdrink* ist Whisky köstlich. (conditional)
 ‘Whisky is delectable as a long drink.’ → ‘if it is served as a long-drink’
- (8) Selbst *als Digestif* ist Whisky geeignet. (concessive)
 ‘Whisky is even appropriate as a digestif.’ → ‘even if it is served as a digestive’
- (9) Selbst *als Longdrink* kann ich Whisky nicht trinken. (concessive)
 ‘I cannot even drink whisky as a long drink’ → ‘even if it is served as a long drink’

The concessive reading, in each case overtly signalled through *selbst* ‘even’, is based in the affirmative sentence (8) on the fact that whisky is not usually drunk as a digestif (at least not outside the Anglo-Saxon world); in the negative sentence (9), by contrast, concessivity is based on the fact that (even on the European continent) whisky with soda is widely known as a long drink. If the typical concessivity of Type 1 – as already stated – is known as a “counter-reason without effect”, then the second type of conditional concessive circumstantials could be called “counter-condition without effect” (“wirkungslose Gegenbedingung”).⁶ Concessive circumstantials can thus be attributed to two, more fundamental types of secondary predicate, i.e. causal and conditional.

2.4 Conditional or causal circumstantials vs. restrictive or non-restrictive “loose” appositions

The constructions which – as mentioned above – are regarded by (German) Germanists as a subtype of so-called “loose” appositions that constitute either restrictive or non-restrictive controller modifications, are exactly equivalent in their function to conditional and causal circumstantials. In this section it will be discussed whether conditional and causal circumstantials and the corresponding loose appositions do in fact represent different categories. For this reason a comparison with Polish equivalent constructions will be helpful:

restrictive - conditional

- (10) Frauen *als Vorgesetzte* sind meinem Freund suspekt.

6 To a certain extent Type 2 concessivity has an equivalent in so-called irrelevance conditionals, which the GDS (1997, 2319-2322) describes as a subtype of adverbial clauses: *Selbst wenn er als Longdrink angeboten wird, kann ich Whisky nicht trinken* ‘Even when it is served as a long drink I cannot drink whisky’.

- (11) *Kobiety jako przełożone* są dla mojego przyjaciela podejrzane.
lit.: 'Women as superiors are suspect to my friend' → 'when they are superiors'

non-restrictive - causal

- (12) *Peter als Arbeitsloser* bekam eine Ermäßigung.
(13) *Piotr jako bezrobotny* dostał zniżkę.
'As an unemployed person, Peter got a reduction' → 'because he is unemployed'

In these four sentences, the relevant *als-* and *jako-*phrases are positioned adjacent directly to the right of their phrase of reference, i.e. their controller, and thus in a typical position for appositions. However, they can also occur in other linear positions, e.g. at the beginning of the phrase, in which case – especially in German with its mandatory finite verb form coming second – other components can occur between the phrase of reference and the controller:

- (14) *Als Arbeitsloser* bekam Peter eine Ermäßigung.
(15) *Jako bezrobotny* Piotr dostał zniżkę.
'As an unemployed person, Peter got a reduction.'
(16) *Als Vorgesetzte* sind Frauen meinem Freund suspekt.
(17) *Jako przełożone* kobiety są dla mojego przyjaciela podejrzane.
'As superiors, my friend finds women suspect.'

In such cases, Germanist linguists commonly speak of "distant (or: discontinuous) appositions" ("Appositionen in Distanzstellung") that are not directly adjacent on the right-hand side but remote from the controller. EISENBERG (1986, 323) ascertains, however, that in positional terms "*als* plus Nominal" has similar possibilities to adverbials. This raises the general question whether constructions of this kind should be classified as appositions or as adverbials (adverbials understood in a broader sense, including secondary predicates), or, to be more precise, whether or not they should be classified as part of the nominal phrase of their controllers. Nichols assumes the latter for "her" circumstantials. Of course, the term "circumstantial" chosen by her, is reminiscent of traditional terms such as German "Umstandsbestimmung", Polish "okolicznik" and Russian "obstoja-tel'stvo". In fact, she defines (p. 367) a circumstantial as "[...] an actant not governed by the verb. Also adverbial; in relational grammar oblique or non-term". In the following, the term "adverbial" refers exclusively to event-oriented adjuncts.

For participant-oriented adjuncts – as already stated – the term “secondary predicate” is used.⁷ Neither, of course, are parts of a nominal phrase.

The assessment of *als*-phrases of this kind as appositions, however, would mean classifying them as constituents of the nominal phrases to which they refer, and not as elements of the verbal phrase or the sentence-level. One argument in favour of an interpretation of *als*-phrases as parts of the noun phrases of their controllers is e.g. that in German such *als*-phrases can be placed in the so-called “Vorfeld” together with their phrase of reference (or, following the generative approach, in the SpecCP position), as in sentences (12) and (14). In other *als*-phrases, like for example the depictives in (18) and (19) and in (20) and (21), this is not possible, even in Polish, although in that language the constituent sequence is substantially freer than in German and a specific structural “Vorfeld” is not assumed (cf. DPKG 1999, 495ff):

(18) *Herrn Meier (nur) *als Vorgesetzten* habe ich kennen gelernt.

(19) *Pana Meiera (tylko) *jako przełożonego* poznałem.
with an intended meaning of ‘I (only) got to know Mr. Meier as a superior’

but

(20) Herr Meier habe ich (nur) *als Vorgesetzten* kennen gelernt.

(21) Pana Meiera poznałem (tylko) *jako przełożonego*.
‘I only got to know Mr. Meier as a superior.’

LAWRENZ (1993, 99) therefore qualifies *als*-phrases as in (18) and (20) as “constituents of VP or as adverbials” (transl. GH). This is the class of *als*-phrases which the GDS (1997) describes as “komplementbezogene Verbgruppenadverbialien”, i.e. as adverbials within the verbal phrase that are oriented towards a complement of the primary predicate. (The GdS does not postulate other classes of complement- or participant-oriented “adverbials”.)

