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1. A constructionist approach to ‘unselected object constructions’

In constructionist approaches to argument structure (e.g., Goldberg [1995]) the study of so-called ‘unselected object constructions’ has been instrumental in reaching the conclusion that argument structure is not determined by the verb but rather by the construction. Goldberg argues that skeletal argument structure constructions are capable of contributing arguments.

(1) The caused-motion construction
a. He sneezed the napkin *(off the table)
b. John worked his debts *(off)
c. John wiped {the dust/the fingerprints} *(off the table)

Goldberg (1995: 224): “By recognizing the existence of meaningful constructions, we can avoid the claim that the syntax and semantics of the clause is projected exclusively from the specifications of the main verb. In this way, we avoid the problem of positing implausible verb senses to account for examples such as the following: He sneezed the napkin off the table (...).”

(2) He sneezed the napkin off the table ex. from Goldberg (1995: 54):

| Semantics: | CAUSE-MOVE <cause theme source > |
| R: means | SNEEZE <sneezer > |
| Syntax: | V | SUBJ | OBJ | OBL |

Similarly, as pointed out by Acedo-Matellán & Mateu (2013), constructions with a resultative prefix like the ones contained in the Latin examples in (5) to (10) can also be argued to involve an “unselected object”, i.e., to put it in Goldberg’s terms, the direct objects found in the examples in (5) to (10) can be claimed to be licensed not directly as arguments of the simple verb but by the resultative-like construction. E.g., see (11) for a CG analysis of (5).

(5) [Serpentes] putamina ex-tussiunt. / *tussiunt. (Latin)
snake.NOM.PL shell.ACC.PL out-cough.3PL
‘Snakes cough the egg shells out.’ (Plin. Nat. 10, 197)

(6) Omne caseum cum melle ab-usus eris. / *usus eris.
all.ACC.N.SG cheese.N.ACC.SG with honey.ABL off-use.FUT.2SG
‘You will have used up all the cheese with honey.’ (Cat. Agr. 76, 4)

(7) E-dormi / *Dormi crapulam, inquam.
out-sleep.IPFV.2SG intoxication.ACC.SG say.PRS.1SG
‘Sleep off that intoxication, I said.’ (Cic. Phil. 2, 30)

(8) Veniebat [...] ut sudorem illic ab-lueret. / #lueret.
come.IPFV.3SG that sweat.ACC there off-wash.IPFV.SBJV.3SG
‘He used to go there to wash his sweat off.’ (Sen. Epist., 86, 11)

(9) Haec libertus ut e-bibat / #bibat [...] custodis?
this.ACC.N.PL freedman.NOM that out-drink.SBJV.3SG guard.PRS.2SG
‘Are you guarding these possessions for your freedman to guzzle them all up?’ (Hor. Sat. 2, 3, 122)

(10) [Acta] quae ille in aes in-cidit / #cecidit.
deed.N.ACC.PL which.ACC.N.PL he in brass.ACC in-cut.PRF.3SG
‘The deeds which he engraved on brass.’ (Cic. Phil. 1, 16)


Nota bene: the constructions in (5) through (7) feature verbs unable to take accusative in the absence of the prefix: *tussio ‘cough’ (intransitive), *utor ‘use’ (utor takes ablative), and dormio ‘sleep’ (intransitive); the rest of examples feature transitive verbs, although they do not seem to theta-select their objects: in (8) the sweat, sudorem, is not washed, but washed off; in (9) the verb bibo ‘drink’, in combination with the prefix ex-, appears with an object which does not refer to a drinkable entity; finally, in (10) acta ‘deeds’, is not selected by simple caedo ‘cut’, but it is possible with the prefixed verb incido ‘cut into’, ‘engrave’.
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(11) CG analysis of Lat. Serpentes putamina extussiunt à la Goldberg (1995):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantics: CAUSE-CHANGE &lt;cause theme result&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R: means TUSSIURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R: means TUSSIENS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Morphosyntax: -V SUBJ OBJ er-

(12) a. Serpentes putamina *ex)tussiunt. (Latin)

b. The snakes cough the egg shells *(out).

