

## Event-related states in secondary predication\*

Ignacio Bosque

ibosque@ucm.es

*Universidad Complutense, Madrid (Spain)*

### ABSTRACT.

Analyses of secondary predication based on the aspectual properties of predicative complements are almost standard today. This paper shows that these approaches are not restrictive enough and make a large number of incorrect predictions. It also shows that the meaning of the main (or primary) predicate is essential to restrict the secondary one. Throughout the text, a pragmatically based analysis of the necessary restrictions is compared with one grounded on semantic paradigms, and several examples are proposed of how the latter may be articulated and developed. Event-related states in secondary predication are shown to be necessary, and are claimed to follow from a series of fine-grained semantic notions crucially related to the meaning of the primary verb.

### KEYWORDS.

Secondary predication, stage-level predicates, individual-level predicates, lexical aspect.

### 1. Some problems of a standard analysis

In this short paper I will show that a widespread analysis of the distribution of secondary predicates is too powerful; then, not sufficiently restrictive and, consequently, fragmentary and only partially accurate. Since the correct alternative is not straightforward, I will settle for tentatively exploring and comparing the options that arise as possible substitutes. I will pick—but not fully develop—one of these lines, after schematically outlining the pros and cons of other options.

Secondary predicates (henceforth SPs) correspond to so-called *predicative complements* in the Romance linguistic tradition. Overviews on

---

\* I am indebted to Ana Bravo, José María Brucart, Ángela Di Tullio, Elena de Miguel and Antonio Fábregas for their valuable comments and suggestions on an early version of this paper. It goes without saying that none of them is responsible for any errors or misunderstandings that these pages might contain.

Spanish SPs include Demonte & Masullo (1999) and RAE-ASALE (2009: ch. 38). Overviews for other Romance Languages are provided in Salvi (2001), Ramos (2002), Raposo (2013), and Abeillé & van Peteghem (2021). Other analyses of the general properties of secondary predication may be found in Napoli (1989), Williams (1980), Nakajima (1990), Legendre (1997), Winkler (1997), and Irimia (2005). More specific references will be added in the following pages.

I will begin with a brief reminder. Verbs that allow for SPs can be classified into three main groups:

- (1) a. Quasi-auxiliaries.
- b. Small clause selectors.
- c. Other proper or *bona fide* main predicates.

Verbs in (1a) —also called semi-copulatives, pseudo-copulatives and quasi-copulatives in the literature— are grammaticalized predicates. They cannot dispense with the SP (*María quedó paralizada* ‘M. became paralyzed’ > \**María quedó* ‘M. became’), or give rise to a different interpretation in these contexts (*Juan se mantiene firme* ‘J. stands firm’ > *Juan se mantiene* ‘J. stands up, J. supports himself’).

Verbs in group (1b) typically take propositional complements (*considerar* ‘consider’, *ver* ‘see’, *creer* ‘believe’). However, there is some controversy as to whether or not some partially grammaticalized verbs taking non-propositional complements should belong to group (1b). Classical examples include *dar* ‘give’, as in *Juan me dio roto el libro* ‘J. gave me the book broken’, and *tener* ‘have’, as in *María tiene azules los ojos* ‘M. has green eyes’. Detailed analyses of the latter pattern are found in Harre (1991) and Sanz Martín (2011). Verbs in (1b) parallel those in (1a) in that they are not able to dispense with their SP complement keeping their meaning, as in *Lo consideran tonto* ‘They consider him a fool’ vs. #*Lo consideran* ‘They appreciate him’. There is a huge literature on the group (1b) and its relationship with the other two groups. Good overviews may be obtained from Aarts (1992), Hoekstra (1992), Cardinaletti & Guasti (1995), Bowers (2001), Rafel (2010), Carreira et al. (2017), and the references therein.

Verbs in group (1c) maintain their meaning when the SP is dispensed

with (*Llegó cansada* 'She arrived tired' > *Llegó* 'She arrived'), although some of them may belong to (1c) or to (1a) depending on the chosen SP, as in *caer inconsciente* 'to fall unconscious' (= (1c)) vs. *caer prisionero* 'fall prisoner' (= (1a)). The predicates of (1c) are usually classified according to two main criteria:

- (2) a. The syntactic role of the predication's subject.
- b. The semantic interpretation of the SP.

Depending on (2a), SPs can be predicated of the subject (*Llegó cansada* 'She arrived tired'), the direct object (*Compré nuevo el coche* 'I bought the car new'), or the indirect object (*Le dispararon dos tiros dormido* 'He was shot twice when sleeping'). Some verbs admit the first two options, as in *Juan encontró a María {agotado / agotada} 'J. found M. exhausted [masc.-fem.]'* SPs included in PPs may belong to the first group (*Peca de ingenuo* 'He is too naïve') or to the second (*Lo toman por tonto* 'They take him for a fool'). The two major groups of SPs that are usually established according to (2b) are those in (3):

- (3) a. SPs with depictive readings.
- b. SPs with resultative readings.

To these two, other possible interpretations of SPs are added in some studies, including Olsson (1976: § 3) for French, and RAE-ASALE (2009: § 38.8) for Spanish. The reading in (3a) is often called "concomitant" in the Romance tradition. It expresses some temporal state in which the patient is located, as in the example above *Compré nuevo el coche* 'I bought the car new'. This sentence thus means 'I bought the car being new' or '...when it was new'. SPs in (3b) allude, on the other hand, to the state resulting from some verbal action, as in *Dibujar torcido el barco* 'To draw the boat crooked'.

Most titles in the secondary predication literature focus on either (3b) or the configurational differences between (3a) and (3b). In this paper, I will focus on (3a), and particularly on the fact that these SPs have been repeatedly restricted on the bases of their *Aktionsart* properties. Proposals

do not exactly coincide on the event classes to be distinguished and other specific aspectual features claimed to be relevant. General references to this line of research include Rothstein (1983, 2004, 2011), Rapoport (1991, 1993, 1999), and McNally (1994). As regards Spanish, studies supporting analysis of SPs grounded on lexical aspect (again, with some differences not to be addressed here) include Hernanz (1988), Zagona (1993), Demonte (1988-1989, 1992, 1994), Jiménez Fernández (2000), Marín (2001), and Gumiel *et al.* (2016), among others.

Let us first consider a standard example of the relevance of aspectual factors as constraining elements of depictive secondary predication, and then see why these restricting conditions fall short. In (4) it is schematically shown that *sucio* ‘dirty’ is a stage-level (henceforth, SL) predicate, at least in this context, and also that *elegante* ‘elegant’ is an individual-level (henceforth, IL) predicate.<sup>1</sup> Some familiarity with the *ser-estar* distinction is assumed here.

