

The dynamicity of stative resultatives

Bernhard Wälchli (Stockholm)

The term “resultative” is used in two different ways in cross-linguistic studies with astonishingly complementary distribution. Since reference is made to both of them here, the terms must be distinguished. I call them STATIVE RESULTATIVES and ACCOMPLISHMENT RESULTATIVES, respectively, using Vender’s verbal aspect categories to characterize the different domains they denote. The following examples from Latvian exemplify stative resultatives (1) and accomplishment resultatives (2).

(1) Sien-a/as ir no-krāso-t-a/as.
wall-NOM.F.SG/PL be:PRS3 PV-paint-PTC.PST.PASS-NOM.F.SG/PL
‘The wall(s) is(are) painted.’

(2) Jānis no-krāso-ja sien-u/-as zil-u/-as
Janis PV-paint-PST3 wall-ACC.F.SG/PL blue-ACC.F.SG/PL
‘John painted the wall(s) blue.’

According to the classical definition by Nedjalkov & Jaxontov (1988: 6) stative resultatives are “verb forms that express a state implying a previous event”. They play an important role in grammaticalization studies of tense, aspect and voice categories. For accomplishment resultatives it is more difficult to find a classical definition. They are constructions with two predicates, a dynamic one (V) and a stative one (the result, R) in a causal relationship expressing a change of state, usually transitive, which is why they are sometimes termed VOR. Despite some parallelism between (1) and (2), there are considerable differences: they express different verbal aspects (state vs. accomplishment) and the result predicates are different (“paint[ed]” in 1 and “blue” in 2). However, they share the combination of dynamic and stative marking devices. Both have a dynamic verb (*krāso* ‘paint’) with a bounder (*no-* “down”). The stativizing devices in (1) are the passive past participle and the auxiliary ‘be’. In (2) a lexical stative predicate is added agreeing in case and number with the undergoer.

In order to relate the two kinds of resultatives, a third term has to be introduced: (dynamic-stative) RESULT PAIR. The elements of a result pair can be related in various ways: by inflection (participle in Latvian and English), by derivation (Huaraz Quechua *hita* ‘throw’: *hita-reka-n* ‘[throw-STAT.IMPV-3SG >] lies disorderly’) or by formal identity as in (3) from Moore (Niger-Congo, Gur).

(3) sebrā ka-a roogā zugu
sheet nail[PFV]-IND house on
‘The piece of paper is nailed to the wall’ (“The sheet nails on the house.”)

Result pairs cut across lexicon and grammar in cross-linguistically recurrent, but also highly diverse ways (for instance, many languages of the world do not have any participles). This talk addresses result pairs from the perspective of stative resultatives. A domain-centered (extensional) approach is taken investigating the expression of local states with picture stimuli in a convenience sample of 74 languages. Other data sources are reference grammars and texts. Expressions of states are searched for traces of dynamicity of most different kinds, including dynamic verbs, markers of anteriority, goal or source marking instead of stative locative (e.g., English *is nailed to the wall*, not *on the wall*), etc. A further major question to be addressed (but not to be answered conclusively) is how the typology of stative resultatives relates to other grammatical and lexical typologies, such as the presence/absence of participles, positional verbs (‘stand’, ‘lie’, ‘sit’), and motion events.