In Polish, a depictive is allowed adjacent to the right of the initial controller only in contrastive readings with a corresponding intonation with marked expressive emphasis on the depictive (23). German does not allow an *als*-phrase directly adjacent to the right of the controller, even in this case of (22):

(22) *Paul *als Held* kehrte zurück, nicht als Feigling.

(23) Paweł *jako bohater* wrócił, nie jako tchórz.
‘Paul returned [as] a hero, not [as] a coward.’

7 Cases of ambiguity between event and participant orientation are described in SCHROEDER (2004, § 2.3.3.).

By the same token, nor is a temporal circumstantial possible in this position in German:

(24) *Peter *als Kind* trug eine Brille.⁸

but

(25) *Als Kind* trug Peter eine Brille.
'As a child, Peter wore glasses.'

In Polish, by contrast, it is possible to position such a temporal-circumstantial secondary predicate adjacent to the right – in other words, it allows a literal, linear translation of (24):

(26) Piotr *jako dziecko* nosił okulary.

Thus, while in Polish it is only the depictives, in German it is depictives and temporal circumstantials, i.e. those secondary predicates that are not described as appositions in Germanist linguistics, that display a different, restricted linearisation behaviour compared to conditional and causal circumstantials (and the concessives derived from them).

Last but not least, the two types of *als*-phrases that Germanist linguists view as internal to the NP also display noticeable coordination behaviour.

restrictive (conditional):

(27) [*Als Aperitif*]_i und [bei Völlegefühl]_k [ist Magenbitter, unersetzlich]_k.

(28) *Jako aperitif* i w przypadku uczucia sytości gorzka wódka jest niezastapiona.
'As an aperitif, and when feeling satiated, a herbal vodka is indispensable'

non-restrictive (causal):

(29) [*Als Arbeitsloser*]_i und [wegen seiner Kindheitserlebnisse]_k [wusste Peter, was es heißt, kein Geld zu haben]_k.

(30) *Jako bezrobotny* i z powodu swoich przeżyć z dzieciństwa wiedział Piotr, co to znaczy, nie mieć pieniędzy.
'As an unemployed person, and because of his childhood experiences, Peter knew what it meant to have no money.'

This supports the syntactic equivalence of event-related adverbials and participant-related circumstantials, at least when the latter are in a position distant to

8 A causal reading of this surface clause would also be acceptable, e.g. in a dressing-up scenario in which the children had to wear glasses, but not the adults; cf. also the typical causal construction: *Peter als Kind verstand den Witz natürlich nicht* 'Being a child [because he was a child], Peter naturally did not understand the joke'.

the controller. If one followed the Germanistic descriptive tradition, then sentences (27) and (29) would have to be seen as a coordination of a subphrase of an NP (the so-called distant apposition) on the one hand, and an adverbial from outside that NP on the other, which would be an ungainly solution for any syntax model.

The same coordination behaviour is given both in temporal circumstantials and temporal adverbials as well as in depictives and manner adverbials:

- (31) [*Als Kind*]_i und [*später, im Alter,*]_k [*trug Peter, eine Brille*]_k.
 (32) *Jako dziecko i później, w starości, Piotr nosił okulary.*
 ‘As a child and later, in old age, Peter wore glasses.’
 (33) [*Er, kehrte [als Held],* und [*mit großem Hallo*]_k in sein Heimatdorf zurück.]_k
 (34) *Wrócił jako bohater i z wielką pompą do swojej rodzinnej wsi.*
 lit.: ‘He returned [as] a hero and with a great fanfare to his home village.’

With the latter two types of adjuncts (temporal circumstantials and depictives), however, this does not present a problem, as owing to their positional behaviour described above (the above-mentioned exclusion in direct adjacency to the right of the controller) they cannot be “suspected” of being appositional. A co-occurrence without a conjunction is ruled out, unless one of the two phrases can be interpreted as subordinate to the other and thus modifying the latter semantically. This is possible, for instance, in a construction with a temporal circumstantial *Als Kind trug Peter vor der Einschulung eine Brille* ‘As a child, before starting school, Peter wore glasses’.

Additionally, the following should also be considered: in German, prepositional adverbials as in (35) and also (37) are not acceptable, or are at least questionable, when directly adjacent to the right of the subject in initial position, while the same phrases do not pose a problem as parenthetical insertions in the same linear position but prosodically or graphically marked, cf. (36) and also (38). This is true independent of whether the adverbial occurs alone as in (35) and (36) or coordinated in conjunction with an *als*-phrase as in (37) and (38):

- (35) ^{??}*Peter wegen seiner Kindheitserlebnisse* wusste, was es heißt, kein Geld zu haben.
 ‘Owing to his childhood experiences Peter knew what it meant to have no money.’

- (36) Peter – *wegen seiner Kindheitserlebnisse* – wusste, was es heißt, kein Geld zu haben.
 ‘Peter – owing to his childhood experiences – knew what it meant to have no money.’
- (37) ^{??}Peter *als junger Arzt und wegen seiner Kindheitserlebnisse* wusste, was es heißt, kein Geld zu haben.
 ‘As a young doctor and owing to his childhood experiences, Peter knew what it meant to have no money.’
- (38) Peter – *als junger Arzt und wegen seiner Kindheitserlebnisse* – wusste, was es heißt, kein Geld zu haben.
 ‘Peter – being a young doctor and owing to his childhood experiences – knew what it meant to have no money.’
- (39) Peter *als junger Arzt* wusste, was es heißt, kein Geld zu haben.
 ‘As a young doctor, Peter knew what it meant to have no money.’

