

Adjectival and non-adjectival resultative constructions: the role of morphology in their cross-linguistic variation

Víctor Acedo-Matellán, Universitat de Barcelona

Complex resultative predicates present non-trivial cross-linguistic variation within the group of languages that allow them: while Germanic, Latin and Slavic, for instance, all permit complex resultative constructions based on *adposition*-like elements like prefixes or particles (see (1)), only Germanic permits them when based on *adjectival* secondary predicates (see (2)). In this talk I provide an analysis of complex adjectival and non-adjectival resultative constructions within a syntactic theory of argument structure and morphology, crucially concentrating on the abovementioned contrast.

As a representative of the small-clause approach to complex resultative constructions (see also Hoekstra 1988), Mateu (2002), assuming the by now well-known Talmian distinction between *s(atellite)-framed* and *v(erb)-framed* languages (Talmy 1985, 2000), states that the answer to the cross-linguistic puzzle posed by resultatives is better stated in (l-) syntactic terms (Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002): s-framed languages allow resultatives because in those languages the element expressing change or transition, the Path, which is argued by him to head the resultative secondary predicate, is expressed as a *satellite*, that is, as an element independent from (though related to) the verb (see English *-to* in (3a) and *awake* in (4a)); on the other hand, v-framed languages are unable to sustain resultatives because the Path *conflates* into the verb (Hale & Keyser 2002), turning out to be morphophonologically indistinguishable from it (see Catalan *entrà* in (3b) and *despertà* in (4b)). While acknowledging that the s-/v-framed distinction and a syntactic interpretation thereof is an adequate starting point to understand the contrasts between languages like Romance and languages like Germanic seen in (4), I show that Mateu's (2002) explanation is not fine-grained enough, since there are languages fitting the characterisation of an s-framed language, like Latin (Acedo-Matellán & Mateu 2008) or the Slavic languages (Gehrke 2008), which seem to pattern with v-framed languages in not allowing adjectival resultative constructions, as already seen in (2). My proposal is based on the observation that languages disallowing adjectival resultatives generally disallow resultative secondary predications where the Path component is not morphologically attached onto the verb. This is the case, for instance, with Latin and Slavic, which seem to require the presence of a prefix in the expression of complex resultative predicates. Thus, for instance, these languages contrast with Germanic in the fact that their PP resultative constructions do not generally allow an unprefixated verb (see (5) and (6) for Latin and Russian; see (3a) for Germanic). I suggest that in these languages there is a morphological requirement for the Path head to be attached onto the verb and that this prefixation mechanism is incompatible with the expression of the secondary predicate as an adjective. This results from an independent morphological fact: namely, that in these languages the adjective is always inflected for agreement. Since affixation cannot, by hypothesis, target inflected forms, the adjective must remain in situ, failing to satisfy the mentioned morphological requirement that the Path be affixed onto the verb (see (7)). By contrast, languages like English do not feature such a morphological requirement and, hence, may generate resultative constructions based on adjectives. An additional piece of evidence in favour of a morphological analysis of the problem is provided by Icelandic, an s-framed language where AP resultatives are of two kinds: those where the adjective is inflected and remains in situ and those where the adjective is not inflected and is affixed onto the verb (see (8)). Having into account v-framed languages, which disallow both AP and PP resultatives, a typology emerges which is finer-grained than that of Talmy's or Snyder's (2001) and which is based strictly on a morphophonological basis: whether Path is specified as *fusing* or *conflating* (yielding Romance-type v-framed languages), *affixal* (yielding Latin-type, *weak* s-framed languages) or unspecified (yielding Germanic-type, *strong* s-framed languages).

- (1) Resultatives based on adposition-like elements
- a. *English: the particle expresses a result state (Hale & Keyser 2002)*
He slept the hours *away*
 - b. *Latin: the prefix expresses a result state (Acedo-Matellán & Mateu 2008)*
[Serpentes] [ova] solida hauriunt [...] atque [...] putamina *(ex-)tussiunt
snakes.NOM eggs.ACC whole.ACC.PL swallow.3P and shells.ACC out-cough.3P
'Snakes swallow eggs entirely and cough out the shells' (Plin. *Nat.* 10, 197)
 - c. *Russian: the prefix expresses a result state (Babko-Malaya 1999)*
Ivan vy-kopal klad
Ivan out-dug.PERF treasure.ACC
'Ivan dug out the treasure'
- (2) Adjectival resultatives
- a. *German: adjectival resultative (Kratzer 2004)*
Die Teekanne leer trinken
The teapot empty drink
 - b. *Latin: unavailability of adjectival resultatives*
*Poculum vacuum bibere
glass.ACC empty.ACC drink.INF
 - c. *Russian: unavailability of adjectival resultatives (Strigin 2004)*
*Ona mylila men'a skolzkim
she soaped/was soaping me slippery
- (3) *English vs. Romance: expression of a change of location (Mateu 2002)*
- a. The boy danced *into* the room
 - b. El noi *entrà* a l'habitació ballant/*El noi ballà a l'habitació
the boy entered PREP the=room dancing the boy danced PREP the=room
- (4) *English vs. Romance: expression of a change of state (Mateu 2002)*
- a. The dog barked the chicken *awake*
 - b. El gos *desperta* els pollastres bordant/ *El gos bordà els pollastres desperts
the dog awakened the chickens barking the dog barked the chickens awake
- (5) [...] repente ex omnibus partibus *ad pabulatores* *(ad-)volaverunt [...]
suddenly out all.ABL.P part.ABL.P on forager.ABL.P on-fly.PERF.3P
'They flew upon the foragers suddenly from all quarters' (Caes. *Gall.* 5, 17, 2)
- (6) *Obligatory prefixation of Path: Russian (Rojina 2004)*
- a. vy-brosit' kota iz okna
out-throw cat out window
'To throw the cat out of the window'
 - b. *brosit' kota iz okna
throw cat out window
- (7) *Latin: prefixation of preposition (5) vs. unavailability of prefixation of adjectives (2b)*
[_{VP} ad-[_V √VOL] [_{Path} (~~ad~~) [_{Place} pro [ad pabulatores]]]]
*[_{VP} vacuum-[_V √BIB] [_{Path} (~~vacuum~~) [_{Place} poculum [~~vacuum~~]]]]
- (8) *Icelandic non-affixed and affixed resultative adjectives (Whelpton 2006)*
- a. Ég kýldi lögguna kalda
I.N punched cop.the.F.ACC.S cold.F.ACC.S
'I punched the cop out cold'
 - b. Hann hvít-þvoði gólfíð.
he.N white-washed floor.the.N.ACC.S
'He washed the floor extremely clean'

SELECTED REFERENCES

MATEU, Jaume. 2002. *Argument structure: relational construal at the syntax semantics interface*. PhD Dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona; TALMY, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