- (4) a. El vestido {estaba / \*era} sucio. ‘The dress was dirty’  
 b. El vestido {\*estaba / era} elegante. ‘The dress was elegant’  
 c. María traía {sucio / \*elegante} el vestido. ‘M. brought her dress, which was {dirty / elegant}’

In (4c) it is shown that some SL predicate may function as an SP of the direct object, whereas an IL counterpart may not. Thus, the aspectual restriction on secondary predication seems to work. The relevance of the IL-SL distinction on SPs may easily be extended to predicates in group (1b), as in (5):

- (5) a. Lo consideraba {inteligente [IL] ~ ??cansado [SL]}.  
 ‘I considered him to be {smart / tired}’  
 b. Lo notaba {\*inteligente [IL] ~ cansado [SL]}.  
 ‘I noticed that he was {smart / tired}’

---

<sup>1</sup> This does not necessarily mean that the *ser-estar* alternation corresponds exactly to the IL-SL distinction, but just that it provides a useful guide for it. On this particular point, see especially the states of the art in Leonetti (1994), Fábregas (2012) and Brucart (2017).

This does not prevent some verbs in group (1b) —including *querer* ‘want’ or *ver* ‘see’ among others— from being compatible with both types of predicates:

- (6) a. Quiero azul [IL] la camisa.  
‘I want the shirt blue’  
b. Quiero limpio [SL] el baño para esta tarde.  
‘I want the bathroom to be clean by this afternoon’  
(7) a. Veo posible [IL] una solución.  
‘I see that some solution is possible’  
b. Veo cansada [SL] a María.  
‘I see that M. is tired’

It is also compatible with the fact that some verbs in the (1c) group are equally compatible with IL predicates (*Nació rica* ‘She was born rich’; *Sus palabras sonaron proféticas* ‘His/Her words sounded prophetic’) and their SL counterparts (*Nació descentrada* ‘She was born off-centered’; *Su voz sonaba cansada* ‘His/her voice sounded tired’).

But generalizations on SPs based on aspectual information are hasty, since they make incorrect predictions. Plainly said, it is not enough for many adjectives and participles to constitute SL predicates (in the (1c) group) in order to be used as depictive SPs. Crucially, they may or may not appear in these sentences depending on the semantic properties of the main or primary predicate. An example of this restriction is shown in (8):

- (8) a. El apartamento estaba {barato / disponible}.  
‘The apartment was {cheap / available}’  
b. Alquilé {barato / \*disponible} el apartamento.  
‘I rented the apartment {cheap / available}’

It is somehow surprising that the existing analyses of secondary predication do not account for contrasts such as those in (8). The fundamental reason lies in the fact that most of these analyses omit the semantic role of the main verb in the secondary predication, and also omit the semantic relation holding between the two predicates involved.

As it is obvious, some particular apartment may be available on certain days and occupied on others. This ensures that *disponible* ‘available’ (an adjective that rejects the auxiliary verb *ser* ‘be’) is an SL predicate. Typical paraphrases of depictive predicates (‘in the state of being...’, ‘when it was...’, etc.) naturally apply to (8b). As for *barato* ‘cheap’, notice that a resultative reading is rejected, since this sentence is not about some apartment which becomes cheap as a result of renting it out.

We may then conclude that (i) both *barato* ‘cheap’ and *disponible* ‘available’ are depictive SL predicates in (8); (ii) the latter does not constitute an adequate event-related state (ERS) for *alquilar* ‘rent’; and (iii) claims about aspectual distinctions on SPs overgeneralize inappropriately.<sup>2</sup> Notice also that depictive SPs do not provide conditions (whether temporal or not) for the main event to take place, since availability is a condition for apartments to be rented. Rather, from a set of available options they pick up some particular temporal state, crucially dependent on the denotation of the main verb, and disregard other alternatives. This property directly links SPs to focused constituents (Winkler 1997). Nevertheless, it makes their interpretation more complex because it is further constrained through a number of semantic variables.<sup>3</sup> I will present some of these variables in the coming pages, but first let me show another example of the relevance of ERSs:

- (9) a. La carne está {cruda / cara}. ‘The meat is {raw / expensive}’  
 b. Compró {cruda / cara} la carne. ‘S/he bought the meat {raw / expensive}’  
 c. Comió {cruda / \*cara} la carne. ‘S/he ate the meat {raw / \*expensive}’

2 Sometimes they may even be simply wrong. In (ia) it is shown that the verb *comprar* ‘buy’ quite naturally admits some IL adjectives as SPs, contrary to what it is usually assumed. Arguably, the argument may be extended to the verb *beber* ‘drink’, as shown in (ib):

(i) a. “Cuando compré el terreno, lo compré grande, de casi media manzana” (J. Goyonante, *Gestión*, Google Books)

‘When I bought the land, I bought it large, almost half a hectare’

b. “Aquel bruto se bebía casi puro el ajeno” (A. Palacio Valdés, *Los papeles del Doctor Angélico*, quoted in S. Fernández Ramírez’s AGLE (reference 68392).

‘That brute man drank absinthe almost pure’

3 I am not addressing the possibility that the information expressed by SL predicates might sometimes be obtained in the Syntax, but it seems to be an option. The adverb *ya* ‘already’, which expresses perfectivity, could add the content that an SL predicate must convey, as suggested in (i):

(i) María le prestó {\*viejo / ?ya viejo} el vestido.

‘Mary lent her/him her dress, which was (already) old’

Thanks to A. Bravo for bringing this to my attention.

Notice that in (9c) we do not exactly speak about “a certain state of the meat”, but rather about “a certain state of the meat relative to the event of eating it”, as opposed to other possible situations. Again, SL states introduced by SPs in depictive predication turn out to be ERSs. We cannot, in consequence, avoid the task of adequately relating such states to the events to which they are linked. This simply means that standard analyses of depictive predication on aspectual grounds fall short because they postulate necessary but insufficient conditions. Let us consider the following contrasts now:

- (10) a. El café estaba {caliente / exquisito}.  
          ‘The coffee was {hot / exquisite}’  
      b. Suelo tomar {caliente / \*exquisito} el café.  
          ‘I usually drink my coffee {hot / \*exquisite}’  
      c. El café me supo {\*caliente / exquisito}.  
          ‘The coffee tasted {\*hot / exquisite} to me’

Perhaps someone would try to rule out these contrasts as arguments for ERSs, on the basis that the coffee that is exquisite at a certain time spot is not (arguably) the same coffee that is exquisite at some other time. But this hypothetical argument, based on the “type-token” distinction, is of little value, since (apart from being applicable to the SL adjective *caliente* ‘hot’ as well), it would force us to consider as IL predicates a large number of adjectives that are standardly characterized as SL, whether they are predicated of individuals or of types.<sup>4</sup> I conclude that *exquisito* is a SL predicate in (10) (which does not prevent it from being IL in other contexts),

---

<sup>4</sup> Nevertheless, type denoting DPs (mostly plural) may choose IL secondary predicates in contexts where other DPs only admit their SL counterparts:

