Manner of obtainment as a relative in a family of resultative constructions[1]

Konrad Szczesniak

University of Silesia

Abstract

The present paper examines the syntactic and semantic properties of a group of constructions which carry an idiomatic interpretation of obtainment. In Polish and German, the constructions under consideration consist of a verb with a directional particle followed by an object NP, as exemplified in (1a)-(1b).

(1a)	Adam	wynurkował	starego	buta.		(Polish)
	Adam	wy- snorkeled	old	shoe.		
	'Adam found an old shoe while snorkeling.'					
(1b)	Michael	erboxte	sich	den	Titel.	(German)
	Michael	er- boxed	REFL	the	title.	
	'Michael boxed his way to the (championship) title.'					

Sentences containing these constructions will be assumed to have the same basic interpretation "Subject obtains/produces Object by V-ing". A constructional analysis of the constructions will be proposed, as they pose licensing problems and their interpretation cannot be accounted for in terms of the individual conceptual structures of the lexical items composing the sentence. Unlike most accounts of verb particle constructions based on implicit or explicit assumptions of straightforward semantic composition, the present study proposes an analysis under which the semantic structure of verb particle combinations is not a compositional function of the verb and the particle/prefix alone. It is argued that the construction comes with its own subcategorization frame (separate from that carried by the verb) which is motivated by the meaning of the construction and its corresponding constructional subevent. Additionally, a crosslinguistic correlation will be shown to hold between a language's ability to express event conflation (Talmy 1985, 2000) and the occurrence of some form of the construction in that language. This will be taken as an indication of the resultative nature of those types of directional phrases which involve the semantic interpretation of boundary crossing.

---

1. Introduction

1.1 Properties of the constructions

The present contribution focuses on the behavior of the prefix *wy-* in Polish, as illustrated in (1a)-(1b). This prefix is associated with an unlicensed postverbal NP, a fixed syntactic frame and a specified meaning, all of which call for a constructional analysis. In terms of its syntax and semantics, the Polish prefix is similar to the prefix *er-* in German (example 1c) and a number of verb particles in other languages. These and other such examples will be viewed as instantiations of constructions related to the numerous family of resultatives.

(1a)   Małysz   wyskakał   medal.
        Małysz   wy- jumped   medal.
        'Małysz won a medal in ski-jumping.'
(1b)   Chłopi   wymodlili   deszcz.
        Peasants   wy- prayed   rain.
        'The peasants brought about the rain by praying.'
(1c)   Clark und Lee ertanzten   sich   eine   Medaille   im   Samba-Tanzwettbewerb.
        Clark and Lee er- danced   REFL   a   medal   in a samba dance contest.
        'Clark and Lee won a medal in a samba dance contest (by dancing).'

The above examples are taken to share the meaning "Subject obtains/produces Object by V-ing". These sentences exemplify a special group of constructions, which will be referred to as the "Manner of Obtainment Constructions" (MOCs). MOC sentences contain morphologically complex verbs composed of a root and a prefix, which are otherwise common forms in both languages. Although most examples in the paper come from Polish and some from German, giving the impression that a single construction is being discussed, similar constructions exist in other languages, and these are governed by slightly different constraints. Therefore, the constructions under consideration will mostly be referred to in the plural.

To appreciate how verbs contribute to the interpretation and form of MOC sentences, it is helpful to briefly review some relevant facts about verbal morphology in the two languages. In

German, verbal prefixes come in two types: separable and non-separable particles. The difference between the two types is that, in finite verbs, the former detach from the verb and move to the position following the object NP. For example, in main clauses, the verb *aufmachen* ('open') will split into the root *machen* ('make') and prefix *auf*, as in *Sie machen die Augen **auf*** ('They open their eyes'). Prefixes of the other type remain attached to the verb, as in *Sie **zer**brechen den Spiegel* ('They break the mirror'), where the prefix *zer-* does not move to the position after *den Spiegel.* But what both types have in common is that the meaning of a particle verb is different from that of the root alone, sometimes only slightly so, and sometimes quite considerably. The same is true of prefixed verbs in Polish, where a single verb root can give rise to a few dozen forms. One important difference between the two languages is that Polish lacks separable particles, so prefixes never migrate to the position after the object NP, and such non-separable particle verbs are found in Polish MOC sentences. Interestingly, German does not make use of its ample inventory of separable particles in MOC sentences and, like Polish, only employs non-separable particles.

The interpretation of obtainment is an integral semantic part of the meaning in the above examples. In Polish and German, MOC sentences do not convey meanings along the lines of "try to obtain", but "succeed in obtaining". For example, sentences (2a) and (2b) do not mean "fought in order to score a goal", but "managed to score a goal by fighting."

(2a)	Beckham	wywalczył	gola.		(Polish)
	Beckham	wy-fought	goal.		
(2b)	Beckham	erkämpfte	ein	Tor.	(German)
	Beckham	er- fought	a	goal.	
	'Beckham scored a goal (by fighting).'				

It is quite clear that the scoring of the goal is not a mere implicature but a true entailment, because it passes the test of non-cancelability. The obtainment reading cannot be canceled by saying (2c)/(2d).

(2c)   *Beckham wywalczył gola, ale mu się nie udało.   (Polish)

(2d)   *Beckham erkämpfte sich ein Tor, aber es gelang ihm keins.   (German)

   'Beckham scored a goal, but he didn't succeed.'

  For comparison, in non-MOC sentences, where obtainment is not entailed, but merely implicated, it is possible to cancel it; sentences (2e)-(2f) are by no means anomalous.

(2e)   Beckham pracował i walczył o gola, ale mu się nie udało.   (Polish)

(2f)   Beckham arbeitete und kämpfte für ein Tor, aber es gelang ihm keins.   (German)

   'Beckham worked and fought for a goal, but he didn't succeed.'

  The prefixes *wy-* and *er-* are similar to English aspectual particles like *up* (Jackendoff 2002) or *on* (Toivonen 2006; McIntyre 2004) in that they combine freely with any verb meeting their selectional criteria and produce predictable semantic effects. The particle *up* is used to impose a telic reading on sentences with telically ambiguous verbs which can take either telic or atelic temporal phrases:

(3a)   Jane drank the beer in ten minutes/for ten minutes.   (telic/atelic)

(3b)   Jane drank the beer up in an hour/*for an hour.