In other words, a (non-temporal) circumstantial *als*-phrase can freely occur directly adjacent to the right of its controller if it is not coordinated with a semantically corresponding adverbial, cf. (39). In this position it can cooccur with such an adverbial only if both are parenthetically marked, cf. (38). (Both are possible in coordination as well in sentence-initial position, before the controller, as has been illustrated by (29).) But in parenthesis any structure is possible, not only the adverbial on its own (36), even sentences such as ... – *at least I strongly assume so* – ... Parenthetical insertions of whatever element are, of course, not the subject of this discussion.

The proposed conclusion is as follows: Only if the secondary predicative element marked with *als* is positioned directly adjacent to the right of its controller should it be interpreted as an element of the NP of its controller, i.e. as an apposition. When the secondary predicative element is positioned distant to the controller it behaves like adverbials as a part of the VP (depictives) or on the sentence level (circumstantials). It is thus unnecessary to assume a “category” of distant appositions.

3. A closer view

3.1 Aspects of temporal reference and modality in primary and secondary predication

The classification in Table 1 must be differentiated especially in respect of attributes of temporal reference and modality. The first relevant aspect of this differ-

entiation is the possibility of “actual” or “individual” vs. “non-actual” or “non-individual” temporal reference of the whole predication. A sentence or utterance like *The tea is cold, darling* refers to an individual circumstance in space and time, i.e. a circumstance that is actual (actually ongoing) at the point of reference⁹ in the sense of REICHENBACH (1947). In Slavistic tense and aspect research, reference to one or more certain points of reference along the time axis is commonly called an “actual” (aktuelle) reference (cf. e.g. MEHLIG 1980, 2f). In Lehmann’s tense-aspect model (e.g. LEHMANN 1999), “actual reference” would be equivalent to “episodicity”.¹⁰ Lehmann defines (p. 217ff.) individual, concrete, or unique events (in a stricter sense) and processes as episodes. Habitual, iterative, generic or general (universal) factual states of affairs, as e.g. in the iterative sentence *Bei Peter ist der Tee immer kalt* ‘At Peter’s the tea is always cold’, are not episodic in Lehmann’s sense, as they do not refer to unique episodes or individual circumstances. We will stick to the more traditional term of “actual” [+actref] or “non-actual” [-actref] temporal reference.¹¹

The second relevant aspect is that of real [+real] vs. non-real modality [-real] (in a broader sense) of the secondary predicate. The latter encompasses the non-real modality in a strict sense (possibility, conditionality etc.) as well as reference to the future in the sense of any time after the moment of speech (cf. GIVÓN 1984, 285). The characteristics of the four types of secondary predication assumed above are summarized in following table:

	SecP		PrimP		Example
	actref	real	actref	real	
Depictives					
1	+	+	+	+	Gestern zum Mittag aß er Rindfleisch <i>als Tartar</i> . 'Yesterday for lunch he ate beef (in the form of) tartar.'
2	+	+	+	-	*

- * The numbered lines without examples serve to facilitate a comparison of the four individual tables and illustrate which combinations are possible and where.

9 ... which in present tense, of course, coincides with the point of speech.

10 For more details on episodicity cf. LEHMANN (1994).

11 In HENTSCHEL (2006) we used the term “individual reference” [±iref] instead, which might be confusing, “individual(s)” being more associated with “object reference” than “time reference”.

	3	+	+	-	+	
	4	+	-	+	+	
	5	+	+	-	-	
	6	+	-	+	-	Gestern zum Mittag hätte er Rindfleisch <i>als Tartar</i> gegessen. (Er war nämlich leicht betrunken.) 'Yesterday lunchtime he would have eaten beef (in the form of) tartar. (He was in fact slightly drunk.)' or: Morgen zum Mittag wird er Rindfleisch <i>als Tartar</i> essen. 'Tomorrow lunchtime he will eat beef (in the form of) tartar.'
	7	+	-	-	+	
	8	+	-	-	-	
	9	-	+	+	+	
	10	-	+	+	-	
	11	-	+	-	+	Polnische Männer essen Rindfleisch am liebsten <i>als Tartar</i> . 'Polish men most prefer to eat beef (in the form of) tartar.'
	12	-	-	+	+	
	13	-	+	-	-	
	14	-	-	+	-	
	15	-	-	-	+	
	16	-	-	-	-	Gäbe es noch Rinder, würden polnische Männer Rindfleisch am liebsten <i>als Tartar</i> essen. 'If there were still cows, Polish men would most prefer to eat beef (in the form of) tartar.' or: Auch in ihrem nächsten Leben werden polnische Männer Rindfleisch am liebsten <i>als Tartar</i> essen. 'In their next lives Polish men will still most prefer to eat beef (in the form of) tartar.'
TempCirc	1	+	+	+	+	<i>Als Sieger</i> des Wettbewerbs küsste er sofort seine Freundin. lit.: 'As (the) winner of the competition he immediately kissed his girlfriend.' (in the sense of: 'Having (just) won the competition, he ...')
	2	+	+	+	-	
	3	+	+	-	+	* <i>Als Sieger</i> rauchte er nie wieder. lit.: 'As (the) winner of the competition he never smoked again.' (in the sense of: 'Having won the competition he ...')

