Accounting for cross-linguistic variation in modification by depictives
David Erschler, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev
erschler@bgu.ac.il
Depictives (1) are APs that modify DPs without forming a single constituent with the DP. Depictives express stage-level properties.

(1)a.   Mary$_i$ ate the fish$_j$ **raw$_{\#i/j}$/ drunk$_{i/\#j}$**.   b.   John$_i$ served Mary$_j$ coffee **drunk$_{i/*j}$**.

Languages of the world vary in which arguments can be modified by depictives. I argue that only a binding-based analysis can account for this variation. Specifically, I propose that the null specifier of the DepP is an anaphoric pronoun and that the cross-linguistic variation is reduced to the variation in the base position of the DepP and in the binding domain of the anaphor in its Spec.

Existing proposals. The literature converges on the proposal that depictives are complements of a small clause, to be denoted here by DepP. The location of DepP and the nature of its relationship with the DP it modifies is a matter of discussion. One type of proposal places PRO in Spec DepP and assumes the relation to be that of **control**, (Chomsky 1981; Safir 1983; Legendre 1997; Szajbel-Keck 2015), a.o. Another type of proposal assumes the relation between the modified DP and the depictive to be that of binding, (Rothstein 1983; Bailyn 1995; Richardson 2007), a.o. A number of proposals argue for a **multidominant structure**, where DepP and the main clause are derived separately, after which DepP is grafted to the main clause against the modified DP (Rapoport 1999; You 2016; Rapoport & Irimia 2018). Pylkkänen (2008) proposes a **semantic composition procedure** for depictives that rules in subjects, direct objects, and high applicatives, but rules out low applicatives. Finally, (Marušič et al 2003, 2008) propose that in Slovenian, DepP with an overt Spec is merged in lieu of the respective DP.

Case studies. The question which arguments can be modified by depictives in which language has not been addressed systematically. Here, I focus on several better-studied cases. **Slovenian** depictives are reported to not be sensitive to the syntactic of the modified DP, (Marušič et al 2003, 2008). In **English** and some other well-studied languages, only subjects and direct objects can be modified by depictives (1), (Williams 1980; Demonte 1987; Obria 2014 a.o.). **Tyvan** (Turkic) only has DO-depictives (2a); subject depictives are expressed by converbial clauses (2b), Nevskaya (2019).

(2)a.   ol   etti   **čig-ge**   či:r   b.   ol   **anïyaq tur-ɣaš** čoqaparɣan
         he   meat-ACC   raw-DAT   eats   s/he   young stand.AUX-CVB died
         'He eats meat raw.'   'S/he died young.' (lit. 'being young')

In the **Ossetic** languages (Iranian), any argument (3a-b) but no adjunct (3c-d) can be modified by a DepP.

(3)   a.   soslan$_i$ **χeteg-ɐj$_j$**   **rasug-ɐj$_{i/j}$**   tɐrsuj
                 S   Kh-ABL   drunk-ABL   fears
                 'Soslan fears Khetag drunk.'   *Digor Ossetic*

         b.   soslan$_i$ **χeteg-ɐn$_j$**   maʃin-i dɐʁɐl-tɐ   **rasug-ɐj$_{i/j}$**   ravardta
                 S   Kh-DAT   car-GENkey-PL   drunk-ABL   gave
                 'Soslan$_i$ gave Khetag$_j$ the car keys when he$_{i/j}$ was drunk.'

         c.   tikis$_i$ **soslan-bɐl$_j$**   **rasug-ɐj$_{i/*j}$**   χussuj   *Digor Ossetic*
                 cat   S-SUP   drunk-ABL   sleeps
                 'The cat is sleeping on Soslan (when it/*Soslan is) drunk.'

         d.   soslan$_i$ [$_{PP}$ **alan-i$_j$ raʒi**]   **rasug-ɐj$_{i/*j}$**   lɐwuj
                 S   A-GEN   in.front.of   drunk-ABL   stands
                 'Soslan stands in front of Alan drunk'   *Digor Ossetic*

Proposal briefly. As in the majority of current proposals, the depictive is assumed to be the complement of a small clause headed by Dep^0, which is assumed to be responsible for the idiosyncratic morphological marking that the adjective receives and for the depictive semantics. The relationship between a host and a depictive is that of anaphoric binding. As standardly assumed in binding-based approaches, different readings correspond to different base positions of the DepP. In different languages, DepP can adjoin to VP, ApplP, or vP. Spec DepP is occupied by a null anaphor. It is the lexical properties of Dep^0 that are responsible for possible adjunction sites of DepP. The binding domain of the respective depictive anaphor is the minimal one possible, that is, it is the category DepP adjoins to.