As pointed out by Acedo-Matellán (2010: 220), the Ancient Greek examples in (13) and (14) “are cases of unselected object constructions, since the occurrences of the unprefix ed verbs orkheomai ‘dance’ and kubeúo ‘play dice’ are intransitive”.

(13) *(Ap-)orkhé:ošá [...], tôn gámon (Ancient Greek)

‘You have danced your wedding away (i.e., ‘You have ruined your wedding by dancing’) (Hdt. 6, 129)

(14) *(Kata-)kubeúkas þà ónta (Russian)

‘Having gambled away his possessions…’ (Lis. 14, 27)

Exs. from Acedo-Matellán (2010)

(15) a. Ona is-písala svoju ručku (Russian)

b. On pro-pil vsju svoju zarplatu

e. Reběnok do-kričal-sja do xripoty

‘The boy danced his feet sore.

The speaker talked himself hoarse.

The dog barked the chickens awake. (ex. from Goldberg [1995: ex. [39], p. 185)

(16) a. Er ver-gärnter-te sein gesamtes Vermögen. (German)

b. Sie er-schreinerte-te sich den Ehrenpreis der Handwerkskammer.


Conclusion: The existence of so-called ‘unselected object constructions’ provides a good argument for (neo)constructionist approaches to argument structure (for cognitively oriented ones, see Goldberg [1995, 2006] and Croft [2001, 2012], i.a.; for some generative ones, see Borger [1994, 2005], Marantz [1997, 2005, 2013], and Acedo-Matellán & Mateu [2013], i.a.).
In contrast, Washio (1997: 7) gives a negative definition of weak resultatives: “let us call resultatives that are not strong in the sense weak resultatives.” (e.g., see [20]). Indeed, in (20) the meaning of the verb and the meaning of the adjective are not independent of each other. For example, the adjective can specify the result encoded in the verb. Cf. also Takamine (2007), for further discussion.

(20) Weak resultative constructions
   a. Tarō-ga kabe-o pinkuiri-ni nutta. (Japanese)
      ‘Tarō painted the wall pink.’
   b. Boku-wa isu kiriimu-o katikati-ni koorase-ta.
      ‘I scraped away the wall.’

Mateu (2012) claims that Washio’s (1997) strong/weak distinction is not only valid for adjectival resultatives but also for prepositional-like resultatives (verb-particle constructions included): cf. (21) and (22). In particular, Mateu (2012) argues that Japanese resultatives like (20) and Italian verb-particle constructions like (22) share some formal and semantic properties that separate them from strong resultatives like (19) and strong P-verb constructions in (21). [NB: similarly, Spencer & Zaretskaya (1998) show that English strong resultatives like (19) and Russian constructions like (21c,21d) share some semantic properties.]

(21) Strong P-verb constructions
   a. John worked his debts off.
   b. Serpentes putamina extusiunt. (Latin)
      ‘Snakes cough the egg shells out.’
   c. Ona is-pisala svoju ručku (Russian)
      ‘Her pen ran out of ink’ (lit. She wrote her pen out (of ink)).
   d. Reběnok do-křičal-sja do xripoty
      ‘The baby cried itself hoarse.’

(22) Weak P-verb constructions
   a. Luca ha lavato via la macchia. (Italian)
      ‘Luca washed the stain away.’
   b. Gianni ha raschiato via la vernice.
      ‘Gianni scraped the paint away.’

1 Washio concluded his (1997) paper by pointing out that Japanese and French (and, more generally, Romance) behave alike with respect to those phenomena which fall under Levin and Rappaport’s (1988) “lexical subordination”. He added “it would not be particularly surprising, therefore, if further research tells us that French, and, more generally, Romance: JM> does in fact share significantly more such abstract properties with Japanese than it does with English” (p. 43).

2 This example involves an unaccusative structure, where Gianni is not an external argument. Although verbs like correre ‘run’ or volare ‘fly’ select avere ‘have’ in the unergative structure, they select essere ‘be’ in the unaccusative one e.g., in the one containing the particle via ‘away’. Hence the contrasts between (23a) and (ia).