  Additionally, the presence of *up* in such sentences signals the completeness of the action expressed by the verb:

(4a)   Charlotte covered up her drawing.

(4b)   Matt tanked his truck up.

  Similarly, the prefix *wy-*, when attached to a verb with an object NP, consistently signals the element of obtainment (parallel to the completeness of *up*) in the interpretation of the sentence and gives it a telic reading, as in (5).

(5)   Edyta   wybiegała   sobie   ładną figurę   w miesiąc/??przez miesiąc.

  Edyta   wy- ran   REFL   great body   in month/for month.

  'Edyta built a great body (by running) in a month/for a month.'

In Polish, this Aktionsart feature determines the grammatical aspect of *wy-* verbs as perfective, with the action directed toward obtainment being interpreted as having ended.

The construction under consideration is also similar to the Time-*away* Construction (Jackendoff 1997, 2002). In both cases, the semantic head of the phrase is other than the verb (the verb merely names a manner modifier), and a non-subcategorized object follows the verb.

(6a)   Frank drank the night away.
(6b)   Dwight fished the morning away.
(6c)   Will and Fiona danced and kissed the night away.

What these verbs have in common is that they are either intransitive or optionally intransitive, and when they do take complements, the category of possible objects is limited. The verb *drink* can take a limited number of objects, and so can *fish*; even if it is possible in theory to fish for any kind of thing, there is one traditional object that the verb selects. The same goes for *dance* and *kiss.* Consequently, when their complement is an understood object, these verbs often appear without it.

In the MOCs, too, only those verbs are allowed which are either intransitive like *chodzić* in Polish, *wandeln* in German (both 'walk'), or optionally intransitive − those with "less than obligatory" implicit objects such as *wędkować* ('fish') or *tańczyć* ('dance') (for a discussion of similar constraints in German, see also Kolehmainen 2006: 284). In (7), the postverbal NPs are not objects of the verbs *łowić/wędkować* ('fish') or *chodzić* ('walk'); these verbs name the manner in which the objects were effected.

(7a)   Turyści   wychodzili   sobie   pęcherze   na   stopach.
        Tourists   wy- walked   REFL   blisters   on   feet.
        'The tourists got blisters on their heels from so much walking.'
(7b)   Damian   wywędkował   sobie   grypę.
        Damian   wy- rod-fished   REFL   flu.
        'Damian caught the flu while rod-fishing.'

1.2 Problems for generative syntax

The above properties of the MOCs are not captured by Generative Grammar principles. The telic interpretation of obtainment induced by means of intransitive verbs poses two problems. First, the meaning conveyed by MOC sentences cannot be derived entirely from the compositional contributions of the lexical items found in these sentences. Second, intransitive verbs taking object NPs raise obvious licensing questions. These two problems will be reviewed in turn.

Syntax has traditionally been assumed to be separate from semantics, and syntactic constructions have been taken to be devoid of meaning. This generativist assumption was exposed by Jackendoff (1997: 48) who called it "syntactically transparent semantic composition". Under this assumption, one should be able to account for the meaning composition in sentences only in terms of individual semantic contributions of the lexical items found in those sentences. However, in MOCs, some part of the meaning of a sentence, indeed the most interesting part, seems to arise out of nowhere. The semantic element "obtain" is not featured in any of the lexical items composing MOCs; this meaning cannot be attributed to the object noun, the verb, the prefix alone, or even the prefix and the verb combined. If used in a sentence without an object, the prefixed verb in (8) does not carry the idea of obtainment, and this is true of both Polish and German.

(8a) *Chłopiec   wypłakał.   (Polish)
       Boy   wy- cried.
       'The boy cried.'
(8b) *Der Junge   erweinte.   (German)
       The   boy   er- cried.
       'The boy cried.'

It should be stressed that sentences with verbs like *wypłakać* or *erweinen* lacking objects would be anomalous both syntactically and semantically. They would be ungrammatical because *wy-* and *er-* are transitivizing particles and call for an object. But apart from being ungrammatical, such sentences would also be deprived of the obtainment interpretation. By comparison, when the verb *put* is used without an object, a sentence like *The boy has put into the box* will be

ungrammatical, but its "putting" interpretation is preserved. For an *er-* or *wy-* verb alone to evoke an obtainment interpretation, a speaker would need to associate it with a similar *er-/wy-* verb followed by an effected object, and it is questionable that all native speakers will be able to make that association, especially with new or rare *er-* or *wy-* verbs like *ermogeln* ('get by cheating') or *wyfaulować* ('obtain by committing a foul'). When faced with an objectless *wypłakał*, Polish native speakers cannot provide even an approximate interpretation to the effect of "he obtained something by crying and begging, but I don't know what it was". Therefore, whenever *wy-* or *er-* verbs are glossed in this paper as 'obtain by doing something', these glosses should be taken as shorthand approximating the meaning of the whole verb phrase, not as meanings of these verbs alone.

To further illustrate the insufficiency of a verb and its particle alone to produce a meaning associated with a given construction, similar examples from English could be provided. For instance, in the Time-*away* Construction, the verb and the particle *away* (without an object NP) are not sufficient to convey the interpretation of "spend time (frivolously) by V-ing". A sentence like *Karen and George danced away* will not be interpreted as Karen and George having spent the whole time dancing. This meaning does not appear until a postverbal time NP is added.

The second problem presented by the MOCs is that of licensing object NPs. Under the Projection Principle, intransitive verbs should not take direct objects. Intransitive verbs, such as the unergative *biegać* ('run') or *skakać* ('jump'), do not have internal arguments in their subcategorization frames, so the Projection Principle should not build verb phrases containing obligatory direct objects. Although the verbs in question are preceded by transitivizing prefixes (which make them seem like legitimate object-taking verbs), I will show that they are not transitive prior to entering the constructions. Therefore, it is impossible to account for where their objects originate, if one considers only the subcategorization frame of the verb without assigning a subcategorization frame to the construction.