4	+	-	+	+	
5	+	+	-	-	
6	+	-	+	-	
7	+	-	-	+	
8	+	-	-	-	
9	-	+	+	+	<i>Als Kind</i> verlor er beide Beine. 'As a child he lost both legs.'
10	-	+	+	-	<i>Als Kind</i> hätte er beide Beine verlieren können, wenn man ihn nach einem Unfall nicht sofort operiert hätte. 'As a child he could have lost both his legs if he hadn't had an operation straight after an accident.'
11	-	+	-	+	<i>Als Kind</i> lebte er in Paris. 'As a child he lived in Paris.'
12	-	-	+	+	
13	-	+	-	-	<i>Als Kind</i> hätte er in Paris leben können, wenn sich seine Eltern nicht hätten scheiden lassen. 'As a child he could (might) have lived in Paris if his parents hadn't divorced.'
14	-	-	+		<i>Als Rentner</i> will / wird er eine Weltreise machen. 'As a pensioner he wants to go / will go on a trip round the world.' (in the sense of: 'When he retires, he wants...')
15	-	-	-	+	
16	-	-	-	-	<i>Als Rentner</i> will / wird er viel reisen. 'As a pensioner he will/wants to travel a lot.' (in the sense of: 'When he retires, he wants...')
CondCirc					
1	+	+	+	+	
2	+	+	+	-	
3	+	+	-	+	
4	+	-	+	+	
5	+	+	-	-	
6	+	-	+	-	<i>Als der am schwersten Verletzte des Unglücks</i> hätte er noch am Unfallort behandelt werden müssen. [ambig. with CausCirc 2] 'As the most severely injured accident victim (in the sense of: 'if he had been...') he should have been operated on right at the scene of the accident.'
7	+	-	-	+	<i>Als Redner</i> für den morgigen Staatsempfang bringt er beste Empfehlungen mit. 'As the speaker at the state reception tomorrow he is most highly recommended.'
8	+	-	-	-	<i>Als am schwersten von einem Lawinenunglück Betroffener</i> würdest du später häufig zu Talkshows eingeladen. 'As the one most seriously affected by an

					avalanche you would often be invited to talk-shows later on.'
9	-	+	+	+	
10	-	+	+	-	
11	-	+	-	+	
12	-	-	+	+	
13	-	+	-	-	
14	-	-	+	-	<i>Als Beamter</i> hätte ich mich geweigert, die Anweisung auszuführen. 'As (if I were) a civil servant, I would have refused to carry out the instructions.' or: <i>Als Arzt</i> hätte er dem Verletzten den Arm abgebunden. 'As (if he had been) a doctor, he would have bandaged up the wound in the injured person's arm.'
15	-	-	-	+	<i>Als Mittelstürmer</i> spielt er immer gut. 'As centre-forward he always plays well.' or: <i>Als Mittelstürmer</i> ist er zu klein. 'As centre-forward he is too small.' (in the sense of: 'He is too small to be centre-forward.')
16	-	-	-	-	<i>Als Beamter</i> dürfte er nicht streiken. 'As (if he were) a civil servant he would not be allowed to strike.' or: <i>Als Arzt</i> wüsste er das. 'As (if he were) a doctor he would know that.'
CausCirc					
1	+	+	+	+	<i>Als der am schwersten Verletzte des Unglücks</i> wurde er noch am Unfallort operiert. 'As he was (or: Being) the most severely injured victim of the accident he was operated on right at the scene of the accident.'
2	+	+	+	-	<i>Als der am schwersten Verletzte des Unglücks</i> hätte er noch am Unfallort operiert werden müssen. [ambig. with CondCirc 6] 'As (or: Being) the most severely injured person from the accident he should have been operated on at the scene of the accident.'
3	+	+	-	+	<i>Als am schwersten vom Lawinenunglück Betroffener</i> wurde er später häufig zu Talkshows eingeladen. 'As (or: Being) the one most seriously affected by the avalanche he was later frequently invited to talkshows.'
4	+	-	+	+	
5	+	+	-	-	<i>Als einziger Überlebender dieses Unglücks</i> wird er bestimmt häufig zu Talkshows eingeladen werden. 'As (or: Being) the only survivor of the accident he will certainly be invited to talkshows frequently.'

6	+	-	+	-	
7	+	-	-	+	
8	+	-	-	-	
9	-	+	+	+	<i>Als Arzt band er dem Verletzten sofort den Arm ab.</i> 'As (or: Being) a doctor he bandaged the injured person's arm immediately.'
10	-	+	+	-	<i>Als Arzt hätte er dem Verletzten sofort den Arm abbinden müssen.</i> 'As (or: Being or: As he is...) a doctor he should have bandaged the injured person's arm immediately.'
11	-	+	-	+	<i>Als Arzt kannte er Trauer und Verzweiflung nur zu gut.</i> 'As (or: Being) a doctor he knew all too well about grief and despair.'
12	-	-	+	+	
13	-	+	-	-	<i>Als Arzt hätte er das wissen müssen.</i> 'As (or: Being or: As he is...) a doctor he should have known that.'
14	-	-	+	-	
15	-	-	-	+	
16	-	-	-	-	

Table 2

Key: SecP = secondary predication; PrimP = primary predication; actref = reference to an individual, actual state of affairs; real = real modality; TempCirc = temporal circumstantial, CondCirc = conditional circumstantial; CausCirc = causal circumstantial.

3.2 Discussion

The information derivable from Tables 1 and 2 substantiates the classification of secondary predicative constructions proposed above:

(A) As shown above, **depictives** differ from the other three types firstly in that they stand within the scope of negation (Tab. 1 A). It is also commonly pointed out that depictives stand in the scope of the temporal and modal operators of the primary predication, i.e. they have no independent temporal or modal values, or even that the secondary predication only applies for the validity of the primary predication (SCHROEDER 2004, § 2.2.2.1.2, § 2.3.1.1). The temporal coincidence of validity of primary and secondary predication can, of course, not be understood in an ontological sense. In a sentence such as *Er aß das Ei roh* 'He ate the egg raw' the egg was of course already raw before being eaten. But the depictive expresses – strictly speaking – not only a temporal relation, but also the relevance of the state of affairs expressed by the depictive for the state of affairs

expressed by the primary predication, that is, the relevance of the former for the latter within the temporal limitations of the validity of the latter. It cannot be discussed here whether this type of relevance corresponds to the one alluded to by Grice's maxim of relation. But it is obviously related to pragmatics rather than to semantics (cf. SCHROEDER 2004, § 2.3.1.2) A depictive construction the relevance of which cannot be reconstrued by the listener or reader is judged as unacceptable. Thus, the criterion of relevance would make a sentence such as *"Peter betrachtete die Eier roh* 'Peter looked at the eggs raw' unacceptable or at least questionable. In an every day pragmatic context of examining eggs, for instance when purchasing them, the statement would definitely seem unsatisfactory. A specific pragmatic context, however, can considerably improve the acceptability of the combination of the primary predication "examine (Peter; eggs)" and the secondary one "raw (eggs)": *Um die Veränderung der Farbe ihrer Schalen durch Kochen genau zu erfassen, betrachtete Peter die Eier zunächst roh* 'In order to grasp precisely the change in colour of the eggshells through boiling, Peter first looked at the eggs in their raw state'.

