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Typology of resultative constructions

Terminology, key notions

- Transitive vs intransitive verbs, agent vs patient
- Subjective vs objective resultative
- Constructions with “auxiliary verbs”
  - to be
    * er ist gekommen
    * the stick is broken
  - to have or equivalent
    * I have my task written, j'ai mon devoir d'écrit (coll. French)
    * u menja rabota napisana (Russian) “at-me task [is] written”
    * primus u menja potušen (dialect. Russian) “stove at-me [is] turned-off”
    * mul on auto pestud (Estonian) “at-me is car washed”
    * im teseal ȅ zna (Cl. Armenian) “of-me seen [there] is him”
    * liber mihi lectus est “book to-me read is”

- Agreement and case patterns
- Overlaps with perfect (actional), passive
Diverging views

- Viewpoint 1: Inherent passivity of the transitive verb
- Viewpoint 2: Non-orientation
- Viewpoint 3: There are visible diatheses
  - “Mediopassive”
  - “Passive”
  - “Antipassive”
Basic constructions (non resultative)

- Transitive recent past
  - (1) *Kepa-k ogi-a jan du* “Peter-ERG bread-the:ABS eaten he-has-it”
    (Peter ate the bread)

- Intransitive recent past
  - (2) *Kepa etorri da* “Peter-ABS come he-is” (Peter came)
  - (3) *ogi-a jan da* “bread-the:ABS eaten it-is” (someone ate the bread)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th><em>Kepa-k</em></th>
<th><em>ogi-a</em></th>
<th><em>jan</em></th>
<th><em>du</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter-ERG</td>
<td>bread-DET:ABS:SG</td>
<td>eat:PPP</td>
<td>have:3Se:3Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter ate the bread</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th><em>Kepa</em></th>
<th>/<em>/</em>/</th>
<th><em>etorri</em></th>
<th><em>da</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peter:ABS</td>
<td></td>
<td>come:PP</td>
<td>be:3Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter came</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>/<em>/</em>/</th>
<th><em>ogi-a</em></th>
<th><em>jan</em></th>
<th><em>da</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bread-DET:ABS:SG</td>
<td>eat:PPP</td>
<td></td>
<td>be:3Ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the bread was eaten / someone ate the bread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resultative constructions in Basque (1/4)

Basic constructions (non resultative)

● Transitive recent past
  ➢ (1) *Kepa-k ogi-a jan du* “Peter-ERG bread-the:ABS eaten he-has-it”
    (Peter ate the bread)

● Intransitive recent past
  ➢ (2) *Kepa etorri da* “Peter come is” (Peter came)
  ➢ (3) *ogi-a jan da* “bread-the:ABS eaten is” (someone ate the bread)

The resultative constructions

● “Intransitive perfect”
  ➢ (4) *Kepa etorri-a da* “Peter has come (yet)"
  ➢ (5) *ogi-a jan-a da* “the bread is eaten (yet)"

● “Passive”
  ➢ (6) *ogi-a Kepa-k jan-a da* “the bread is eaten, and Peter did it”

● “Antipassive”
  ➢ (7) *Kepa ogi-a jan-a da* “Peter has eaten the bread yet”

● “Transitive perfect”
  ➢ (8) *Kepa-k ogi-a jan-a du* “Peter has the bread eaten”
Resultative constructions in Basque (2/4)

(1) *Kepak ogia jan du*
Peter ate the bread

(3) *ogia jan da*
the bread was eaten

(5) *ogia jana da*
the bread is eaten

(7) *Kepa ogia jana da*
Peter is having eaten
the bread

(8) *Kepak ogia jana du*
Peter has his bread eaten

(9) *Kepak ogia nik jana du*
Peter has his bread eaten
by me

Non-resultative

Resultative

Subjective

Objective

Possessive
Peculiarities of the participle in these constructions

- **Agreement pattern**
  - **Perfect:** *Kepa* *sagarrak janak ditu*
    - “Peter-ERG apple-PL eaten-PL he-has-them”
  - **Passive:** *sagarrak Kepa janak dira*
    - “apple-PL Peter-ERG eaten-PL they-are”
  - **Antipassive:** *Kepa sagarrak jana da*
    - “Peter-ABS apple-PL eaten he-is”

- **Morpheme -a:** usual for adjectives in predicative function
  - *ogia on-a da, sagarrak on-ak dira*
    - bread-the good-the it-is, apple-the-PL good-the-PL they-are
  - *begiak ederr-ak dituzu*

- **Word order peculiarities**
  - **Usually, constituents may be moved**
  - **But**
    - In passive, the agent sticks to the participle
    - In antipassive, the patient sticks to the participle
Bi-clausal analysis: a participial clause in predicative function

- **Passive**
  - (6) ogia [Kepak jan-a] da the-bread is [having-been-eaten by-Peter]

- **Antipassive**
  - (7) Kepa [ogia jan-a] da Peter is [having-eaten the-bread]

- **Perfect**
  - (4) Kepa [etorri-a] da Peter is [having-come]
  - (5) ogia [jan-a] da the-bread is [having-been-eaten]
  - (8) Kepak ogia [jan-a] du Peter has the-bread [having-been-eaten]
  - (9) Kepak ogia [nik jan-a] du Peter has the-bread [having-been-eaten by me]
Voice in Basque (again)

Diatheses?

● Mediopassive: why not?
  • Topicality of patient
  • Tense-aspect value preserved

● Passive: no
  ➢ For:
    • Topicality of patient
  ➢ Against:
    • Tense-aspect not preserved (contrary to usual actional passive)
      ➢ Why this erroneous categorization?
        • OK with non-terminative verbs (maitatua da “he is loved”)
        • Resultative with agent is misleading

● Antipassive: no
  ➢ For:
    • Agent in absolutive
  ➢ Against:
    • Tense-aspect not preserved
    • Patient in absolutive too
    • No distinctive verb marking
Voice ambiguity in resultatives (1/2)

- Voice ambiguity of the past participle
  - O Jainko hoinbertze mirakulu egina! “O God who has done so many miracles!”
  - estamos bien comidos
  - perdu chat persan “lost Persian cat”

- Classical Armenian
  - Periphrastic perfect (resultative)
    - im teseal ē zna “of-me seen is him”, “I have him seen”
    - na teseal ē yinēn “he seen is from-me”
    - es teseal em zna “I having-seen am him”

  - Disambiguation difficult or impossible
    - [z]or ēr p`oreal i vimē (Benveniste)
      - “which:NOM was carved in stone”
      - “which:ACC [someone] had carved in stone”
    - oroc` tueal ēr zarcat`n “of-who:PL given was money-the”
      - “who had given the money” / “to whom the money was given”
    - (Basque) Kepa jana da: passive or antipassive?
Old Persian *tya manā kartam* “which of-me [is] done”

- *quod a me factum est ~ quod habeo factum*
- Diverging views: Benveniste, Cardona, Pirejko... probably insoluble

Possible causes of voice ambiguity

- Favoured by resultative periphrasis with *have*
  - Subjective resultative > active actional perfect
    - *etorri-a = etorri d-en-a* “who came”
    - *ogia jana* as a contraction of *ogia jan du-en-a* “who ate the bread”
- Form identity between past participles of transitive and intransitive verbs
Conclusion

- Basque
  - Diatheses
  - Classification of resultatives
- Development of active use of past passive participle
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