2. Unsatisfactory solutions to extra-lexical meaning and licensing problems

2.1 Independent lexemes

The extra-lexical meaning and licensing problems could, in theory, be dismissed if the *wy-* verb forms were recognized as separate lexemes, complete with "obtain" meanings and independent subcategorization frames, as illustrated in (9), allowing for the generation of VPs in full compliance with the Projection Principle.

(9a)   *wypłakać*   Verb, [__, NP]
       wy- cry   (Polish: 'obtain by crying and begging')
(9b)   *erweinen*   Verb, [__, NP]
       wy- cry   (German: 'obtain by crying and begging')

This approach would require listing such meanings in the lexicon, a possibility advocated by Svenonius (2004: 227) who argues that when spatial or directional prefixes are used for metaphorical extensions, the meanings they yield are idiosyncratic, as is illustrated by the Russian example in (10).

(10)   vy-dumatj
       out-think
       invent; cf. English *think up*
       (example (52a) in Svenonius 2004)

Svenonius' conclusion that such idiosyncratic meanings must be listed in the lexicon is contested in the present paper. It is argued that such meanings are not idiosyncratic, as they can be generated systematically by a rule associated with the MOCs. In fact, the Russian prefix *vy-* signals the exact same semantic function as is found in the Polish *wy-* and German *er-*, namely that of "obtain/produce x by V-ing". The reason why Svenonius classified (10) as an idiosyncratic meaning is perhaps that the example was analyzed in isolation from other similar examples, and without reference to the rule responsible for generating such forms.

Thus, the "separate lexeme" approach comes at the price of postulating hundreds of potential *wy-* forms which are not even stored in the lexicon. The forms in question can be generated freely more or less the way English aspectual particle verbs can be added to verbs to produce forms like *glue up*, *boogie on*, or *sing away*. Although some of such forms, especially the more frequent ones, may be represented in the memory (Bybee 1985; Pinker 1999), it would be absurd to envisage all of them as separate items in the lexicon, including the myriads of potential combinations like the Polish *wypogować* ('obtain by pogoing') or German *erdribbeln* ('obtain by dribbling'). There is something implausible about the idea that lexemes, which are otherwise thought of as elements stored in the long-term memory, can be mass-coined on the spot, in working memory. MOC verbs are similar to regular past tense forms of low-frequency verbs like *vitiated* or *malingered* in that neither these nor MOC verbs need to be listed in the lexicon to be used or comprehended. Instead, they are assembled online more like inflectional forms or syntactic phrases rather than bona-fide lexical derivations.

The classification of the *wy-/er-* forms as derived independent lexemes is further complicated by the absence of a property normally observed in derivation, namely semantic opacity. In the process of derivation, a single morpheme may have a number of related but different word-formation effects with the resulting coinages standing in dissimilar relationships to their bases. For example, Plag (2003: 15) shows that adding the morpheme *-ity* to an adjective like *curious* yields two related but independent meanings ('lust for knowledge' and 'object of interest'). A derivational morpheme does not have a single fixed derivational function identical in all instances of its use. On the other hand, it is hard to classify *wy-* verbs as derived lexical items, complete with their own subcategorization frames, because *wy-* is 100% regular wherever it combines with a verb. A brief survey of *wy-* verbs, those listed in dictionaries as well as novel verbs, shows a fixed semantic pattern. Established verbs such as *wyćwiczyć* ('obtain by practicing'), *wymęczyć* ('obtain by tiring'), *wypracować* ('obtain by working'), *wyprosić* ('obtain

by asking'), or *wysiedzieć* ('obtain by sitting'), which are listed in major Polish dictionaries are all defined as expressing obtainment. Novel verbs, which are not normally included in dictionaries but can be found on the Internet, such as *wymantrować* ('obtain by chanting mantras'), *wywiosłować* ('obtain by rowing') or *wyżonglować* ('obtain by juggling') also carry the obtainment interpretation which is clear from the context: whenever they are followed by an object NP, the entity expressed by that NP will be understood to be obtained in a manner specified by the verb.

More indirect evidence suggesting that the *wy-* verbs are not separate lexemes comes from the observation that languages impose constraints on the contents allowed within the verb meaning. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1991) suggest that manner and result cannot be lexicalized at the same time in one verb. When a verb lexicalizes manner (*to wipe, rub*, etc.), it says nothing about the result (what is wiped does not necessarily become clean), and conversely result verbs do not specify the manner (the verb *to clean* says nothing about how the cleaning was done). If a *wy-* form were in fact a single separate lexical item, it would be in violation of the constraint, as every *wy-* verb clearly expresses both manner and result.

2.2 Polysemous words

Another possibility to be considered is that the verb is polysemous. If a verb like *think* additionally meant "produce by thinking", the form of the construction in question would arise naturally via the application of traditional argument linking rules. However, the polysemy approach seems misguided. It is convincingly ruled out by Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004: 533-534), who insist that in unusual uses, the verb retains its original meaning. To make a case for unchanging verb meanings, they provide an example of a rather unlikely meaning shift: the verb *belch* used in a motion phrase like *He belched his way out of the restaurant* (example (4a) in Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004). Quite simply, it is beyond belief that the verb *belch* is converted to a motion verb in the lexicon. Besides, the benefits offered by polysemy would be heavily

outweighed by the burden to be shouldered by the lexicon. The number of meanings to be stored would not just double – meanings would have to be multiplied to accommodate these and probably many more constructions that will be encountered in future research.

2.3 Small clauses

A possible way to account for the unlicensed postverbal NP is an approach which Teun Hoekstra (1988) developed for resultative phrases. He insists that "the licensing of the complement structure in the resultative construction should be determined by general principles" (Hoekstra 1988: 101). To defend the explanatory completeness of GB-theory, Hoekstra had to contend with the question of licensing NP complements that are clearly not arguments of the verb, as in example (11).

(11)   She drank **him** under the table.
        (example (56b) in Hoekstra 1988)

 He applied Stowell's (1981) theory of small clauses (SC), syntactic units hypothesized to have clausal status, expressing a subject-predicate relation, but lacking a finite verb. For example, in the sentence *They consider John intelligent*, the phrase following the verb is analyzed as a small clause, where the subject *John* is selected by the AP head *intelligent*. The small clause itself is a complement compatible with the selectional requirements of the verb *consider*. Thus, the appeal of the SC analysis is that it helps keep alive the possibility that the complement structure of a verb phrase can be accounted for by the verb alone.