It must therefore in principle be possible to temporarily restrict (if not the predication itself, then) the relevance of the secondary predication. This clearly implies that especially those predicates can be used as depictives whose validity is ontologically limited in both directions (e.g. 'sad'), i.e. which have as a rule a beginning and an end, or at least unilaterally limited, like 'raw' having possibly the status 'non-raw' after 'raw', or 'ripe' having the prior status of 'non-ripe'. Other, "unlimited" predicates (like 'intelligent', 'genius') are often said to be ruled out as depictives (cf. e.g. HINTERHÖLZL 2001). This claim seems to be too strong in the following sense: Even a predicate like *Genie* 'genius' can be used as a depictive in an *als*-phrase if it implies a statement not directly about a "quality" of its controller but about a judgement or evaluation as to that quality by the corresponding environment. For example a sentence like *Im Alter von 10 Jahren verließ er sein Dorf in den Bergen als geistig Zurückgebliebener, im Alter von 40 Jahren kehrte er als Genie zurück* 'At the age of ten years he left his village in the mountains mentally retarded, at the age of 40 years he returned a genius' is fully acceptable. What is at issue here is not the actual mental quality of the individual referred to, but "the picture" of this mental quality construed by his environment at different points of time in his life. In "cotexts" that allow such a reading presumably any predicate is possible with a depictive reading.

Some depictive constructions with *als* and a noun¹² leave open whether they refer to “appearance” or to “reality”, obviously rather in the sense of ambiguity than in the sense of vagueness: *Er kehrte als Held in sein Dorf zurück* ‘He returned to his village (as) a hero’. Others refer clearly to “reality” as e.g. *Er starb als Kind* ‘He died as a child’.

Thus, if in the literature the simultaneous validity or even temporal coincidence of secondary and primary predication is discussed, then this affects the pragmatic relevance of the secondary predication. If simultaneous validity is thus understood, this also gives rise to certain referential characteristics of the predications (or propositions) in question: if the primary predication displays actual reference [+actref], then the secondary predication will do so, too. If the primary predication has non-actual reference [-actref], then the same will be true of the secondary predication (for more details see (B) below). A reading of a depictive as a statement referring to “appearance” can be triggered by this mechanism: If someone returns home (as) a hero he is at least a hero at the very moment of his return, i.e. at least in the eyes of the people at home.

Table 2 also illustrates that in depictive constructions the values for the [+real] or [-real] modality of secondary and primary predication always match. In principle, the referential and modal features of the depictives must be identical with those of the primary predication, which gives rise to four cases (Tab. 2, depictives 1, 6, 11, 16). The cases with the feature [-real] strongly resemble conditional circumstantials, however negation tests prove them to be depictives.

(B) A common feature of **temporal circumstantials** and **depictives** is that only a temporal relation between the validity of the primary and the secondary predication is expressed, which distinguishes them both from conditional and causal circumstantials, i.e. “factual” circumstantials (Tab. 1 C). Unlike depictives, which – as already stated – express simultaneous validity (conditional on the relevance of the secondary predication for the primary), temporal circumstantials establish the temporal background or framework for the validity of the primary predication. In this sense, in terms of temporal reference, temporal circumstantials are restrictive (Tab. 1 E).

One could attempt to explain the fact that in German depictives may not occur together with their controllers (directly adjacent to them on the right-hand side) in preverbal position of the corresponding sentences by the second fact that depictives simply are not constituents of the nominal phrases of their con-

12 Note that with adjectives in German *als* often explicitly expresses “appearance”, whereas zero-marking expresses “reality” (or – put more precisely – is unmarked in this respect): *Er wurde als gesund / gesund aus der Klinik entlassen*, ‘He was discharged from hospital/the clinic with a clean bill of health / as ‘well’.’

trollers: two constituents in front of the finite verb form (i.e. in the “Vorfeld”) are as a rule not possible in German.¹³ What is remarkable here, however, is, firstly, that it is not possible in Polish either (with unmarked, non-expressive and non-contrastive intonation of the depictives) to place the controller with a directly adjacent depictive in sentence-initial position before the primary predicate. Secondly, in the “Vorfeld” of German sentences temporal circumstantials are also not permitted adjacent to the right of the controller, in contrast to conditional and causal circumstantials. But this phenomenon can be accounted for: the discussion in 2.4 has shown that it is reasonable to assume that phrases semantically equivalent to conditional and causal circumstantials, but not to temporal ones, can be realized within the nominal phrase of the controller, which would mean that there would be only one constituent and no double occupancy of the “Vorfeld”. There remains the question, however, why secondarily predicative phrases expressing a temporary relation are ruled out in the nominal phrase of corresponding controllers.¹⁴

A further feature of temporal circumstantials is that they are [-actref] in the sense explained above, as all examples offered so far illustrate. In a sentence such as *Als Kind verlor er beide Beine* ‘As a child he lost both legs’, where the primary predication ‘he lost both legs’ is [+actref], the *als*-phrase delimits the temporal setting for which the primary predication is true. This means that it does not refer to an individual circumstance true at a certain time at a certain place. Temporal circumstantials are not equivalent to a temporal clause with actual reference (episodicity), even if the corresponding noun is a deverbal one: *?Als Sieger küsste er sofort seine Freundin*, lit.: ‘Being the winner, he immediately kissed his girlfriend’ is – insofar as it is at all acceptable¹⁵ – no paraphrase of the non-copular *Als er gesiegt hatte, küsste er ...* ‘When he had won, he kissed...’, in which the temporal adverbial phrases refer to an individual, actual event (the winning).

