

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 univertate 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. *v*P after Spell-Out: [_{vP} [_v √PIS *v*] [_{PathP} Path [_{PlaceP} Place √IS]]]
2. Raising of Place to Path and Path to *v*: [_v [_{Path} [_{Place} √IS Place] Path] [_v √PIS *v*]]
3. Linearization: √IS-Place-Path-√PIS-*v*
4. Vocabulary Insertion: is-∅-∅-pis-∅

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).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(8) a. <i>Ona robiła dziurę w płaszczu <u>szczotką</u>.</i>
 she made^{IPF} hole in coat brush.INS</p> <p>b. <i>Ona delala dyrku v pal’to <u>ščëtkoj</u>.</i>
 she made^{IPF} hole in coat brush.INS</p> <p>c. <i>Vona robyla dyrku na kurttsi <u>shitkoju</u>.</i>
 she made^{IPF} hole in coat brush.INS</p> | <p>(9) a. *<i>Ona <u>czesala</u> dziurę w płaszczu.</i>
 she brushed^{IPF} hole in coat</p> <p>b. *<i>Ona <u>česala</u> dyrku v pal’to.</i>
 she brushed^{IPF} hole in coat</p> <p>c. *<i>Vona <u>terla</u> dyrku na kurttsi.</i>
 she brushed^{IPF} hole in coat</p> |
|---|---|

‘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).

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

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.