 According to Hoekstra, the small clause analysis is equally effective when applied to resultatives. Unsubcategorized NP complements such as *him* in (11) cease to be problematic if they are viewed as subjects (and therefore rightful arguments) of small clauses. In other words, it is no longer necessary to attempt to justify the NP *him* as being selected by the verb; it appears on the strength of the invitation from the PP head *under the table*.

However, explaining NPs as complements of small clauses in resultative phrases merely pushes the question a step back, because an explanation is required for what licenses small clauses themselves. Although a small clause like *John intelligent* seems an uncontroversial complement of the verb *consider* (after all, this verb typically takes clausal complements), it is much harder to justify the small clause *him under the table* as a complement of the verb *drink* or intransitive verbs taking unlicensed resultative complements such as the verb *sleep* in *sleep your wrinkles away*. These are not the kind of complements specified in the selectional requirements of these verbs.

Having admitted that SC predicates are not licensed by the verb, Hoekstra concludes that

> we do not need a specific rule to introduce the SC, thereby licensing its occurrence. Rather, we claim that each activity denoting verb may be combined with a complement that denotes the state resulting from that activity. We might formally implement this by providing each activity denoting verb with an optional result argument. Alternatively, we may postulate a lexical rule stipulating that a verb of the category 'non-stative' may have a result argument. (Hoekstra 1988: 131)

In other words, to salvage the unassisted functioning of the Projection Principle, the burden of licensing is transferred to the lexicon, a problem discussed earlier in section 2.1. Unfortunately, the economy of this solution is compromised by the need to similarly tag lexical entries for a host of other configurations with unlicensed complements, including the MOC constructions. Furthermore, even if lexical entries do in fact leave an empty slot for optional arguments as postulated by Hoekstra, that would still be insufficient to determine the form of the construction under consideration. The secondary predicates observed in the resultative and other related constructions are of detailed, often conflicting architectures, which are not sufficiently blueprinted by a mere "optional result argument" slot appended to verbs in the lexicon. The small clause observed in the MOCs differs from that proposed for the resultative, and that difference should be specified somewhere.

Note in passing that it is irrelevant whether the extra unlicensed material should be analyzed as a small clause or something else. It seems that under the assumption of syntactic transparency, no alternative treatments eliminate the problem of licensing postverbal NPs. For example, Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) rejected Hoekstra's Small Clause approach on the grounds that its uniform representation disregards the type of verb used in the resultative construction. Under their analysis, licensing depends on the verb in the resultative construction, with some NPs being regular arguments projected by the verb (in transitive-based constructions), and other NPs (in unergative-based constructions) being unlicensed complements. Apart from a postverbal NP, the construction involves the addition of a resultative XP which almost certainly does not originate as a projection from the verb. Whatever its adequate analysis, the formation of the resultative has to be specified somehow either by postulating special lexical rules or by dropping constraints of syntactically transparent composition. Either way, as Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004: 534) observe for constructions in general, it is necessary "to abandon the rigid view that the verb alone determines the complement structure of its VP."

2.4 Unpronounced affixes

The obtainment reading could arise as a result of an unpronounced affix attached to the verb. A similar idea for resultative constructions was proposed by Kratzer (2005), who postulated a covert marker to account for the causation interpretation. She notes that "[this interpretation] does not seem to be contributed by either the adjective or the verb alone. Do we have to conclude then that constructions all by themselves can introduce meaning components as specific as causal relations?" (ibid: 2) Kratzer answers in the negative; she claims that "[r]esultatives do not force us to assume that syntactic constructions or semantic composition rules can introduce non-logical meaning components like causal relations" (ibid: 2).

Reluctant to ascribe the causative meaning to the operation of the structure, she proposes an analysis where the NP originates in the resultative phrase via raising. To account for the event

structure found in resultatives, Kratzer postulates an "unpronounced morpheme consisting of an interpretable feature [cause]," (ibid: 32) which serves to introduce an event argument. Thus, under Kratzer's analysis, the untypical structure of resultative sentences follows from straightforward syntactic principles, without extra semantic or structural specifications carried by resultative constructions.

If this stance could be sustained, then a host of other unpronounced affixes could be proposed, including one with an interpretable feature [obtain] present in the MOCs or an affix with a feature [spend] responsible for the Time-*away* Construction. A point of contention would then be whether the unpronounced affixes should be regarded as a thing of the lexicon or syntax. If they can be shown to come from the lexicon, then Kratzer's solution should be sufficient not only for resultative constructions, but also for any construction with a meaning having an unknown source. Simply, that meaning could be imputed to a hidden morpheme which projects its structure and interpretation onto the sentence.

To determine the provenance of unpronounced affixes, it is useful to consider some of their characteristics. Kratzer proposes that they attach to adjectives (in adjectival resultative phrases), so they are bound morphemes rather than independent lexical items. But are they more akin to overt derivational or inflectional affixes? Kratzer gives reasons to classify them as derivational affixes with specific constraints on the kinds of adjectives they can be attached to. She also stresses that not all types of causation are expressed, and the resultative adjectives express only those states which are brought about by direct causation.

This last fact, however, makes it hard to consider unpronounced [cause] affixes as derivational morphemes, as they do not exhibit the property of semantic opacity mentioned in section 2.1. The relationship which holds between the source adjectives and resultative adjectives is completely regular and predictable (it is always direct causation). Such word-formational regularity is typical of inflection, not derivation. In other words, Kratzer's unpronounced affixes

are unlikely to be lexical material; instead they seem to originate from syntax, and so would any other unpronounced affixes with interpretable features like [obtain] or [spend]. While this does not seem to be an impossible burden for syntax, this approach does not, in principle, differ much from a constructional stipulation which Kratzer claims to reject by arguing "in favor of a very restricted set of general composition principles which apply freely" (Kratzer 2005: 25).