In addition to their [-actref] restriction, temporal circumstantials are typically [+real], which yields four main characteristics (Tab. 2, TempCirc 9, 10, 11, 13). Temporal circumstantials can only assume the [-real] value in reference to the future. In such cases the primary predication must, of course, refer to the future, i.e. also have [-real] value. This offers two further possible temporal circum-

13 Cf. MÜLLER (2003) on cases of multiple occupations of the “Vorfeld”.

14 This question, i.e. why secondary predicates, and particularly depictives, that only express a temporal, but no “factual” relation between the secondary and primary predication, show specific linearisation restrictions in more than one language, must be left to further investigation.

15 A non-temporal, causal construction ‘because he was the winner’, or ‘because he had won’ is acceptable in German.

stantials (Tab. 2, TempCirc 14, 16). Both resemble the conditional. This similarity is not least expressed by the corresponding adverbial clauses taking on the "conditional" present rather than future tense: *Als Rentner ...*, i.e. *Wenn ich Rentner bin, werde ich viel reisen* 'When I am retired I shall travel a lot'. The same is true in conditional clauses: *Als Mittelstürmer spielt er immer gut*, literally 'As centre-forward he always plays well', paraphrased as (*Immer*) *Wenn er Mittelstürmer ist, ...* 'Whenever he plays centre-forward...'. On the other hand, temporal circumstantials with [+real] are sometimes identifiable as temporals through the co-text; in isolation these "surface sentences" can be temporal or causal: *Als Direktor lebte er in Paris*, either 'When he was a director he lived in Paris' or 'Because he was the director he lived in Paris'.

(C) The [-real] feature is inherent to **conditional circumstantials**. However, not all eight logically possible cases are attested. Those cases in which the primary predication is as equally [-real] as the conditional circumstantial itself do not constitute a problem (Tab. 2, CondCirc 6, 8, 14, 16). These are all cases of constructions of the unreal type. The primary predication can however be [+real] if it also has no actual reference, i.e. if it is [-actref]; in other words, if it has an iterative, habitual, generic reference: *Als Vorgesetzte sind Frauen ihm suspekt* 'Women as superiors are suspect to my friend', *Als Mittelstürmer spielt er gut* 'As centre-forward (= in centre-forward position) he plays well'. As GIVÓN (1984, 285) also ascertains, iterative, habitual and generic references resemble the non-real modality. In terms of semantic reference, subjunctive *Frauen als Vorgesetzte wären ihm suspekt* 'Women as superiors would be suspect to him' and indicative generic *Frauen als Vorgesetzte sind ihm suspekt* 'Women as superiors are suspect to him' lie close together, as the latter only implies by default that women in superior positions do exist.¹⁶

There are constructions, however, in which at first glance the primary predication in conditional circumstantial context does actually assume [+real, +actref] values: *Als Mittelstürmer spielt er heute gut* 'As centre-forward (= In the position of the centre-forward) he is playing well today', e.g. in the context of an

16 There is a type of construction that shows the characteristics [-actref, +real] but that in opposition to sentences like *Als Vorgesetzte sind Frauen ihm suspekt* 'Women as superiors are suspect to my friend', or *Als Mittelstürmer spielt er gut* 'As centre-forward (in centre-forward position) he plays well' in the primary predication shows no "stage-level predicate" but a temporally stable, individual-level predicate, e.g. *Als Mittelstürmer ist er zu klein* 'As centre-forward he is too small.' Here we observe a reversal of the distribution of condition, or reason, and consequence. The condition is named in the primary and the consequence in the secondary predication. A natural paraphrase would be: *Er ist zu klein, um Mittelstürmer zu sein (zu spielen)* 'He is too small to be (play) centre-forward'. A more intensive analysis of such constructions must be left to further investigation.

actual match (cf. Tab. 2, TempCirc 1), or *Als Redner hat er gestern überzeugt* 'As the speaker he was very convincing yesterday'. It is doubtful here, though, whether despite a strong superficial similarity (cf. the "centre-forward" clauses in Tab. 2, ConCirc 15) these cases can be classified as conditional circumstantials. The real modality and the actual reference in the primary predication also give the secondary predicate a reading with real modality, an inference which on the other hand brings depictives to mind. It is clear, however, that they are not depictives, because *als*-phrases are outside the scope of negation. It is also clear that sentences like the last two can be pronounced with the same unmarked intonation as *Als Kind lebte er in Paris* 'As a child he lived in Paris', i.e., that there is no contrastive focus (the latter is only possible, but not imperative), which indicates a circumstantial. It is important to note that *als Mittelstürmer* 'as centre-forward' here is just as unrestrictive¹⁷ as depictives are. The only difference is that in a negated sentence, i.e. *als Mittelstürmer spielt Peter heute nicht gut* 'As centre-forward Peter is not playing well today', the *als*-phrase does not stand in the scope of negation. In this case of a "non-restrictive circumstantial", therefore, a parallel to causal circumstantials becomes apparent, or at least a causal "nuance" 'because he is centre-forward today' is resonant. Further research into such constructions is necessary.

In general, **temporal circumstantials** are, like **conditional circumstantials** (but unlike causals) restrictive in character. The former exercise a restriction on the temporal reference (the primary predication is valid within the temporal scope set by the secondary predication), the latter exercise a logical if-then restriction, whereby the "if" is verbalised implicitly in the circumstantial, and the "then" in the primary predication. In respect of restrictivity HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT (2005, 20) are no doubt correct to emphasize the analogy of these (temporal and conditional) circumstantials to weak free adjuncts discussed by STUMP (1985).