   (23) a. Gianni è corso via.² (Italian)
      ‘Gianni is run away.’
      ‘Gianni danced away.’
Mateu’s (2012) descriptive generalization: strong \{adjectival and prepositional-like\} resultatives necessarily involve the Co-event (e.g., Manner) \textit{conflation} pattern. In contrast, weak \{adjectival and prepositional-like\} constructions only involve the Path/Result \textit{incorporation} pattern. Verb-framed languages like Romance or Japanese are expected to lack ‘unselected object constructions’, which are typical of satellite-framed languages like Latin, Germanic or Slavic languages (as shown above, these constructions belong to the first type).

3. A formal analysis of conflation processes: the case of ‘unselected object constructions’

(24) Haugen (2009: 260): “Incorporation is conceived of as head-movement (…), and is instantiated through the syntactic operation of Copy, whereas Conflation is instantiated directly through Merge (compoundung)”. \textit{Nota optima}: Haugen’s (2009) definition of Conflation does not fully coincide with the one found in Hale & Keyser (1998, 2002).

(25) On the non-primitive status of Incorporation and Conflation operations:
Incorporation $\rightarrow$ Chomsky’s Internal Merge \\
Conflation $\rightarrow$ Chomsky’s External Merge \\
(cf. Copy/Move in (24))

(26) a. John smiled. \  \ (cf. [27])
b. John smiled his thanks. \  \ (cf. [30])

(27) Incorporation

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PathP} \\
\sqrt{\text{SMILE}} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{v'}
\end{array}
\]


\textit{Nota bene II:} Incorporation is also involved in all those typical cases analyzed by Hale & Keyser (2002): unergative denominal verbs like \textit{smile}, transitive denominal verbs of the locatum (e.g., \textit{saddle}) and location (e.g., \textit{shelve}) types, and (anti)causative deadjectival verbs (e.g., \textit{clear}). In all these cases the root comes from an inner complement position.

As is well-known, Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) claim that English unergative verbs like \textit{smile}, \textit{work}, \textit{cry}, \textit{speak}, \textit{play}, \textit{sleep}, \textit{snore}, etc. are hidden transitives. According to them, evidence for this proposal can be found in languages like Basque (see [28]) and Jemez (see [29]). Typically, English unergatives involve incorporated variants, whereas Basque involve non-incorporated (i.e., analytical) variants. Similarly, Hale & Keyser’s bimorphic analysis of unergatives in (27) is supported by Jemez, where the nominal root incorporates into a visible light verb ‘do’.

(28) \textit{barre egin} ‘smile do’; \textit{lan egin} ‘work do’; \textit{negar egin} ‘cry do’; \textit{hitz egin} ‘word do’; \textit{iolas egin} ‘play do’; \textit{lo egin} ‘sleep do’; \textit{zurrunga egin} ‘snore do’, etc. \ (Basque)

(29) \textit{hil-‘a} ‘laugh-do’; \textit{sae-‘a} ‘work-do’; \textit{shil-‘a} ‘cry-do’; \textit{se-‘a} ‘speech-do’, etc. \ (Jemez)

The \textit{formal} distinction between \textit{conflation vs. incorporation}, when applied to resultatives, runs parallel to Washio’s (1997) \textit{semantic} distinction between \textit{strong} vs. \textit{weak} resultatives, respectively. From a Hale&Keyserian perspective, the formation of resultative constructions like (31a) and (31b) can be shown to be different depending on how the null light verb can acquire phonological content: via conflation or via incorporation, respectively.

(31) a. The boy danced his feet sore. 
   b. Taro-ga yuka-o kirei-ni fuita. \ (Japanese) 
      \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Taro wiped the floor clean’}.

Strong resultatives like the unselected object construction in (31a) are formed via conflation (i.e., the root is directly adjoined to the null verbal head), as depicted in (32a) (cf. Mateu & Rigau [2002, 2010], McIntyre [2004], Embick [2004], Mateu & Espinal [2007], Zubizarreta & Oh [2007], and Acedo-Matellán [2010], i.a.). In contrast, weak resultatives like (31b) are formed via incorporation (i.e., the root comes from an inner complement position), as represented in the Japanese resultative in (32b).