2.5 Semantic side-effects of general syntactic principles
Yet another way to account for the obtainment meaning without recourse to constructional explanations is to suppose that it is a semantic effect similar to the directness effect or wholeness interpretation associated with direct objects (Pinker 1989: 66). Briefly, a relationship holds between a verb and its direct object to the effect that the argument expressed by the object is understood to be affected directly or completely. For example, the difference between *I loaded the wagon with hay* and *I loaded hay onto the wagon* is that in the first sentence, the whole wagon is loaded with hay, and in the second, nothing is said about how much space is left. The directness effect is clear in sentences *I had my hair cut* (indirect causation) and *I cut my hair* (direct causation – the object immediately follows the verb). But unlike the directness and wholeness effects, the obtainment interpretation is a more local semantic effect, and there are no general rules of syntax saying that combining a prefixed verb with an object yields this meaning.

3. Event conflation and the MOCs

The construction in question shares a number of characteristics with event conflation (Talmy 1985, 2000; Slobin 1997), a category for expressing manner alongside directionality. It has long been assumed that sentences like (12) express two events, one of which is conveyed by the verb of manner *slink*, and the other by one of a number of what Talmy calls "deep verbs" like MOVE or BE, which do not surface in the sentence.

(12)   The cat slinked into the apartment.

The sentence is interpreted as a FIGURE *cat* moving relative to a GROUND *apartment*, according to formula (13).

(13)   [The cat MOVED into the apartment] WITH-THE-MANNER-OF [the cat
       slinked]

This analysis is also applied to agentive causative motion. In (14), the object traversing the path *out of the socket* is moved by an extra participant.

(14)   I yanked the plug out of the socket.

For such readings, a special deep verb $_A$MOVE is proposed, with the subscript $_A$ referring to the agentivity of the extra participant.

(15)   [I $_A$MOVED the plug out of the socket] WITH-THE-MANNER-OF [I yanked the plug]

A similar approach can be applied to the MOCs. Like example (14) above, sentence (16) can also be decomposed into two elements OBTAIN and WITH-THE-MANNER-OF.

(16)   Ronaldo   wydryblował   sobie   sławę.
       Ronaldo   wy- dribbled REFL   fame.
       'Ronaldo dribbled his way to fame.'

(17)   [Ronaldo OBTAINED fame] WITH-THE-MANNER-OF [Ronaldo dribbled]

But Talmy's event conflation is invoked here not only as a notational convention. It is argued that the MOCs are also examples of conflations, and their obtainment interpretation is based on the verb $_A$MOVE. Although a deep verb OBTAIN is hypothesized for all such examples, the obtainment effect is achieved on the force of a directional movement metaphor, and the verb OBTAIN is a derivation of $_A$MOVE. Some evidence in favor of this approach comes from the morphology of the verb: in literal uses, the prefix *wy-* is a directional morpheme used for

expressing agentive movement. For example, in (18), the object *article* is $_A$MOVED out of an implicit source, a directional path interpretation signaled by the prefix *wy-*.

(18)   Profesor   wyciągnął   artykuł.
       Professor   wy- pulled   article.
       'The professor pulled out an article.'

Similarly, in (19), the effected object "theory" can be interpreted as being invented by means of being metaphorically $_A$MOVED out of somewhere, as if pulled out of a container.

(19)   Profesor   wymyślił   teorię.
       Professor   wy- thought   theory.
       'The professor invented a theory.'

The metaphorical source of the obtainment reading is further supported by the existence of verbs preceded by the prefix *wy-* which convey both the obtainment reading and a literal spatial path; in these verbs the directional motion serves as a manner whereby obtainment occurs. Some established examples include *wykopać* ('dig up'), *wyłowić* ('fish out'), *wyszarpać* ('yank out'), or *wycisnąć* ('squeeze out'). It is tempting to speculate that such literal motion verbs may have served as models for MOC verbs.

Thus, using Talmy's notation, "the obtaining/producing of the theory by thinking" can be broken up into two subevents, as illustrated in (20).

(20)   [The professor $_A$MOVED the theory (out of a container)] WITH-THE-MANNER-OF
       [the professor thought]

At this point, doubts may arise regarding the proposed semantico-syntactic affinity between event conflation and the MOCs postulated on the basis of the spatial motion prefix *wy-* alone. After all, although the path is literal in event conflation, the prefix *wy-* in the MOCs may be a mere non-directional homonym. However, there are other reasons to postulate a path reading in both cases. As Goldberg (1991) has shown, when a path is predicated of an argument, no extra

path can be added, a regularity which she captured in the Unique Path Constraint (UPC)
(Goldberg 1991: 368):

(21)   If an argument X refers to a physical object, then more than one distinct path cannot be
        predicated of X within a single clause.

        Sentence (22) is ungrammatical because it has multiple path phrases predicated of the
physical object.

(22)   *Shirley sailed into the kitchen into the garden.
        (example 6b in Goldberg 1991)

        Goldberg extends the UPC to resultative phrases, which she also considers metaphorical
paths. Under the UPC, resultative phrases should not co-occur with path directional phrases:

(23a)   *The soldier kicked the door open to his unit.
(23b)   *The house burned to a crisp to the ground.

        If the obtainment reading in the MOCs is based on a metaphorical interpretation of a path,
extra paths should be blocked. This is precisely what happens in German and Polish:

(24a)   *Kahn   erbolzte   sich   den   Ball   zu   Klose.   (German)
         Kahn   er- slammed   REFL   the   ball   to   Klose.
         'Kahn obtained the ball to Klose.'
(24b)   *Smolarek wypracował   sobie   piłkę   do   bramkarza.   (Polish)
         Smolarek   wy- worked   REFL   ball   to   goalkeeper.
         'Smolarek obtained the ball to the goalkeeper.'

        Note that the above sentences are not semantically anomalous. It is perfectly possible for a
ball to be obtained and then passed to another player. The reason why the sentences are ill-formed
is that they name two distinct paths within one clause: one literal physical path and another one
which is a metaphorical resultative interpreted as obtainment. The latter metaphorical path

interpreted as obtainment is conflated with manner much the way literal paths conflate with manner in event conflations.

4. Cross-linguistic correlations between event conflation and the MOCs

The link between event conflation and the MOCs should also be clear from the following typological correlation. If a language allows manner-event conflation, it is also likely to have the MOCs in its inventory of constructions. Although a comprehensive list of languages allowing or disallowing these conflations has not been compiled yet, those that have been studied seem to confirm a strong correlation. To take just a few random examples of languages studied by Slobin (2003), Chinese, all Slavic, Finno-Ugric, and most Germanic languages have some form of conflating manner with the obtainment interpretation. On the other hand, languages without manner conflation, such as Romance, Semitic, and Turkic languages as well as Japanese and Basque, do not have an equivalent of *wy-*/*er-* verbal formations.