- (i) a. Leí {completo [SL]/\*interesante [IL]} el informe administrativo.  
          ‘I read the administrative report {in full / and it was interesting}’  
      b. En cuanto a los informes administrativos, los he leído más interesantes [IL].  
          ‘As for the administrative reports, I have read some more interesting (than this one)’  
          This factor may also affect the relationship between ERSs and the main predicate, as shown in (ii):  
(ii) a. [talking about T-bone steaks] “Los he comido más caros y peor asados” [from an online review in TripAdvisor, 13-2-2017]  
          ‘I have eaten them more expensive and worse roasted’  
      b. [talking about ceviche] “En mi ciudad lo he comido maravilloso” (El topic de las cocinitas, 1-10-2019)  
          ‘In my town, I have eaten it wonderful’

I take these SPs to be IL predicates. The fact that they express some form of degree quantification (either lexically or syntactically) might be a factor favoring the SL > IL coercion process, as E. de Miguel has pointed out to me.

and also that this adjective is unable to provide the ERS required in (10b), whereas it does provide the one necessary in (10c).<sup>5</sup>

The concept of ERS, around which these pages revolve, is uncommon in the grammar of secondary predication. This notion is presented very briefly in RAE-ASALE (2009: § 38.8l), but I have not been able to find it developed in other studies. Some authors, including Olsson (1976, 1981), Himmelmann & Schultze-Berndt (2005) and Palancar & Alarcón (2007)—the latter for Spanish—, have recognized the need to divide depictive secondary predicates into several semantic classes. This might be related to the notion I have just introduced, even if their strategy is different from mine. In the pages to follow I will explain why ERSs are important in secondary predication, and I will suggest some ways of including them in the grammar.

## 2. Is all this Semantics or Pragmatics?

We have seen that no aspectual classification of the adjective *barato* ‘cheap’ (an IL or SL predicate in different contexts) contains the information relevant to characterize it as an ERS for a small group of actions involving commercial activities: *comprar* ‘buy’, *vender* ‘sell’, *alquilar* ‘rent’, *traspasar* ‘transfer’, *conseguir* ‘get’, *obtener* ‘obtain’, and very few others. The relevant question now is whether this information is semantic (and, specifically, lexical) or pragmatic. If it is lexical, one would expect advanced lexicons to specify it, since it would be part of our knowledge of words. This does not imply that it is to be found in present-day dictionaries, but rather that we would expect it to be included in more developed lexicons. On the other hand, if the relevant information is pragmatic, no present or future lexicon would have to include it, since speakers would derive or calculate the appropriate paradigms by bringing into play various contextual variables.

---

5 Some adjectives and participles that are constructed with *estar* are not compatible with depictive interpretations. For example, texts may be sloppy or careless (Sp. *El texto estaba descuidado* ‘The text was sloppy’), even if this not one of “their possible states”. Therefore, *descuidado* ‘sloppy’ does not seem to be a SL predicate in this context, even if it is constructed with *estar*. Not being a SL predicate, it would not be correct to adduce contrasts such as (i) as arguments in favor of its restrictive properties as an ERS:

- (i) a. El texto estaba {completo / descuidado}.  
‘The text was {complete / sloppy}’  
b. Leí {completo / \*descuidado} el texto.  
‘I read the text {in full / being sloppy}’

There seem to be arguments for both positions, but lexical factors are, in my opinion, of greater weight than pragmatic ones. I will attempt to schematically evaluate both of them.

Let us consider some (apparently) pragmatic factors first. Jackendoff (2011) recalled that English prepositional passives present the well-known problem of adequately restricting the prepositions allowed in them:

- (11) a. The bed was slept {in / on / \*under / \*beside} by John.  
b. The telescope was looked {through / \*inside} by the technician.

Jackendoff observed that prepositional complements introduce in these cases “the proper function” of the subject, in Millikan’s (1984) sense, or “the telic role” corresponding to it, in Pustejovsky’s (1995) terms. In Jackendoff’s words, “beds are for sleeping in or sleeping on; they are not for sleeping under or beside. Telescopes are for looking through; they are not for looking inside (of). Thus, a characterization of these cases of the prepositional passive must refer to the semantics of the surface subject and its interaction with the semantics of the verb and preposition”. Some years earlier, a similar conclusion had been reached by Riddle & Sheintuch (1983), for whom these passives are only admitted by the participants who perform “the most prominent role in the eyes of the speaker”. In RAE-ASALE (2009: § 38.8h) it is noted, in a similar line of reasoning, that many resultative SPs in Spanish express “natural consequences” of the actions that the main verb denotes.

There is some relationship between the factors relevant for restricting English prepositional passives and our parallel associations of main verbs to SPs. Predicates designating depictive states relative to the food that is consumed are (prototypically, in our society) “raw”, “cooked”, “fried”, “in good (or bad) condition”, “peeled”, etc. The states relative to foods that are sold may coincide with some of these, since certain foods may be sold raw or cooked, peeled or unpeeled, etc. On the other hand, the paradigm of predicates corresponding to “expensive”, “cheap” or “at a good price” is rejected in the group of SPs appropriate for eating. Therefore, these predicates are not ERSs with respect to that particular action.<sup>6</sup>

---

6 Coercion processes may affect the proper licensing of ERSs. If we are able to reinterpret *comer* ‘eat’ as ‘purchase for consumption’, the acceptance of *barato* ‘cheap’ or *caro* ‘expensive’ as SPs for that verb would be

In Bosque (2000), I suggested that the verbs *read* and *write*, which are provided by Pustejovsky's (1995) telic qualia for phrases such as a *difficult book*, are obtained extra-grammatically. Plainly said, there are more readers and writers in our world than people dedicated to selling, illustrating, binding, translating, correcting, localizing or distributing books. Although *read* and *write* are the verbs that come most immediately to mind, the NP *a difficult book* would admit natural interpretations in which the other verbs I have just mentioned would be understood in the appropriate context. Even so, the same paper advocated a lexical solution (hence, expected from a full-developed lexicon) to provide the verb expected in phrases such as *a difficult path* (i.e. *walk along*), *a difficult step* (i.e. *take*) or *a difficult condition* (i.e. *meet*). Interestingly, Pustejovsky (1995) argues for a lexical treatment of the hyper-specific information provided in his qualia system, while other authors have suggested solutions based on pragmatic strategies. For a comparison of options see Bouillon & Busa (2001), De Miguel (2012), and Willems (2013).

It should be noted that actions that allow us to interpret certain SPs, particularly resultative ones, must be inferred when they are not mentioned in the text. I have in mind minimal pairs such as the following:

- (12) a. Me dejó barato el vestido.  
       'I got my dress for cheap from him/her'  
       b. Me dejó nuevo el vestido.  
       'S/he left my dress brand new'
- (13) a. Deja abierta la puerta, por favor.  
       'Please, let the door open'  
       b. Deja blanca la puerta, por favor.  
       'Please leave the door white'

The fact that both *nuevo* 'new' and *barato* 'cheap' are SL predicates in (12) guarantees the grammaticality of those sentences, but it does not follow that (12a) speaks of the result of buying something, whereas in (12b) one

---

possible. This is what makes sense of examples such as *En aquella época se comía cara la carne por la terrible escasez de alimentos* 'At that time, meat was expensive to eat because of terrible food shortages'. Thanks to J.M. Brucart for bringing this to my attention. Recall, in a different sense, the remark in footnote 4.

speaks of the result of sewing, mending or washing a certain dress. Similarly, (13a) describes the state following an event of going out or coming in, but (13b) follows one of painting. Since neither of the above verbs appears in these sentences, the natural question is how the speaker knows that these are the correct interpretations.