(32) a. \begin{array}{c}
\text{PathP (ResultP: cf. Hoekstra’s Small Clause Result)} \\
\sqrt{\text{SORE}} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{Path' (Adj)} \\
\text{v'}
\end{array}

b. \begin{array}{c}
\text{PathP (ResultP)} \\
\sqrt{\text{KIREI}} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{Path'} \\
\text{wipe yuka Path' X'}
\end{array}
Nota bene I: Following the so-called “localist hypothesis” (cf. Gruber [1965] and Jackendoff [1983], i.a.), whereby Result can be claimed to involve Path, an abstract P(path) can be claimed to be represented in the syntactic argument structure of adjectival resultative constructions.

Nota bene II: Word order details are omitted in the analysis of the Japanese resultative in (32b).

The syntactic argument structure in (32b) can be compared with Baker’s (2003: 221) full syntactic structure in (33) (cf. Hale & Keyser 2002) for the controversial distinction between l(exical)-syntax and s(entential)-syntax: according to them, the term s-syntax is used to refer to the syntactic structure assigned to a phrase or sentence involving both the lexical item and its arguments and also its “extended projection” (Grimshaw 1991/2005) and including, therefore, the full range of functional categories and projections implicated in the formation of a sentence interpretable at PF and LF).

\begin{align*}
\text{(32b)} & \quad \text{I wiped the table clean.} \\
\begin{tikzpicture}
\node (TP) at (0,0) {TP};
\node (I) at (1,1) {T tense};
\node (vP) at (3,1) {vP};
\node (v) at (4,0) {v};
\node (V/PredP) at (3,-1) {v’};
\node (DP) at (0,-1) {DP};
\node (vPredP) at (3,-2) {v’};
\node (CAUSE) at (1,-2) {CAUSE};
\node (the table) at (3,-3) {the table};
\node (V/Pred) at (4,-3) {V/Pred};
\node (AP) at (5,-3) {AP};
\node (BE) at (4,-4) {BE};
\node (WIPED) at (4,-5) {WIPED};
\node (clean) at (5,-5) {clean};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{align*}

Baker (2003: 221)

Some remarks are in order: On the one hand, Baker (2003) is silent on which syntactic analysis should be posited for unergative resultatives, i.e., unselected object constructions like (31a) The boy danced his feet sore. Of course, these resultatives cannot be analyzed as (33), i.e., as involving incorporation: cf. # [John [CAUSE [his feet [DANCED sore]]]]. To solve this problem, we can adopt Haugen’s (2009) distinction between conflation and incorporation (cf. McIntyre [2004], Mateu & Espinal [2007], Mateu & Rigau [2010], and Acedo-Matellán [2010], i.a.). In contrast, Italian verb-particle constructions like the one exemplified in (35b) can be claimed to be formed via incorporation (i.e., the root is claimed to come from an inner complement position), as depicted in (36b).

\begin{align*}
\text{(35) a. } & \quad \text{John worked his debts off.} \\
\text{b. } & \quad \text{Gianni ha lavato via la macchia.} \quad \text{I Italian}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{(36) a. } & \quad \text{Gianni has washed away the stain} \\
\text{b. } & \quad \text{Gianni ha lavato via la macchia.} \quad \text{I Italian}
\end{align*}
Notice the parallelism between unselected object constructions like (35a) *John worked his debts off* and Washio’s (1997: 7) strong resultatives like (31a) *The boy danced his feet sore* “in which the meaning of the verb and the meaning of the adjective are fully independent of each other”: indeed, in these constructions, it cannot be predicted from the mere semantics of the verb what kind of state the patient comes to be in as the result of the action named by the verb. In contrast, Italian verb-particle constructions like (35b) are similar to Washio’s (1997: 7) weak resultatives: in these cases the meaning of the verb and the meaning of the particle are not independent of each other. For example, in weak verb-particle constructions the particle can be claimed to specify the result incorporated into the verb.