4.1 Verb-framed and satellite-framed languages

It has been observed in the literature (Talmy 1985, 2000; Slobin 1997) that when it comes to expressing motion and manner, languages encode motion paths in one of two ways. Languages like Spanish frame paths by means of verbs (25a); others, like English, frame motion paths by means of particles (such as *in* in *into*), also referred to as "satellites" (25b). This English option is not possible in Spanish (25c).

(25a)   El   gato   entró   en   el   apartamento.
        The   cat   entered   in   the   apartment.
        'The cat entered the apartment.'

(25b)   The cat slinked into the apartment.

(25c)   *El   gato   se   deslizó   en   el   apartamento.
        The   cat   REFL   slinked   in   the   apartment.
        'The cat slinked into the apartment.'

Thus with respect to this property, languages form two groups referred to as verb-framed languages (V-languages) and satellite-framed languages (S-languages) (Talmy 1985: 102; Slobin 1997: 439). An important consequence of the difference is that particles present in S-languages allow for the expression of path along with manner of motion in the same VP, an option unavailable for speakers of V-languages, where manner can only be expressed as an adverbial modifier in a non-minimal VP:

(26)   El   gato   entró   en   el   apartamento   deslizando.
        The   cat   entered in   the   apartment   slinking.
        'The cat entered the apartment (by) slinking.'

This difference was further specified by Slobin (1997: 441) who observed that what V-languages do not allow is conflating manner and path involving the element of "boundary crossing". Motion along an unbroken path can be expressed next to the verb as in (27) expressing both path and manner, but the PP is an adverbial modifier, not a true complement in the event conflation:

(27)   El   gato   se   deslizó   por   la   calle.
        The   cat   REFL   slinked   through the   street.
        'The cat slinked down the street.'

When a boundary is crossed, V-languages stop the path particle being realized in a minimal VP. Slobin (1997: 441) observes that "[i]t appears to be a universal characteristic of V-languages that crossing a spatial boundary is conceived of as a change of state, and that state changes require an independent predicate."

If there is a relation between resultative change of state, crossing a boundary and obtainment involving directional phrases, it should be reflected by cross-linguistic correlations to this effect. That is, one would expect V-languages to disallow conflating obtainment with manner (since they disallow conflating resultative meanings with manner) and S-languages to offer the

option of conflating manner and obtainment by means of the same mechanisms as in literal motion event conflations described above. These expectations are confirmed by data coming from languages of the two types, as will be demonstrated in the subsequent discussion based on Slobin's (2003: 162) division into the two groups.

Satellite-framed (S-languages)

Germanic:	Dutch, English, German, Icelandic, Swedish, Yiddish
Slavic:	Polish, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Ukrainian
Finno-Ugric:	Finnish, Hungarian
Sino-Tibetan:	Mandarin Chinese

Verb-framed (V-languages)

Romance:	French, Galician, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish
Semitic:	Moroccan Arabic, Hebrew
Turkic:	Turkish
Basque:	
Japanese:	
Signed languages:	American Sign Language, Sign Language of the Netherlands

4.2 The MOCs in satellite-framed languages
It turns out that languages of the S-frame type allow for the simultaneous expression of manner and obtainment. Apart from the Polish examples listed before, similar forms are found in a number of typologically unrelated languages.

(28a) Hannawald   ersprang   sich   einen   Pokal   in Willingen   (German)
           Hannawald   er-jumped   himself   a   medal   in Willingen
           'Hannawald won a medal in ski-jumping in Willingen.'

(28b) Janez   si   je   prismučal   pokal   v   Willingnu.   (Slovene)
           Janez   himself   AUX   at- jumped medal   in   Willingen.
           'Janez won a medal in ski-jumping in Willingen.'

 (28c) Cunminmen   cong   tianshang   qiu lai   (Mandarin Chinese)
           Villagers   from   sky   pray-come

           le   yu.
           [aspect marker]   rain

'The villagers got the rain after praying for it.'

(28d)   Sportlane   maadles   välja   medali.   (Estonian)
        Athlete   wrestled   out   medal.

'The athlete won a medal in wrestling.'

(28e)   Ik   heb   me   een   bult   gelachen.   (Dutch)
        I   AUX   myself a   hump   laughed.

'I grew a hump laughing.'

Similar examples for Finnish are provided in Kolehmainen and Larjavaara (2004: 17).

(28f)   Kononen   käveli   ennätyksensä.
        Kononen   walked   record.ACC.3PX[2]

'Kononen made his record in walking.'

(example 20b in Kolehmainen & Larjavaara 2004)

Of course, just how close the above forms are in terms of their syntactic distribution is an open question. It is quite obvious that the languages quoted impose different restrictions on the construction, and in fact the differences may be so great that it will be necessary to describe them as instantiations of different constructions. However, although they may turn out to be different, the constructions in these languages are not unrelated. The directional markers suggest that they have more in common than is possible by mere coincidence – in most (if not all) of them the causative interpretation of obtainment is conveyed by the metaphor of directional movement and boundary crossing. For example, the suffix *pri-* in Slovene expresses "bringing in" or movement "to oneself", which is also the underlying function of the Chinese verb particle *lai* (28c). The Polish *wy-* conveying the meaning of "retrieving" or "pulling out" is similar to the Estonian *välja* (28d). Although at first look German does not seem to be a language with a directional phrase expressing obtainment, it should not be stricken from the sample prematurely. Elisabeth Rieken (pc) alerted me to the fact that *er-* is historically related to the Old-German *uz-*, *us-*, and *ur-* prefixes, all of which convey the meanings of "aus, hinaus, hinauf" (Krahe 1967: 39). Thus,

---

[2] PX is short for "possessive suffix".

although native speakers are not aware of the directional frame, it serves as a source domain for the obtainment reading. Whether the obtainment reading in Dutch (28e) is also metaphorically motivated is hard to establish with any degree of certainty, because no overt directional morpheme is used and it is a question for further research how productive such forms are in Dutch. English may be the odd one out among the S-languages, as it does not use a productive verb particle construction for the expression of obtainment meanings. The closest equivalent seems to be the *X's Way* Construction, but this does not bear striking resemblances to the single-morpheme satellite particles found in the other languages. However, here too, obtainment is conveyed metaphorically by a directional phrase, as in *Beckham dribbled his way to fame*. Although more research is necessary to settle this question, as a preliminary approximation, the obtainment meaning can be assumed to manifest itself as effected objects "coming one's way".