One option is to assume that we should obtain these readings from the lexical entry for *vestido* ‘dress’ when combined with *nuevo* ‘new’ in a fully-developed lexicon. Since Ducrot’s (1993, 1995) *topoi* or Pustejovsky’s (1995) *qualia* provide —these authors argue— some objective lexical content, these pieces of information would be explicit in some hyper-specific lexicon. But if the relevant information turns out to be of a pragmatic nature, it cannot (and must not) be described in any lexical repertoire, since it would be the result of the speaker’s calculation based on contextual conditions. We would not, therefore, expect a dictionary to inform us (in its entry for *open* or for *leave*) that the action “leave open” naturally follows those of entering or leaving a place.

A final potential argument in favor of the relevance of pragmatic factors in determining ERSs comes from the fact that it is often a complex predicate that provides the crucial information required for SPs to be licensed. The content of adjective complements cannot be specified in the lexicon, but sometimes it compositionally provides the information relevant to choose the appropriate SPs, as shown in (14):

- (14) a. Juan está contento (con su nuevo trabajo).  
      ‘J. is happy (with his new job)’  
      b. Juan abrió la puerta contento.  
      ‘J. opened the door happy’  
      c. ??Juan abrió la puerta contento con su nuevo trabajo.  
      ‘J. opened the door happy with his new job’

Thus, the main problem for a lexical analysis is the simple fact that the information provided by the adjective’s complement cannot be part of lexical entries. In González García (2002), other cases are proposed in which it is a complex predicate that compositionally provides the necessary requirements of some SPs.

These are some of the arguments that might suggest a pragmatic solution to the proper characterization of ERSs. I do not intent to dismiss them completely, but I believe that arguments that point to an answer of a semantic (and, specifically, lexical) nature are much stronger. I will mention four of them.

a) The first of these arguments is the fact that the preceding examples contain numerous asterisks. The asterisks appearing in (8)-(11) would not be expected if we faced strictly pragmatic information, since the speaker would adapt the contexts in these cases to provide possible scenarios for all the situations described.

b) A second argument for a lexical analysis comes from the existence of well-known semantic classes of NPs acting as SPs. For example, nouns accepting NPs as SPs with the verbs *nombra* 'appoint', *designar* 'designate' denote positions, jobs, offices or professions. Similarly, the nouns that *proclamar* 'proclaim' admits as SPs designate positions of relevance in some hierarchy, together with the status of the person who succeeds in some endeavor: *proclamar ganador a alguien* 'to proclaim someone the winner'; *proclamar presidente al candidato* 'to proclaim the candidate president'. It is not difficult to lexically restrict, with similar semantic information, the paradigm of possible SPs for English verbs such as *declare* (as in *to declare a building a historical monument*), or *naturalize* (as in *He was naturalized Colombian*), among others.

c) In many known cases, SPs form a complex predicate with the main verb, then calling for a unified syntactic category. This complex predicate gives rise to several lexicalized VPs, semi-locutions and several fixed expressions (mostly resultative), as *meter preso* 'imprison', *pagar caro* 'pay dearly', *atar corto* 'tie up, keep on a short leash', *dejar claro* 'make clear', and many more. Interestingly, these are not always lexical units, since paradigms of SPs are often built up in this pattern. Some of these paradigms are short (*hacer trizas, pedazos, añicos, papilla* 'shatter, smash to pieces'; *pasar inadvertido, desapercibido, sin pena ni gloria* 'go unnoticed'), but others may be longer: when *caer* 'fall' is used as a quasi-auxiliary verb, the set of possible SPs includes *enfermo* 'ill', *prisionero* 'prisoner', *rendido* 'exhausted' and some other adjectives. See below for more extensive paradigms with other quasi-auxiliary verbs.

d) The fourth argument is stronger, and comes from the very fact that *barato* 'cheap' or *caro* 'expensive' select a set of predicates which denote buying or selling actions. Although predicates are expected to restrict their arguments, in the abundant literature on SPs it is often pointed out that SPs assign a theta-role to their predication's subjects, but few references are made to their relationship with the main predicate. In a similar way to that in which manner adverbs are predicates of events (to which they restrict), SPs exert a restrictive role on the main primary they modify. This is exactly what we expect in (8)-(11). Note, in the same vein, that the adjective *intacto* 'intact' is expected as SP of main verbs such as *dejar* 'leave', *conservar* 'preserve', *mantener* 'keep', or *devolver* 'return', but not with *manipular* 'manipulate', *leer* 'read' or *remendar* 'mend'. The SP *perplejo* 'perplexed' is to be expected with *quedar(se)* 'remain', *dejar* 'leave', *asistir* 'attend', *mirar* 'look', *escuchar* 'listen', *presenciar* 'witness' or *sentirse* 'feel', but is not accepted for many other primary predicates. Many other similar cases exist.

These restrictions are to be expected if the meaning of the primary predicate is an essential factor in the process of choosing the secondary one, but are unexpected otherwise. In fact, depictive secondary predication shows a double selection process similar to that of adverbial adjuncts.<sup>7</sup> On the one hand, adjuncts are indirectly selected by aspectual properties of the main predicate (one may recall well-known incompatibilities of the \**know slowly* type). On the other hand, adjuncts strongly restrict the main verb of which they predicate (their external argument), as manner adverbs in *-ly*, *-mente*, etc. make clear.

In other places (Bosque 2004b, 2017), I have pointed out the inadequacy of analyses that attempt to restrict manner adverbs on the basis of event classes. A number of general references on this research line are included in Bosque (2017); as regards Spanish, see Rodríguez Ramalle (2001), among others. One might argue, for example, that the adverb *carefully* is predicated of actions, not of states. But note that the anomalies obtained if this adverb modifies verbs such as *stroll*, *laugh*, *sigh*, *cry* or *wait* are not due to the lack of DPs denoting affected complements. Rather, they are the natural

---

<sup>7</sup> The proximity between these two syntactic patterns has been highlighted in many places, including typological studies (Schultze-Berndt & Himmelmann 2004) and grammatical investigations on Spanish (De Miguel & Fernández Lagunilla 2004; Suñer & Di Tullio 2014).

consequence of the fact that it does not make sense to predicate the very concept of “care” of the above mentioned actions.<sup>8</sup> In Bosque (2004a) it is shown that verbs compatible with adverbs such as *profundamente* ‘deeply’, *fuertemente* ‘strongly’, *poderosamente* ‘powerfully’ or *categoricamente* ‘categorically’, among many others, cannot be characterized through aspectual classes (such as actions, states, accomplishments, achievements, etc.), but through much more subtle —and not always easy to grasp— semantic notions.

