

**Prosody Reveals Syntactic Structure:**  
Secondary Predication in Metrical Finite Corpus Data

The mapping of syntax to prosody is regulated by correspondence requirements that hold between abstract syntactic structure and prosodic structure (Selkirk 2011; Elfner 2012; Ito and Mester 2013, among others). Preferentially, syntactic constituents map to prosodic constituents of the same level: morphosyntactic words ( $X^0$ ) map to prosodic words ( $\omega$ ), syntactic phrases (XP) map to prosodic phrases ( $\phi$ ), and clauses (CP/TP) map to intonation phrases ( $\iota$ ). Given the crucial interaction between syntax and prosody, prosodic structure can be used to identify and differentiate syntactic structure.

Cross-linguistically, secondary predicates tend to be marked by special prosody: they are either in prominent positions and/or are subject to isolation from their respective VPs. Depictives are thought to be more prosodically independent than resultatives (cf. Irimia 2012: 208 and references therein). A further distinguishing feature of secondary predicates is the tendency to occur in STAGE-LEVEL predicates expressing a non-permanent state (Carlson 1977; Simpson 2005; Casaretto 2020). Following Kratzer (1995), STAGE-LEVEL predicates have an extra argument position for events. Likewise, secondary predicates correspond to additional syntactic structure (Kratzer 2005; Irimia 2012) which maps to a separate prosodic domain.

This study examines the distribution of secondary predication across finite metrical corpora, including the works of Homer (Greek) and the RigVeda (Vedic Sanskrit). The central goal of the present study is to identify the diagnostics for secondary predication in Greek and Vedic. Our survey suggests that secondary predicates in Greek and Vedic tend to exhibit uniform prosodic behavior. In particular, secondary predicates are separated from postverbal nominals by (i) caesura, (ii) line break, (iii) the process of *enjambment* whereby syntactic units are broken across multiple prosodic domains at the expense of Selkirk (2011)'s MATCH constraints, or a combination of these strategies. The Greek (1) and Vedic (2) data below illustrate this point.

- (1) **ton** d' ōs oun enoēse podarkēs dīos  
 he.ACC but thus really see.AOR.ACT.3SG swift.NOM.SG.M divine.NOM.SG.M  
 Achilleus // **gymnon**  
 Achilles.NOM.SG // naked.ACC.SG.M  
 “now as brilliant swift-footed Achilles saw him **naked**” (II 21.49-50)
- (2) purutrā vṛtró aśayad **vyàstaḥ**  
 in.many.places Vṛtra.NOM.SG.M. lie.IMP.3SG fling.apart.PTCP.NOM.SG.M.  
 “Vṛtra lay (there), **flung apart** in many places” (RV 01.32.7d)

Prosodic isolation of secondary predicates in Greek is accomplished by enjambment: the depictive/resultative APs and postverbal nominals are parsed in different lines (1). The Vedic data in (2) demonstrate an additional isolation strategy: line-finality and post verbal position. Our findings therefore lend further support to the importance of caesurae and line-boundaries in syntactic analyses of ancient metrical corpora (Hale and Kissock 2021). The tendency to combine with STAGE-LEVEL (rather than INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL) predicates is also apparent—the secondary predicates *seeing him naked* (1) and *laying flung apart* (2) express transient properties and not permanent ones, as predicted. These facts set secondary predicates apart from attributive APs, which do not have complex syntactic structure corresponding to recursive  $\iota$  domains preserved via isolation strategies in finite metrical corpora.

**Selected references.** Carlson, G.N. (1977). "Reference to kinds in English". PhD thesis, UMass Amherst. ■ Casaretto, A. (2020). "Onsecondary predicates in Vedic Sanskrit–Syntax and Semantics" IJDL. ■ Hale, M. and M. Kissock (2021). "n the syntax of comparative clauses in Vedic Sanskrit. . . like someone eating the foam off the water". *Trends in South Asian Linguistics* 367. ■ Kratzer, A. (1995). *Stage-level and individual-level predicates*. ■ Kratzer, A. (2005). "Building resultatives". In Maienborn, Claudia and Angelika Wöllstein, *Event arguments: foundations and applications*. ■ Selkirk, E. (1996). "The prosodic structure of function words". In: *Signal to syntax*. ■ Selkirk, E. (2011). "The syntax–Phonology Interface". *The handbook of phonological theory*.