4.3 Lack of the MOCs in verb-framed languages

The V-languages on the other hand do not express obtainment along the same lines. Manner verbs do not appear in causative frames and are not interpreted as taking constructional arguments; when faced with a hypothetical sentence like (29a), native speakers of Spanish consider it not only ill-formed but quite incomprehensible.

(29a)   *La   banda   cantó   un   premio   en   el   festival.   (Spanish)
         The   band   sang   a   prize   in   the   festival.
         'The band won a prize in a festival.'

(29b)   *Les   villageois ont prié la   pluie   hors   des   cieux.   (French)
         The   villagers   prayed   the   rain   out of the   skies.
         'The villagers got the rain out of the skies after praying for it.'

(29c)   *Karera wa   samba   taikai   de   shou   o   totta/katta   (Japanese)
         Pair   SUBJ   samba   competition   in   prize OBJ   danced.
         'The pair won a prize in a samba dance contest.'

(29d)   *Oamenii saraci   se   rugau   ploaia   din   afara   cerului.   (Romanian)
         Poor   people   REFL   prayed   rain   out   of   the sky.
         'Poor people coaxed rain from the sky through prayers.'

These correlations can additionally be argued to bear on the question of whether or not directional phrases are resultative in nature. Kratzer (2005) argues that resultatives should be separated from directional phrases, and shows that despite superficial similarities with the resultatives, directional phrases exhibit properties defying generalizations proposed for resultative phrases (like the Direct Object Restriction). This objection is probably valid for "pure directionals" which convey mere "toward" senses, but boundary-crossing directionals of the "into/out of" type are resultative in nature. Note that the division of S-languages and V-languages is at the same time a division into languages which possess and lack resultative phrases respectively.

5. MOCs as constructions

In section (2), it was shown that the obtainment meaning shared by MOC sentences poses problems for generative syntax if a grammatical construction is assumed to be semantically neutral. If the obtainment interpretation does not come from the lexical items used in a MOC sentence, the only alternative is to attribute that meaning to the operation of the construction.

The MOCs are therefore classified as a group of constructions on the grounds that the obtainment meaning they are associated with is not fully predictable from their component parts (Goldberg 2003: 219). The MOCs are idiomatic in the sense that their meaning could not be figured out in an "uninformative context" (Nunberg, Sag & Wasow 1994: 495). Following Makkai (1972) and Fillmore, Kay and O'Connor (1988: 507), the construction is regarded an idiom of decoding as "an expression which the language users couldn't interpret with complete confidence if they hadn't learned it separately." The following will be an attempt to capture the form and meaning conveyed by the MOCs.

5.1 Two subevents of a construction

I will now present a constructional analysis of the MOCs following Goldberg and Jackendoff's (2004) approach to the resultative constructions. They argue for an analysis allowing the syntax of

the resultative construction to be predicted on the basis of its semantics by breaking up the interpretation of idiomatic structures into two subevents, constructional and verbal. The interpretation of (30) is analyzed as consisting of two semantic subcomponents illustrated below.

(30)   Willy watered the plants flat.
        (example 13 in Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004)
        constructional subevent: Willy makes the plants flat.
        verbal subevent: (MEANS)   Willy waters the plants.

According to Goldberg and Jackendoff, the form of the construction is derived from the semantics of the constructional subevent; the construction "borrows" the argument distribution properties from the deep verb MAKE found in the constructional subevent. This claim is formalized in point (31) (15 in Goldberg & Jackendoff 2004).

(31)   The semantic argument structure of the constructional subevent determines the
        syntactic argument structure of the sentence by general principles of argument linking.

This approach can also be adopted for event conflation uses of motion verbs. The structure is generated on analogy with directional verbs like *put* or *move.* If it is assumed that (32) accurately captures the constructional and verbal subevents of sentences like *Sven threw the ball into the basket*, then the argument realization involving a PP complement is a straightforward consequence of (31).

(32)   constructional subevent: Sven put the ball(FIGURE) into the basket(GROUND).
        verbal subevent: (MEANS)   Sven threw the ball.

A similar analysis is offered in Svenonius (2004), who points out similarities between Slavic verbal prefixes and Germanic directional particles. On his view, the GROUND PP is a predicate triggered by the directional verbal prefix. As a parallel with Goldberg and Jackendoff, this predicative prefix is taken to originate from the semantics of the constructional subevent associated with the deep verb PUT, which also selects the PP complement. This approach also

works well for Polish, which has the same patterning of the lexical prefix signaling a directional use of the verb.

(33)   Sven   wrzucił   piłkę   do   kosza.
       Sven   in- threw   ball   to   basket.
       'Sven threw the ball into the basket.'

In (33), the prefix *w-* functions as a particle introducing the PP *do kosza*, which is part of the constructional subevent "Sven put the ball(FIGURE) into the basket(GROUND)".

When applied to MOC sentences, the subevent approach captures their form, including the effected object NP. The argument structures of MOC sentences are analogous to the single-complement structure projected by the verb *obtain*, which provides the semantics of the constructional subevent. Consider the following sentences in German and Polish.

(34a)   Schalke erarbeitete   sich   einige   gute   Torchancen.   (German)
        Schalke er- worked   REFL   several   good   scoring chances.
(34b)   Schalke wypracowała   sobie   kilka   dobrych sytuacji.   (Polish)
        Schalke wy- worked   REFL   several   good   scoring chances.
        'Schalke created several good scoring chances.'

(35)   constructional subevent: Schalke obtained several scoring chances (FIGURE).
        verbal subevent: (MEANS)   Schalke worked.

