Slavic creation/consumption predicates in light of Talmy's typology

Alessandro Bigolin Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona alessandro.bigolin@uab.cat

Introduction. The talk is concerned with the licensing of creation/consumption predicates (CCs) (i.e. predicates where the direct object is understood as an incremental theme measuring out the event) in Slavic languages, in light of Mateu's (2012) extension of Talmy's typology. These predicates are shown to conform to the verb-framed type of constructions, despite Slavic languages being commonly regarded as a type of satellite-framed languages. A revision of the typology is proposed which accounts for the pattern observed.

The typological distinction argued by Talmy (2000) divides languages depending on how resultative (change-of-state/location) events are expressed. On the one hand, verb-framed languages (VFLs) (e.g., Spanish) require the *core* component of result (e.g., the final state/ location) to be encoded in the main verb, such that information about <u>manner</u> is either omitted or provided via adjuncts (1a). On the other hand, satellite-framed languages (SFLs) (e.g., English) may encode the result in a "satellite" (e.g., PP/AP) distinct from the main verb, which in turn is free to express a manner co-event (1b).

(1) a. La botella *entró* a la cueva (<u>flotando</u>). b. The bottle <u>floated</u> *into the cave*. the bottle moved-in to the cave floating (Talmy 2000)

Slavic languages, along with Latin, have been labeled "weak satellite-framed" (Acedo-Matellán 2010, 2016) (AM) as they display result prefixes that can attach to manner-denoting verbs (2). The result element is required to form a prosodic word with the verb in these languages, but the verb itself may convey information about manner, making these languages appear to belong to the class of SFLs.

(2) Ona *is*-<u>pisala</u> svoju ručku. (Russian; Spencer & Zaretskaya 1998, apud Mateu 2012) she out-writed her pen (lit. She has written her pen out (of ink).)

A typological extension. Mateu (2003, 2012) explored the idea that SFLs allow a superset of the CCs found in VFLs. Namely, only SFLs are argued to display Complex Effected Object Constructions (CEOCs) (AM), intended here as CCs where the meaning of the verb introduces a manner co-event to the main event of creation/consumption (3). In contrast, VFLs only allow constructions where the verb directly expresses the creation/consumption of the entity denoted by the object, which in turn is typically interpreted as a hyponym of the verb (4).

(3) She <u>brushed</u> *a hole* in her coat. (≈ *made* a hole <u>by brushing</u>) (Levin and Rapoport 1988)
(4) He *dug a hole* in the ground. (COCA Corpus)

A syntactic approach. Syntactic accounts of argument structure stemming from Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) understand SF constructions as involving the adjunction of a mannerdenoting element to a null v head (5), the complement of v being realized independently (Mateu 2002): by means of a small clause (cf. "PredP") in the case of resultative predicates (5a) and as a DP in the case of CCs (5b). VF constructions instead involve either overt light verbs (e.g., *make*) or verbs formed via the incorporation of v's complement into v, as in (6).

- (5) a. $\left[_{\nu P} \left[_{\nu} \sqrt{FLOAT \nu} \right] \left[_{PredP} \left[_{DP} \text{ the bottle} \right] \left[_{Pred'} \text{ Pred} \left[_{PP} \text{ into the cave} \right] \right] \right]$ b. $\left[_{\nu P} \left[_{\nu} \sqrt{BRUSH \nu} \right] \left[_{DP} \text{ a hole} \right] \right]$

In a similar vein, weak SF resultatives such as (2) are accounted for by AM in terms of a PF (Phonological Form) requirement on the null functional head ("Path") heading the small clause result(-like) complement of v in these predicates. A null Path must univerbate with v in weak SFLs and carries its complement ("Place") with it as a further realization condition.

- (7) Derivation of *ispis(ala)* (2) in AM's (2016) framework:
 - 1. vP after Spell-Out: $[_{vP} [_{v} \forall PIS v] [_{PathP} Path [_{PlaceP} Place \forall IS]]$
 - 2. Raising of Place to Path and Path to v: [v [Path [Place] VIS Place] Path] [v] VIS v]
 - 3. Linearization: $\sqrt{1S-Place-Path-\sqrt{PIS-v}}$
 - 4. Vocabulary Insertion: is-Ø-Ø-pis-Ø

Problem. AM's account of weak SFLs predicts the availability of CEOCs - which do not involve Path - in these languages, that are considered as fundamentally SF. **In this talk**, *pace* AM, I provide new data from Slavic languages (Russian, Polish, Ukrainian, Slovak, Croatian) showing that these languages always behave as VF in CCs, as they must resort to run-of-the-mill VF strategies to express such predicates (8) and they rule out SF constructions like CEOCs (9).

- (8) a. Ona robiła dziurę w płaszczu szczotką.
 she made^{1pf} hole in coat brush.INS
 b. Ona delala dyrku v pal'to ščetkoj.
 - she made^{1pf} hole in coat brush.INS
 - c. Vona *robyla dyrku* na kurttsi <u>shitkoju</u>. she made^{lpf} hole in coat brush.INS

(

- (9) a. *Ona <u>czesała</u> dziurę w płaszczu. she brushed^{1pf} hole in coat
 b. *Ona <u>česala</u> dyrku v pal'to.
 - she brushed^{1pf} hole in coat
 - c. *Vona <u>terla</u> dyrku na kurttsi. she brushed^{1pf} hole in coat

'She was making a hole in her coat with a brush.' 'She was brushing a hole in her coat.'