Since aspectual classifications concerning event types are too open-ended (therefore, rough and inaccurate) as restrictive resources for secondary predication, I suggest that we need finer-grained restrictive paradigms defined in semantic terms as more suitable substitutes. I will present some of them schematically in the following section.

### 3. On the semantic relevance of the main verb in secondary predication

Most of the problems noted in the precedent sections are the natural consequence of analyzing SP structures without recognizing the essential role of the primary predicate in them, as well as ignoring the close semantic relationship existing between both predicates. As pointed out by Raposo (2013: 1356), some SPs cannot be classified as depictive or resultative, as they can receive one or another interpretation depending on their primary predicate. This fact confirms, once again, the crucial role of the latter:

- (15) a. Compró la carne en pedazos. [*Depictive secondary predication*]  
 b. Cortó la carne en pedazos. [*Resultative secondary predication*]<sup>9</sup>

I will not say anything about the extensively studied group (1b) here, but I would like to recall that in the Romance literature on secondary predication

---

<sup>8</sup> Transitivity is not relevant here, since *walk*, *sit* or *move* are intransitive verbs compatible with this manner adverb. On the other hand, we certainly speak of actions in all these cases. It is worth remembering that “action” and “movement” are not parallel concepts: the verb *wait* admits imperatives and progressive forms, it can be the complement of *persuade* or *convince*, etc. These contexts confirm that it denotes an action, even if it does not express movement. A similar reasoning may be extended to many other predicates.

<sup>9</sup> Or, at least, “weak resultative” in Washio’s (1997) typology, given that the verb *cortar* ‘cut’ lexically implies the existence of partitions in some affected entity. Thanks to A. Fábregas for pointing this out to me.

it has repeatedly been noticed that the line of separation between (1a) and (1c) is sometimes blurred. Studies that have highlighted this fact include Porroche (1990), Di Tullio (2002), Lamiroy & Melis (2005), Lauwers & Toback (2010), Cifuentes (2012), Hanegreefs (2015), and the references therein. I will argue that restrictive semantic paradigms are to be postulated for these two types of secondary predication. Suppose that we want to fill the gap in (16) with some SP:

- (16) Juan se confesó \_\_.  
      'J. confessed \_\_.'

It is unexpected that the extensive paradigm of SPs capable of being attributed to humans sharply contrasts with the restricted number of options allowed in (16). Admissible SPs may be IL (*culpable* 'guilty') or SL (*sorprendido* 'surprised') predicates, which further lengthens the list. It is, then, obvious that aspectual analyses do not provide any restriction for the gap in (16), not a minor flaw.

Let us take a look at the main verb. *Confesarse* 'confess' behaves as a quasi-auxiliary verb in (16) (cf. #*Juan se confesó* 'J. went to confession'). These verbs (= group (1a)) admit secondary predicates with restrictive paradigms not exclusively grounded on aspectual factors. How is, then, the gap in (16) to be filled? The verb *confesarse* means "to voluntarily and publicly acknowledge thoughts, ideas or feelings". If we have this in mind, the set of paradigms suitable as possible SPs will not seem strange: it includes a few nouns (*autor* 'author', *amigo* 'friend', *defensor* 'defender', *seguidor* 'follower', *hinch*a 'supporter', *discípulo* 'disciple', etc.), and several adjectives and participles affecting the subject in different means. They may be related to moods (*tranquilo* 'quiet', *content* 'happy', *satisfecho* 'satisfied', *ilusionado* 'excited'), situations of uncertainty or lack of expectation (*preocupado* 'worried', *sorprendido* 'surprised', *estupefacto* 'stunned', *extrañado* 'amazed', *alterado* 'upset', *impresionado* 'impressed'), as well as states denoting responsibility (*culpable* 'guilty', *inocente* 'innocent'), or related to the qualification or merit of individuals (*digno* 'worthy', *indigno* 'unworthy', *dispuesto* 'willing', *capaz* 'capable', etc.). Many other adjectives and participles, whether SL or IL predicates, are excluded from (16).

These restrictive paradigms are neither casual nor deductible from aspectual features. Similar considerations along these lines are introduced in Lauwers *et al.* (2019) regarding the French verbs *trouver* ‘find’ and *retrouver* ‘find, retrieve’ and the possible SPs they admit. In Hanegreefs (2015), parallel remarks are made about the Spanish verbs *ver* ‘see’ and *verse* ‘come to be’ and their possible SPs. In Morimoto (2006) and Morimoto & Pavón Lucero (2005, 2006), other specific semantic restrictions on SPs are introduced as regards quasi-copulative verbs such as *encontrarse* ‘find’, *sentirse* ‘feel’, *antojarse*, ‘crave for’, *mostrarse* ‘be seen as’, *presentarse* ‘look, appear to be’, and some others.

More generally, the existence of restrictive semantic paradigms not corresponding to event (or *Aktionsart*) classes is known in the case of other SPs modifying quasi-auxiliary verbs. Those admitted by the auxiliary verb *venir* ‘come’, for example, are grouped in very few semantic clusters. If the subject of predication is not human, expected SL predicates will denote disposition or presentation (*aderezado* ‘seasoned’, *dispuesto* ‘arranged’, *envuelto*, ‘wrapped’, *preparado* ‘prepared’), and necessary cause or link (*provocado* ‘provoked’, *determinado* ‘determined’, *exigido* ‘demanded’, *forzado* ‘forced’, *obligado* ‘compelled’, *pedido* ‘requested’, *requerido* ‘required’). If the verb is constructed with an argumental dative, the SP will express size (*grande* ‘big’, *pequeño* ‘small’), and —strangely enough— presence or absence of sufficient separating space (*estrecho* ‘narrow’, *justo* ‘tight’, *holgado* ‘loose’, *apretado* ‘tight’). See RAE-ASALE (2009: § 38.5t) in relation to these and similar groups.

Restrictive paradigms are also obtained with many other semi-copulative verbs: *mantenerse* ‘remain, keep up’, *salir* ‘come to be’ or *resultar* ‘result’, among others, as well as with so-called “semi-copulative verbs of change”: *ponerse*, *volverse*, *quedarse*, *hacerse*, *devenir*, all of them corresponding to Eng. *become*. The factors constraining the latter paradigms of SPs have been discussed in a large number of monographies. I can only mention a few titles here: Bybee & Eddington (2006), Morimoto & Pavón Lucero (2007), RAE-ASALE (2009: § 38.2), Lauwers & Duée (2011), Delbecque & van Gorp (2012), van Gorp (2017), Conde Nogueroles (2018a, b), and the references therein.