(D) In another sense, however, **temporal circumstantials** are similar to **causal circumstantials**, which correspond more to strong free adjuncts. The latter – as HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT (2005, 21) point out following STUMP (1985) – are not in the scope of a modal operator of the matrix clause, i.e. the primary predication. This means, for example, that a non-real modality of the primary predication [–real] can be combined with a real modality [+real] of the secondary as in *Als Arzt hätte er das wissen müssen* 'As a doctor he should have known that.' (→ 'as/being a doctor'). Weak free adjuncts, and also conditional circumstantials, by contrast, stand in the scope of such an operator, as e.g.

17 This was not recognised in HENTSCHEL (2006), and the suggested interpretation as a "generally restrictive circumstantial" can be discarded.

in *Als Arzt hätte er das gewusst* ‘As a doctor he would have known that.’ (→ ‘if he had been a doctor’). Temporal circumstantials, however, behave like causals in this respect, or like strong free adjuncts: *Als Kind hätte er in Paris leben können, wenn sich seine Eltern nicht hätten scheiden lassen* ‘As a child he could have lived in Paris, if his parents had not divorced.’ (‘when he was a child’). Temporal and causal secondary predicates are not only modally independent from the primary predication, but also typically (the temporal predicates, with the exception of the borderline cases with future reference), or inherently (the causal predicates) [+real], while the appertaining primary predicates can take on both values. If, as a matter of principle, HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZEBERNDT (2005, 21-22) take the modal independence of secondary predicative elements as a criterion for not classifying participant-oriented phrases either as circumstantials or as secondary predicates, then it would only be consistent to also rule out temporal circumstantials (with the typical [+real]), which is, however, not indicated, as, like conditional circumstantials, they determine the validity conditions of primary predication.

Causal circumstantials, as has been shown above, are possible in all cases of real modality of secondary predication (Tab. 2, CausCirc 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13), unlike the temporal circumstantials even with actual temporal reference of the secondary predication. Furthermore, causal circumstantials differ from temporal circumstantials in that they cannot be paraphrases of corresponding adverbial clauses with future tense. Causal circumstantials can of course relate to the future: *Als zukünftiger Minister nimmt er schon heute manche Rücksicht, die er in der Opposition vermissen ließ* ‘As future minister, he already shows a lot of consideration today that he lacked in the opposition’. However, this *als*-phrase is a paraphrase of the clause in present tense *Da er der zukünftige Minister ist* ‘As he is (Being) the future minister’ and not the future form *Da er der zukünftige Minister sein wird...* ‘As he will be the future minister....’. A sentence like *Als Minister wird er nach seiner Wahl manche Rücksicht nehmen müssen* ‘As minister, he will have to show more consideration after his election’ must similarly be paraphrased in temporal conditional form, as in *Wenn er Minister ist (?sein wird)* ‘When he is minister,’ like the sentence *Als Rentner werde ich viel reisen* ‘As a pensioner (when I retire) I shall travel a lot’, i.e. *Wenn ich Rentner bin (?sein werde) ...* ‘When I shall retire’.

(E) A feature shared by **causal** and **conditional circumstantials** is that they can also show actual reference [+actref].¹⁸ The fact that both are also compatible

18 Admittedly, the examples with actual reference in Table II (with causal and conditional circumstantials) do sound like rather artificial constructions and will rarely be found in bodies of literature. However, they are, firstly, constructible and secondly, their artificiality could be a specific

with the non-real modality of primary predication means that in the [-real] context ambiguities between conditional and causal readings can occur (cf. e.g. Tab. 2, CondCirc 6, CausCirc 2): *Als der am schwersten Verletzte des Unglücks hätte er noch am Unfallort operiert werden können* 'As / Being the most severely injured person from the accident he could have been operated on right at the scene of the accident.' can be paraphrased as *Wenn er der am schwersten Verletzte des Unglücks gewesen wäre* 'If he had been the most severely injured...' or as *Weil er der am schwersten Verletzte des Unglücks war...* 'Because he was the most severely...'.⁷

(F) Conditional Circumstantials and **depictives** resemble each other in that there are certain modal compatibility requirements for the relation between the primary and secondary predication. In depictives the modality is determined by the primary predication, which allows both [+real] and [-real] modalities. In conditional circumstantials, the secondary predication is [-real] by definition, which typically involves the [-real] modality of the primary, or, if not, the iterative, habitual or generic reference to the primary predication, which is similar to the non-real modality. Depictive constructions with non-real modality are therefore very similar to constructions with conditional circumstantials, differing only through their (non-contrastive) focus and their position within the negative scope.

(G) The only common feature of **depictive** and **causal circumstantials** apart from their participant orientation is that they do not restrict their respective primary predication. For depictives that means precisely that they themselves are restricted by the primary predication in terms of their temporal and modal values, while causal circumstantials neither restrict the primary predication in any way, nor are they restricted by it.

4. Conclusions

Causal circumstantials are certainly least closely linked to the primary predication. Whether or not they should therefore be regarded as secondary predicates is a question of definition. From the point of view of HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZBERNDT (2005), depictives as well as temporal and conditional circumstantials

feature of *als*-phrases. Adjectival predicates such as *betrunken* 'drunk' are unproblematic: *Betrunken konnte ich gestern nicht nach Hause gehen und übernachtete bei einem Freund* 'Drunk, I could not go home yesterday and so I spent the night at a friend's' or: *Betrunken hätte ich gestern nicht nach Hause gehen können und trank daher nichts* 'I could not go home drunk yesterday and so I drank nothing'.