I will first show that proposals other than the ones based on binding or control cannot account for the attested variation, and then, primarily focusing on the Ossetic facts, I will argue in favor of the analysis sketched above.

Ruling out multidominance and merger of DepP in lieu of DP. Either analysis does not predict any restrictions on DPs that can be modified by a depictive. While in Slovenian this prediction is borne out, it's not clear how to modify the respective analysis so that it would give correct predictions for other languages.

Ruling out the proposal of Pylkkänen (2008). To repeat, this analysis predicts that high applicatives should be modifiable by depictives. As shown by Boneh & Nash (2107), Russian has high applicatives, e.g the dative-marked DP in (4). They cannot be modified by depictives.

(4) Ivan   otpravil **Vase**   podčinennogo   (**pjanym**$_{i/*j/k}$)
     I.   sent   Vasya.DAT.M   subordinate.ACC   drunk
     'Ivan sent Vasya a subordinate (drunk).'

Telling apart binding and control. While in English-like languages binding and control-based proposals give fairly similar predictions, the Ossetic facts allow us to clearly tell apart the two approaches. On the one hand, adjunct control in Ossetic is only possible for subjects and direct objects.

(5) a.   soslan$_i$ je=nsuvɐr-ɐj$_j$ [PRO$_{i/*j}$ χod-gɐ-j]   raledʒuj
          Soslan   POSS.3SG=brother-ABL   laugh-CVB-ABL runs.away
          'Soslan is running away from his brother laughing.'   *Digor Ossetic*
     b.   soslan mɐdin-i$_j$ fɐjjidta   [PRO$_j$ zar-gɐ-(j)]
          Soslan Madina-ACC   see.PST.3SG   sing-CVB-ABL
          'Soslan saw Madina sing.'   *Digor Ossetic*
     c.   fidɐ$_i$ ɐ=furt-ɐn$_j$ dɐʁɐltɐ
          father.NOM   POSS.3SG=son-DAT   keys
          [kust-mɐ   PRO$_{i/*j}$ ratsɐwu-gɐ-j]   ravardta
          work-ALL   go.away-CVB-ABL   give. PST.3SG
          'The father$_i$ left the keys to his son$_j$ when PRO$_{i/*j}$ leaving for the work.'   *Digor Ossetic*

Accordingly, control of PRO in Spec DepP cannot be the relation that exists between a DP and a modifying depictive. On the other hand, the class of nominal expressions able to bind anaphors is identical to those that can be modified by depictives. Any argument (6a-b), but no adjunct (6c), can bind anaphors in Ossetic.

(6) a.   ʃoʃlan-ɐj$_i$ jɐ=mad   ɐppɐlə   jɐ=χi$_i$ raʒə
          Soslan-ABL   POSS.3SG=mother   praises POSS.3SG=REFL in.front.of
          'Soslan's mother praises him in front of himself.'
     b.   soslan-mɐ$_i$ ɐ=χe$_i$ bavdiston
          S-ALL   POSS.3SG=self I.showed
          'I have shown Soslan himself'
     c.   χetɐg$_i$ radʒoruj soslan-bɐl$_j$ ɐ=χets-ɐn$_{i/*j}$ Digor
          Kh.NOM   tells   Soslan-SUP   POSS.3SG=REFL-DAT
          *'Khetag is telling himself$_j$ about Soslan$_j$.'

I propose that the failure of adjuncts to be modified by depictives and to bind anaphors is due to the fact that adjuncts are introduced by adpositions, either silent or overt.

Finally, the following table shows predictions of the proposal depending on the adjunction site of DepP.

Adjunction site of DepP	Predictions	Languages
DP	no sensitivity to the type of a host	Slovenian; case-agreeing depictives in Russian
vP	only subject depictives	no attested cases so far
VP	only object depictives	Tyvan
vP, VP	subject and object depictives	The Standard European system
vP, VP, ApplP	any arguments	Ossetic