As I have anticipated, the need to characterize these restrictive paradigms

is not limited to quasi-auxiliary verbs (=group (1a)), but extends to main verbs (=group (1c)). Indeed, the VPs in (17), constructed with non-auxiliary verbs, are predicated of human subjects. Suppose, again, that these gaps are to be filled by possible subject SPs.

- (17) a. Mis primos vivían \_\_\_ en esta casa.  
'My cousins used to live in this house'  
b. El preso escapó \_\_\_ de la cárcel.  
'The prisoner escaped from the jail'  
c. Juan se presentó al examen muy \_\_\_\_.  
'J. showed up for the exam very...'  
d. María se levantó de la mesa completamente \_\_\_\_.  
'M. got up from the table completely....'  
e. Luis conducía \_\_\_ por la autopista.  
'L. drove on the highway'  
f. Juan permaneció \_\_\_ junto a la puerta.  
'J. stood by the door'  
g. Cada vez me siento más \_\_\_\_.  
'I am feeling more and more...'

Analyses of depictive secondary predication based on aspectual variables predict —incorrectly, as I have pointed out— one single paradigm of SL predicates for all the gaps in (17). Let us concentrate on (17a), which we can approach as a way of illustration. Analyses based on *Aktionsart* typologies would probably exclude from (17a) IL adjectives such as *inteligentes* 'smart' or *desdichados* 'unfortunate', but they would have no way to exclude the extensive set of SL predicates which do not fit in (17a). This group includes many adjectives denoting physical states of individuals (*calvos* 'bald', *delgados* 'thin', *fuertes* 'strong', and many more). These unsuitable SPs do not provide the ERSs required in (17a), since they do not take into account the meaning of the main predicate.

Again, the semantic notions to which the appropriate SPs in (17a) belong are restricted. They are also scarce, and crucially related to the meaning of the verb *vivir* 'live'. They include the contiguity, proximity or coexistence of cohabiting individuals, whether this is evaluated positively or negatively

(*juntos* ‘together’, *solos* ‘alone’, *hacinados* ‘overcrowded’, *aislados* ‘isolated’, *incomunicados* ‘cut off’, *agrupados* ‘grouped’, *separados* ‘separated’, *acompañados* ‘accompanied’, *enemistados* ‘at enmity’, *enfrentados* ‘confronted’), their visibility or their presence (*ocultos* ‘hidden’, *escondidos* ‘concealed’, *encerrados* ‘locked up’, *confinados* ‘confined’, *ignorados* ‘ignored’), and their personal well-being, for which we can also establish a paradigm of positive terms (*felices* ‘happy’, *contentos* ‘pleased’, *satisfechos* ‘satisfied’, *despreocupados* ‘carefree’) and another one of negative notions (*engañados* ‘deceived’, *amargados* ‘embittered’, *marginados* ‘marginalized’, *abandonados* ‘abandoned’, *sometidos* ‘subjugated’, *explotados* ‘exploited’, *oprimidos* ‘oppressed’, *enjaulados* ‘caged’, *acosados* ‘harassed’, *asustados* ‘frightened’).

From the broad set of SL adjectives able to predicate of human subjects, we extract, once again, these restrictive paradigms, in the elaboration of which the main verb (now *vivir* ‘live’) plays an essential role. I will not deny that analyses along these lines are less elegant than those which attempt to account for the possible paradigm of admissible SPs on the basis a single aspectual feature. My point is, simply, that the latter analyses do not make the correct predictions, and also that the option I advocate is more restrictive, accurate, and explanatory.

I would like to make it clear that, in insisting on the need to delimit SPs through fine-grained semantic criteria, I am not denying the relevance of aspectual factors, but rather targeting their supposed sufficiency. We might perhaps find some paradigms of SPs able to be characterized on strictly aspectual conditions, but even in those cases —I suggest— these conditions should be derived from other factors. Suppose we postulate that the adjective *entero* ‘entire, complete’ is a proper SP modifying accomplishments (as in *leer entero el libro* ‘read the whole book’). This assumption seems to be correct. By picking up the SP *entero*, we exclude other non-relevant but possible SL states, as recalled above, then implying that the end point that characterizes some particular event might not be reached. But notice that this semantic characterization simply provides the meaning of the very concept of “accomplishment”.

#### 4. Conclusions and perspectives

In the preceding pages I have argued that the analysis of secondary predication in terms of aspectual parameters is insufficient for two reasons: (i) it does not take into account the meaning of the primary predicate; and (ii) it is too powerful and makes a large number of inadequate predictions. As possible substitutes, I have briefly compared (i) a pragmatically based analysis, and (ii) an option, which seems to me to be preferable, based on restrictive paradigms defined in terms of semantic properties that depend on the meaning of the primary verb. This is not the only case in which some standard solutions to theoretical problems are simple, but incorrect, whereas the alternatives turn out to be more intricate, puzzling and insecure.

Several important questions remain. They could not be solved here, but it seems appropriate to raise at least two of them:

a) The first is whether or not the semantic paradigms I suggest as more restrictive alternatives must be defined individually for each predicate. This question is very similar to the one posed in Bosque (2004b) as regards the lexical classes described in the dictionary REDES (=Bosque 2004a). If these semantic classes were defined for groups of predicates, it might not be necessary to establish them individually for each of them. By proceeding in this way, the information provided by REDES would not have to be stipulated, but could be deduced. For the time being, this is an empirical question. It goes without saying that any attempt to work in this direction would be most welcome.

b) The second question is not common in the literature on secondary predication, but I take it to be essential:

- (18) What specific conditions must any transitive verb fulfill in order to admit SPs of the direct object as possible depictive adjuncts?

As is evident, the question refers to the verb group (1c), not to group (1b). Blanche-Benveniste (1988) collected a list of verbs that reject these SPs. It included the French equivalents of *applaud*, *greet*, *frighten*, *forget*, *deny*, or *help*, as in Sp. *\*Juan ayudó exhausta a María* ‘\*John helped Mary exhausted’. One might perhaps argue that these verbs select unaffected direct objects,

but Blanche-Benveniste's list contained verbs such as *burn*, *hide* or *disturb*, which take affected objects and do not provide the conditions asked for in (18) either. If depictive object SPs are adjuncts, we still do not know why they do not apply freely to any transitive verb; that is, why sentences (19b) and (20b) are ungrammatical.

- (19) a. El hijo de María {es / está} insoportable.  
       'M.'s son is unbearable'  
 b. \*María cuida insoportable a su hijo.  
       '\*M. cares for her son unbearable'
- (20) a. Las pruebas estaban falseadas.  
       'The evidence was falsified'  
 b. \*El fiscal reunió falseadas las pruebas.  
       '\*The prosecutor gathered the evidence falsified'

Since lists of exceptions —such as Blanche-Benveniste's— do not provide generalizations nor explanations, we need one or more precise semantic conditions to answer questions such as (18). From many titles on secondary predication cited in this paper, it seems to follow that we will find the answer through event classes delving into the lexical aspect of predicates. From the arguments I have introduced, it follows that this is not the case. It also follows that the SPs in (19)-(20) are not proper ERSs for their main predicates, so that we will have to complete event classifications with much more specific semantic information in order to find the correct alternative.