A constructional subevent based on the "obtain" meaning serves as a subcategorization frame specifying the arguments in the verb phrase. If it is assumed that the MOCs carry a deep verb OBTAIN, it should follow that those constructions come with a subcategorization frame dictating the form of a MOC sentence.

5.2 The verb in the constructional subevent

The above analysis leaves one question unanswered. It was argued earlier that the obtainment reading is a metaphorical extension of a path across a boundary involving agentive movement

interpreted as $_A$MOVE ("take out"). Why then is a directional phrase "out of a SOURCE" nowhere to be found in the constructional subevent? In fact, it cannot even be added optionally:

(36a) *Schalke erarbeitete sich   einige   gute   Torchancen   (German)
       Schalke   er- worked   REFL   several good   scoring chances
       aus   dem   Match.
       from   the   match.
(36b) *Schalke   wypracowała sobie   kilka   dobrych   (Polish)
       Schalke   wy- worked   REFL   several good
       sytuacji   z   meczu.
       scoring chances from   match.
       'Schalke created several scoring chances from the game.'

Although this question may require further research, at this moment it is tempting to explain the blocking of a GROUND PP complement in terms of the Unique Path Constraint: specifying a source of obtainment could represent a distinct path conflicting with the resultative element present in the interpretation of obtainment. If obtainment is resultative in nature, then it already consists of a path. That no further path phrases can be added should then be a natural consequence of the UPC.

The absence of the PP complement in MOC sentences is significant for the analysis of the construction. It turns out that the constructional subevent contains a predicate OBTAIN. Although this predicate should, at some level of representation, be decomposed into $_A$MOVE and a directional, it is OBTAIN, not $_A$MOVE, that dictates the semantics and the subcategorization frame of the constructional subevent.

6. Conclusions

The paper focused on the Manner of Obtainment Constructions in Polish and German and related constructions in other languages. It was argued that the semantic element of obtainment which the constructions convey cannot be ascribed directly to any of the individual lexical items found in sentences built to the MOC specifications. It was also stressed that the interpretation of

obtainment imposed by means of *wy-* in Polish, *er-* in German (or related morphs in other languages) cannot be ascribed to the operation of those elements alone or even in conjunction with their host verbs, as this effect is only brought about in the presence of an object. Additionally, to rule out the possibility that the obtainment meaning is conveyed by the prefixed verbs, arguments were presented against viewing the prefixed verbs as independent lexical items. Finally, it was argued that the MOCs are related to event conflation patterns with which they share common metaphoric interpretational mechanisms, and that similarities between them should be considered in attempts to account for the resultative nature and the form of the MOCs. In support of the proposed link, a cross-linguistic correlation between the MOC and event conflation was shown to exist, with S-languages being likely to feature some form of the MOCs in their grammars.

References

Bybee, Joan (1985). *Morphology.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [Typological Studies in Language 9].

Fillmore, Charles, Paul Kay & Mary O'Connor (1988). Regularity and Idiomaticity in Grammatical Constructions: The Case of "Let Alone". *Language* 64(3): 501-538.

Goldberg, Adele E. (1991). It Can't Go Down The Chimney Up. Paths and the English Resultative. In *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistic Society* 17. 368-379.

Goldberg, Adele E. (2003) Constructions: a new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7(5): 219-224.

Goldberg, Adele & Ray Jackendoff (2004). The English Resultative as a Family of Constructions. *Language* 80(3): 532-568.

Hoekstra, Teun (1988). Small Clause Results. *Lingua* 74: 101-139.

Jackendoff, Ray (1997). *The Architecture of the Language Faculty.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jackendoff, Ray (2002). English Particle Constructions, the Lexicon, and the Autonomy of Syntax. In Dehé, Nicole, Ray Jackendoff, Andrew McIntyre & Silke Urban (eds.) *Verb-Particle Explorations.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 67-94.

Kolehmainen, Leena & Meri Larjavaara (2004). The bizarre valency behaviour of Finnish verbs: How a specific context gives rise to valency alternation patterns. *Constructions* 1/2004. urn:nbn:de:0009-4-310. Available at http://www.constructions-online.de/articles/31

Kolehmainen, Leena (2006). *Präfix- und Partikelverben im deutsch-finnischen Kontrast.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. [Finnische Beiträge zur Germanistik 16. Available at https://oa.doria.fi/handle/10024/959]

Krahe, Hans (1967). *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft. III Wortbildungslehre.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Kratzer, Angelika (2005). Building Resultatives. In Maienborn, Claudia & Angelika Wöllstein-Leisten (eds.) *Events in Syntax, Semantics, and Discourse.* Tübingen: Niemeyer. 177-212.

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav (1991). Wiping the Slate Clean: A Lexical Semantic Exploration. *Cognition* 41: 123-151.

Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav (1995). *Unaccusativity. At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 26. Cambridge: MIT Press.

McIntyre, Andrew (2004). Event paths, conflation, argument structure and VP shells. *Linguistics* 42(3): 523-571.

Makkai, Adam (1972). *Idiom Structure in English*. The Hague: Mouton.

Nunberg, Geoffrey, Ivan Sag & Thomas Wasow (1994). Idioms. *Language* 70(3): 491-538.

Pinker, Steven (1989). *Learnability and Cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pinker, Steven (1999). *Words and Rules: The Ingredients of Language*. New York: Basic Books.

Plag, Ingo (2003). *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Slobin, Dan I. (1997). Mind, code and text. In Bybee, Joan, John Haiman & Sandra A. Thompson (eds.) *Essays on language function and language type: Dedicated to T. Givón*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 437-467.

Slobin, Dan I. (2003). Language and thought online: Cognitive consequences of linguistic relativity. In Gentner, Dedre & Susan Goldin-Meadow (eds.) *Language in mind: Advances in the investigation of language and thought* . Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 157-191.

Stowell, Timothy A. (1981). *Origins of phrase structure*. MIT Ph.D. dissertation.

Svenonius, Peter (2004). *Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP*. Ms. University of Tromsø. Available at www.ub.uit.no/munin/nordlyd/

Talmy, Leonard (1985). Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms. In Shopen, Timothy (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume III. Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 57-149.

Talmy, Leonard (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Toivonen, Ida (2006). On Continuative *On. Studia Linguistica* 60(2): 181-219.