(examples a.: Polish; examples b.: Russian; examples c.: Ukrainian)

Proposal. I argue that the SFL/VFL distinction can be better captured in terms of a PF requirement on the null v head of VFLs. Namely, this head always has to incorporate its complement in VFLs. The proposal thus groups weak SFLs such as Slavic languages together with standard VFLs. Specifically, the affixation of the result component in weak SF predicates such as (2) is to be considered as the manifestation of a VF behavior, fulfilling the PF requirement of v to incorporate its complement. Weak SFLs thus are VFLs, but they differ from "standard" VFLs in the realm of resultatives (cf. (1a) vs (2)) in that they can express the result component through morphemes that are (**a**). categorially independent from the verb *and* (**b**). affixable to the verb. If the lexicon of a VFL is such that these two conditions are met, the adjunction of a manner-denoting root to v is allowed without ruling out the VF requirement to incorporate v's complement.

Predictions. 1. A creation/consumption reading of a predicate with a manner-denoting verb may be recovered in Slavic languages when the predicate is perfectivized via 'internal' verbal prefixes inducing inner-aspectual telicity (Svenonius 2004, Borik 2006, *i.a.*), as such prefixes have been argued to denote the incorporation of a non-referential result into the verb in a resultative structure (AM). A pragmatic interpretation of the direct object as an incremental theme is obtained via aspectual coercion, giving rise to pseudo CEOCs (10).

(10)	a. Ona <i>wy-<u>czesała</u></i>	dziurę	w płaszczu.	(Polish)
	she RESULT-brushed ^{Pf} hole.ACC in coat			
	b. Ona <i>pro-<u>česala</u></i>	dyrku	v pal'to.	(Russian)
	she RESULT-brushed ^{Pf} hole.ACC in coat			
	c. Vona <i>pro-terla</i>	dyrku	na kurttsi.	(Ukrainian)
	she RESULT-brushed ^{Pf} hole.ACC in coat			
	'She brushed a hole in her coat.'			

2. In contrast, bona fide CEOCs are unavailable in weak SFLs (really, "weak" VFLs) like Slavic languages (9) - as well as in standard VFLs more generally (Mateu 2012) - because of a lack of lexical items capable of expressing incremental themes as affixes.

3. The analysis further predicts a similarity between Slavic languages and Latin in the expression of CCs, as both languages behave as weak SFLs in the domain of resultatives (AM). A corpus-based research seems to bear out the prediction. I further argue that the alleged Latin CEOCs discussed in AM can be either interpreted as hyponymous VF constructions like (4) (most of them are also found in standard VFLs like Italian) or better reanalysed as resultatives. **Implications**. The present take on weak SFLs as VFLs additionally solves the Minimalistic conundrum affecting previous analyses, whereby VFLs appear to consistently lack a structure building operation (*viz.* the adjunction of a root to *v*) that is instead available in SFLs. To wit, weak SF constructions *are* the result of applying this operation in a VF system.

Conclusions. (a). VFL/SFL distinction depends on a PF requirement of v to incorporate its complement in VFLs. (b). Weak SFLs are VFLs where v's complement can incorporate into v via overt prefixation, allowing the adjunction of a root to v. (c). CEOCs are unavailable in weak SFLs.

References. Acedo-Matellán, Víctor. 2010. Argument Structure and the Syntax-Morphology Interface: A Case Study in Latin and other Languages. PhD thesis, Universitat de Barcelona. | Acedo-Matellán, Víctor. 2016. The morphosyntax of transitions: A case study in Latin and other languages. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Borik, Olga. 2006. Aspect and Reference Time. Oxford: Oxford University Press. | Hale, Kenneth and Samuel J. Keyser. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In Kenneth H. and S. J. Keyser (eds.), The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 53-109. | Hale, Kenneth and Samuel J. Keyser. 2002. Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure. Cambridge: MIT Press. | Levin, Beth and Tova R. Rapoport. 1988. Lexical Subordination. Chicago Linguistic Society 24, 275–89. | Mateu, Jaume. 2002. Argument Structure: Relational Construal at the Syntax-Semantics Interface. PhD thesis, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. | Mateu, Jaume. 2003. Parametrizing verbal polysemy: The case of bake revisited. Chicago Linguistics Society 39, 256-69. | Mateu, Jaume. 2012. Conflation and incorporation processes in resultative constructions. In V. Demonte & L. McNally (eds.), Telicity, change, and state: A cross-categorial view of event structure. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 252-278. Spencer, Andrew and Marina Zaretskaya. 1998. Verb prefixation in Russian as lexical subordination. Linguistics 36, 1–39. | Svenonius, Peter. 2004. Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP. Nordlyd 32, 205–53. | Talmy, Leonard. 2000. Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Cambridge: MIT Press.