## REFERENCES

- Aarts, B. (1992). *Small Clauses in English: The Nonverbal Types*. Mouton-De Gruyter.
- Abeillé, M., & Peteghem, M. van (2021). Les constructions verbales avec un attribut. In A. Abeillé, & D. Godard (Eds.), *La grande grammaire du français* (Vol. 1, pp. 288-311). Actes Sud Imprimerie Nationale.
- AGLE. Fernández Ramírez, S. (1997-2022). *Archivo gramatical de la lengua española*. Instituto Cervantes. <https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/agle/>

- Blanche-Benveniste, C. (1988). Laissez-le tel que vous l'avez trouvé: propositions pour l'analyse du fameux attribut complément d'objet. *Travaux de Linguistique*, (17), 51-68.
- Bosque, I. (2000). Objetos que esconden acciones. Una reflexión sobre la sincategorematicidad. In T. Cabré, & C. Gelpí (Eds.), *Lèxic, corpus i diccionaris* (pp. 15-30). Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Institut de Lingüística Aplicada (IULA).
- Bosque, I. (Dir.) (2004a). *REDES: diccionario combinatorio del español contemporáneo*. Ediciones SM.
- Bosque, I. (2004b). Combinatoria y significación. Algunas reflexiones. In I. Bosque (Dir.) *REDES: diccionario combinatorio del español contemporáneo* (pp. 77-174). Ediciones SM.
- Bosque, I. (2017). On the Conceptual Bases of Collocations: Restricted Adverbs and Lexical Selection. In S. Torner, & E. Bernal (Eds.), *Collocations and other Lexical Combinations in Spanish* (pp. 9-20). Routledge.
- Bouillon, P., & Busa, F. (Eds.). (2001). *The Language of Word Meaning*. Cambridge University.
- Bowers, J. (2001). Predication. In M. Baltin, & C. Collins (Eds.), *Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory* (pp. 299-333). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Brucart, J. M. (2017, diciembre 15-16). *Ser/estar*, una distinción escurridiza [Conference presentation]. XXVI Encuentro práctico de profesores de ELE en Barcelona, Spain.
- Bybee, J., & Eddington, D. (2006). Usage-Based Approach to Spanish Verbs of 'Becoming'. *Language*, 82(2), 323-355.
- Cardinaletti, A., & Guasti, M.T. (Eds.). (1995). *Syntax and Semantics* (Vol. 28): *Small Clauses*. Academic Press.
- Carreira, M., Foltran, M. J., & Knöpfler, A. (2017). Small Clauses: Origins and State of the Art. *Revista Lingüística*, 13(2), 383-401.
- Cifuentes, J. L. (2012). Atribución y sus límites: atributo, predicativo y complemento de modo. *Estudios de Lingüística*, (26), 89-144.
- Conde Noguero, M. E. (2018a). La expresión del cambio de estado: delimitación léxico-semántica del verbo *hacer* en la construcción *hacerse* + adjetivo/sustantivo con sujetos animados. *Anuario de Letras*, 6(1), 5-34.
- Conde Noguero, M. E. (2018b). Contribución al estudio léxico-semántico del verbo *ponerse*. *Pragmalingüística*, (26), 33-53.
- Delbecq, N., & van Gorp, L. (2012). *Hacerse* y *volverse* como nexos pseudo-copulativos. Dos maneras de concebir el cambio en español. *Bulletin Hispanique*, 114(1), 277-306.
- De Miguel, E. (2012). Properties and Internal Structure of the Lexicon: Applying the

- Generative Lexicon Model to Spanish. In M. Sanz, & J. M. Igoa (Eds.), *Applying Language Science to Language Pedagogy* (pp. 165-200). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- De Miguel, E., & Fernández Lagunilla, M. (2004). Un enfoque subeventivo de la relación entre predicados secundarios y adverbios de manera. *Revue Romane*, 39(1), 24-44.
- Demonte, V. (1988-1989). Remarks on Secondary Predicates: C-Command, Extraction, and Reanalysis. *The Linguistic Review*, 6(1), 1-39.
- Demonte, V. (1992). Temporal and Aspectual Constraints on Predicative APs. In H. Campos, & F. Martínez-Gil (Eds.), *Studies in Spanish Linguistics* (pp. 413-450). Georgetown University Press.
- Demonte, V. (1994). Algunas propiedades de los predicados secundarios. In *Homenaje a Alonso Zamora Vicente* (pp. 385-410). Castalia.
- Demonte, V., & Masullo, P. (1999). La predicación: los complementos predicativos. In I. Bosque, & V. Demonte (Eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* (pp. 2461-2523). Espasa.
- Di Tullio, A. (2002). La inestable frontera entre atributos y predicativos. *Verba*, 29, 9-29.
- Ducrot, O. (1993). Les topoi dans la théorie de l'argumentation de la langue. In C. Plantin (Eds.), *Lieux communs, topoi, stéréotypes, clichés* (pp. 233-248). Kimé.
- Ducrot, O. (1995). Les modificateurs déréalisants. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 24(1-2), 145-165.
- Fábregas, A. (2012). A Guide to IL and SL in Spanish: Properties, Problems and Proposals. *Borealis*, 1-2, 1-71.
- González García, F. (2002). What can Pragmatic Inference tell us about the Syntax and Semantics of Secondary Predication? *Estudios de Lingüística Inglesa Aplicada*, (3), 281-297.
- Gumiel-Molina, S., Moreno-Quibén, N., & Pérez-Jiménez, I. (2016). Depictive Secondary Predicates in Spanish and the Relative/Absolute Distinction. In C. Tortora, M. Den Dikken, I. L. Montoya (Eds.), *Romance Linguistics 2013: Selected papers from the 43<sup>rd</sup> Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)* (pp. 139-158) John Benjamin.
- Hanegreefs, H. (2015). La capacidad de 'perspectivización' de la pasiva con *verse*. *Verba*, 42, 9-32.
- Harre, C. E. (1991). *Tener + Past Participle: a Case Study in Linguistic Description*. Routledge.
- Hernanz, M. L. (1988). En torno a la sintaxis y la semántica de los complementos predicativos en español. *Estudi General*, (8), 7-31.
- Himmelman, N. P., & Schultze-Berndt, E. (2005). Issues in the Syntax and Semantics of Participant Oriented Adjuncts: An Introduction. In N. P. Himmelman, & E. Schultze-