are secondary predicates. Following the definition of these authors, causal participant-related constructions, which here we have named causal circumstantials, but also participant-oriented predicative complements (not discussed here) as in *Sie sahen Peter als Held an* ‘They regarded Peter as a hero’, which maximally depend on the primary (or fundamental) predication in the sense that they are an obligatory part of it, would not be secondary predicates in their sense. But a common feature of predicative complements, depictives and temporal, conditional and causal circumstantials (the last four all being supplements) is of course that they are predicative and participant-oriented and therefore, as already stated, stand in a copular relation to the participant. The two former types are elements of the verbal phrase, the latter three are bound into a level (levels) above the verbal phrase, i.e. the sentence level. This distinguishes them altogether from “pure” appositions and other attributive modifiers that are parts of the nominal phrase of the controller to which they also stand in copular relation. In German, conditional and causal circumstantials allow an attributively restrictive or an appositive implementation into the nominal phrase of the controller. As we have seen, they are there no longer combinable (through conjunction) with semantically related adverbials (as event-related elements). Causal circumstantials, on the other hand, differ from the other two types of circumstantial due to their non-restrictive character.¹⁹ What is generally implied here is the following hierarchy of syntacto-semantic integration of secondary predicative elements into a primary predication:

- (42) predicative complements > depictives > temporal circumstantials > conditional circumstantials > causal “circumstantials”

Whether it is meaningful to define the three middle elements (and not the two outer elements) as secondary predicates, and not to regard the causal constructions as circumstantials (following HIMMELMANN & SCHULTZE-BERNDT 2005) must be left to further theoretical deliberation and relevant empirical analyses. As to the four secondary predicative types of adjunct that were the focus of interest in this study, commonalities and differences have been demonstrated, and in conclusion these are illustrated again in a simplified form in Table 3 below:

19 This also holds for GEUDER’s (2000) transparent adverbials of the causal type *He angrily shouted at them* (GEUDER 2000, 199), in other words ‘He was angry and this made him shout at them’. In fact these adverbs in English seem to be a subtype of causal circumstantials. Note that they are outside the scope of negation (cf. RENZ & HENTSCHEL, ms.).

<i>Purely temporal relation</i>		
<i>Depictives</i>	<i>Temporal Circumstantials</i>	
	<u>Conditional Circumstantials</u>	<u>Causal Circumstantials</u>
	<u>Cause and Effect Relation</u>	

non-restrictive restrictive

Table 3: Classification of secondary predicative adjuncts

References

- AARTS, B. 1995: Secondary predicates in English. In: Aarts, B. & Meyer, Ch. F. (eds.), *The verb in contemporary English. Theory and description*. Cambridge, 75-101
- DPKG 1999 = Engel, U. et al.: *Deutsch-polnische kontrastive Grammatik*. Heidelberg
- EISENBERG, P. 1986: *Grundriß einer deutschen Grammatik*. Stuttgart
- GDS 1997 = Zifonun, G. et al.: *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Bd. 1-3. Berlin
- GEUDER, W. 2002: *Oriented adverbs. Issues in the lexical semantics of event adverbs*. 2 January 2008 <<http://w210.ub.uni-tuebingen.de/dbt/volltexte/2002/546/pdf/geuder-oriadverbs.pdf>>
- GIVÓN, T. 1984: *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Amsterdam
- HENTSCHEL, G. 2006: Zur Klassifikation sekundärer Prädikate am Beispiel von *als*-Phrasen des Deutschen und *jako*-Phrasen des Polnischen. In: Berger, T., Raecke, W. J. & Reuther, T. (Hrsg.), *Slavistische Linguistik* 2004/2005 (= *Slavistische Beiträge* 453), 143-175

- HENTSCHEL, G. & ANDERS, S. 2006: O składni i semantyce polskiej frazy *z jako* i z uzupełnieniem rzeczownikowym w porównaniu z niemiecką frazą *z als*. In: Bobrowski, I. (red.), *Od fonemu do tekstu*. Kraków, 223-237
- HIMMELMANN, N. P. & SCHULTZE-BERNDT, E. 2005: Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: an introduction. In: Himmelman, N. P. & Schultze-Berndt, E. (eds.) 2005a, 1-68
- HIMMELMANN, N. P. & SCHULTZE-BERNDT, E. (eds.) 2005: *Secondary predication and adverbial modification. The typology of depictives*. Oxford
- HINTERHÖLZL, R. 2001: Semantic constraints on case assignment in secondary adjectival predicates in Russian. In: Jäger, G. et al. (eds.): *Papers on predicative constructions, ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 22, Nr. 05, 99-112
- LAWRENZ, B. 1993: *Apposition. Begriffsbestimmung und syntaktischer Status*. Tübingen
- LEHMANN, V. 1994: Episodizität. In: *Slavistische Linguistik* 1993, 153-179
- LEHMANN, V. 1999: Aspekt. In: Jachnow, H. (Hrsg.): *Handbuch der sprachwissenschaftlichen Russistik und ihrer Grenzdisziplinen*. Wiesbaden, 214-242
- MEHLIG, H. R. 1980: Linguistische und didaktische Überlegungen zum Verbalaspekt im Russischen. In: *Zielsprache Russisch* 1, 1-16
- MÜLLER, ST. 2003: Mehrfache Vorfelddbesetzung. In: *Deutsche Sprache* 31/1, 29-62
- NICHOLS, J. 1981: *Predicate nominals. A partial surface grammar of Russian*. Berkeley (= *University of California Publications – Linguistics* 97)
- REICHENBACH, H. 1947: *Elements of symbolic logic*. New York
- RENZ, M. & HENTSCHEL, G. ms.: Partizipantenbezogene Adverbien im Russischen und Polnischen. (Scheduled for publication in *Zeitschrift für Slavistik* 2008)
- SCHROEDER, Chr. 2004: *Depiktive im Sprachvergleich Deutsch-Türkisch. Eine kontrastiv-typologische Analyse*. Habilitationsschrift, University of Osnaabrück [to appear in the series *Turcologica*, Wiesbaden]
- STUMP, G. T. 1985: *The semantic variability of absolute constructions*. Dordrecht etc. (= *Synthese language library. Texts and studies in linguistics and philosophy* 25)
- ZOLOTOVA, G. A. 1973: *Očerki funkcional'nogo sintaksisa russkogo jazyka*. Moskva