- Berndt (Eds.), *Predication and Adverbial Modification: The Typology of Depictives* (pp. 1-68). Oxford University Press.
- Hoekstra, T. (1992). Small Clause Theory. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 7, 125-151.
- Irimia, M. A. (2005). Types of Secondary Predication. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics*, 25, 20-29.
- Jackendoff, R. (2011). Alternative Minimalist Visions of Language. In R. D. Borsley, & K. Börjars (Eds.), *Non-transformational Syntax* (pp. 268-296). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Jiménez Fernández, Á. (2000). Minimalismo, aspecto y predicados secundarios. *Philologia Hispalensis*, 14(1), 161-179.
- Lamiroy B., & Melis L. (2005). Les copules ressemblent-elles aux auxiliaires? In H. Bat-Zeev Shyldkrot, & N. Le Querler (Eds.), *Les périphrases verbales* (pp. 145-170). John Benjamins.
- Lauwers, L., & Tobback, E. (2010). Les verbes attributifs : inventaire(s) et statut. *Langages*, (3), 79-113.
- Lauwers, P., & Duée, C. (2011). From Aspect to Evidentiality: The Subjectification Path of the French Semi-copula *se faire* and its Spanish cognate *hacerse*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 1042-1060.
- Lauwers, P., Van den Heede, M., & Tobback, E. (2019). *Se (re) trouver* dans tous ses états... atributifs: sens et constructions. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, 135(1), 29–67.
- Legendre, G. (1997). Secondary Predication and Functional Projections in French. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 15(1), 43-87.
- Leonetti, M. (1994). *Ser y estar: estado de la cuestión*. *Pliegos de la Ínsula Barataria*, 1, 182-205.
- Marín, R. (2001). El componente aspectual de la predicación [Doctoral Dissertation]. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.
- McNally, L. (1994). Adjunct Predicates and the Individual/Stage Distinction. In D. Farkas, P. Spaelti, & E. Duncan (Eds.), *Proceedings of West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* (Vol. 12, pp. 561–576). Center for the Study of Language and Information (CSLI).
- Millikan, R. (1984). *Language, Thought, and Other Biological Categories*. MIT Press.
- Morimoto, Y. (2006). Análisis comparativo de *encontrarse* y *sentirse*: entre la predicación y la atribución. In M. Villayandre (Ed.), *Actas del XXXV Simposio Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística* (pp. 1331-1342). Universidad de León.
- Morimoto, Y., & Pavón Lucero, M. V. (2005). Estructura semántica y estructura sintáctica de las construcciones atributivas con *ponerse* y *quedarse*. In G. Wotjak, & J. Cuartero

- Otal (Eds.), *Entre semántica léxica, teoría del léxico y sintaxis* (pp. 285-294). Peter Lang.
- Morimoto, Y., & Pavón Lucero, M. V. (2006). Los verbos pseudo-copulativos modales del español. Actas del VII Congreso de Lingüística General [CD-ROM]. Publicacions i Edicions de la Universitat de Barcelona.
- Morimoto, Y., & Pavón Lucero, M. V. (2007): *Los verbos pseudo-copulativos del español*. Arco/Libros.
- Nakajima, H. (1990). Secondary Predication. *The Linguistic Review*, 7(3), 275-309.
- Napoli, D. (1989). *Predication Theory* Cambridge University Press.
- Olsson, K. (1976). *La construction: verbe + objet direct + complément prédicatif en français. Aspects syntaxiques et sémantiques*. University of Stockholm.
- Olsson, K. (1981). Thème, rhème, focus et la construction avec attribut de l'objet. *Linguisticae Investigationes*, 5(1), 137-168.
- Palancar, E. L., & Alarcón, L. L. (2007). Predicación secundaria depictiva en español. *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 37(1), 337-370.
- Porroche, M. (1990). *Aspectos de la atribución en español*. Pórtico.
- Pustejovsky, J. (1995). *The Generative Lexicon*. MIT Press.
- Rafel, J. (2010). *Complex Small Clauses*. VDM Verlag.
- RAE-ASALE (2009). *Nueva gramática de la lengua española. Morfología y sintaxis* (Vol. 2). Espasa.
- Ramos, J.-R. (2002). El SV, II: la predicació no verbal obligatòria. In J. Solà, J. Mascaró, & M. Pérez-Saldanya (Eds.), *Gramàtica del català contemporani* (Vol. 2, pp. 1951-2044). Empúries.
- Rapoport, T. R. (1991). Adjunct-Predicate Licensing and D-structure. In S. Rothstein (Ed.), *Perspectives on phrase Structure* (pp. 159-187). Academic Press.
- Rapoport, T. R. (1993). Stage and Adjunct Predicates. In E. Reuland, & W. Abraham (Eds.), *Knowledge in Language and Conceptual Structure* (pp. 157-182). Kluwer.
- Rapoport, T. R. (1999). Structure, Aspect, and the Predicate. *Language*, 75(4), 653-677.
- Raposo, E. B. P. (2013). Orações copulativas e predicacões secundárias. In E.B.P Raposo, M. F. B. do Nascimento, M. A. C. da Mota, L. Segura, & A. Mendes (Eds.), *Gramática do português* (Vol. 2, pp. 1285-1356). Fundação Calouste Gulbekian.
- Riddle, E., & Sheintuch, G. (1983). A Functional Analysis of Pseudo-Passives. *Linguistics & Philosophy*. 6(4), 527-563.
- Rodríguez Ramalle, T. (2001). Los adverbios de manera como predicados de los subeventos verbales. *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 31(1), 107-143.
- Rothstein, S. (1983). *The Syntactic Forms of Predication* [Doctoral Dissertation]. MIT.

- Rothstein, S. (2004). *Predicates and their Subjects*. Kluwer.
- Rothstein, S. (2011). Secondary Predicates. In K. von Stechow, C. Maienborn, & P. Portner (Eds.), *Semantics: An International Handbook of Natural Language Meaning* (Vol. 2, pp. 1442-1462). Mouton.
- Salvi, G. (2001). I complementi predicativi. In L. Renzi, G. Salvi, & A. Cardinaletti (Eds.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 191-226). Il Mulino.
- Sanz Martín, B. E. (2011). *El proceso de auxiliarización del verbo tener: de la posesión al aspecto*. Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes.
- Schultze-Berndt, E., & Himmelmann, P. (2004). Depictive Secondary Predicates in Crosslinguistic Perspective. *Linguistic Typology*, 8, 59–131.
- Suñer, A., & Di Tullio, A. (2014). Bare Adjectives as Syncretic Forms. *Borealis*, 3(1), 23-47.
- van Gorp, L. (2017). *Los verbos pseudo-copulativos de cambio en español: estudio semántico-conceptual de hacerse, volverse, ponerse, quedarse*. Iberoamericana / Vervuert.
- Washio, R. (1997). Resultatives, Compositionality and Language Variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, 6(1), 1–49.
- Willems, K. (2013). The Linguistic Sign at the Lexicon-Syntax Interface: Assumptions and Implications of the Generative Lexicon Theory. *Semiotica*, (193), 233–287.
- Williams, E. (1980). Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 11(1), 203-238.
- Winkler, S. (1997). *Focus and Secondary Predication*. De Gruyter.
- Zagona, K. (1993). Spanish Adjectival Secondary Predicates, Time Adverbs and Subevent Structure. *Cuadernos de Lingüística*, 1, 317-354.