_Nota optime:_ conflation and incorporation are not incompatible processes (cf. strong P-verb constructions reviewed in section 1). For example, consider the Latin unselected object construction in (10), repeated in (37). As depicted in (38), the formation of this construction involves both conflation of the root \( \sqrt{\text{CAED}} \) (Lat. *caedere* ‘cut’) with a transitive light verb and incorporation (i.e., copy) of the Path element in *in* into this verb.

(37) [Acta] quae ille in aes in-cidit / #cecidit. (Latin)
‘The deeds which he engraved on brass.’

(38) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\sqrt{\text{CAED}}-v' \\
v\\ DP \\
\text{Path'}
\end{array}
\]

Furthermore, an important distinction is in order when dealing with incorporation processes. Consider the intransitive construction in (39a), drawn from a satellite-framed language like Hungarian, and the one in (39b), drawn from a verb-framed language like Spanish. Both examples involve incorporation of Path into the motion verb. However, in (39a) the P(ath) is affixed onto the verb, which has already been formed via conflation of \( \sqrt{TANCOL} \) ‘dance’ with a light motion verb. In Talmy’s words, (39a) is an example of satellite-framedness. In contrast, in (39b) the incorporation of P(ath) into the verb gives a morphophonological atom *entrar* ‘enter’, whereby it is an example of verb-framedness. As expected from Talmy’s typology, in the satellite-framed construction in (39a) the *co-event* is encoded in the verb, whereas in the verb-framed one in (39b) the co-event is a gerund adjunct.

---

1 As noted above, verb-framedness is not incompatible with satellite-framedness. For example, following Hale & Keyser’s (2000) “P-cognition” analysis of English complex verbs like *cool down* or *heat up*, Mateu & Rigau (2010) claim that Romance phrasal verbs like It. *uscire fuori* lit. ‘exit out’ or *entrare dentro* ‘enter in’, etc. involve “cognate” P(articles).
In contrast, Japanese resultative V-V compounds (e.g., see (42a), taken from Nishiyama [1998: 194]) do not exemplify the conflation pattern but rather the incorporation one: in a verb-framed and head final language like Japanese, Result/Path is typically incorporated into the main null verb (*tubusi* ‘use up’ in [42a]), while the subordinate verb (*nomi* ‘drink’ in [42a]) turns out to be left-adjointed to that main verb. Crucially, in Japanese resultative V-V compounds, the subordinate/adjointed verb is not compounded with a null verb but with a full one, whereby conflation (i.e., compounding of a root with a null light verb) is not involved.

(42) a. *John-ga   Bill-o     osi-taosi- ta.*   (Japanese)  
   John-nom  Bill-acc  push-topple-past  
   ‘John pushed Bill down.’

b. *John-ga   Bill-o     osi-taore- ta*  
   John-nom  Bill-acc  push-fall-past  
   ‘John pushed Bill and Bill fell.’

The relevant preliminary conclusion seems to be that the Yoruba SVC in (44b) should not be put on a par with the Japanese V-V compound in (44a) (NB: the counterpart of [44b] in Japanese is ungrammatical: cf. [44c]) but rather with its equivalent in Chinese.5

4. Concluding remarks

- The existence of so-called ‘unselected object constructions’ provides a good argument for (*neo-)constructionist approaches to argument structure (for cognitively oriented ones, see Goldberg [1995, 2006] and Croft [2001, 2012], i.a.; for some generative ones, see Borer [1994, 2005], Marantz [1997, 2005], and Acedo-Matellán & Mateu [2013], i.a.).

- ‘Unselected object constructions’ like the ones reviewed in Section 2 are strong {resultative/P-verb} constructions that are typically found in Talmy’s (1991, 2000) satellite-framed languages (e.g., Latin, Germanic, Slavic, Chinese, etc). Their formation involves the Co-event conflation pattern (i.e., in formal terms, the one that involves conflation of a root with a null light verb). Despite appearances, Italian phrasal verbs and Japanese weak resultatives can be claimed to fall under the Path/Result incorporation pattern. Talmy’s (1991, 2000) classification of Romance and Japanese as verb-framed languages predicts an interesting parallelism between Italian verb-particle constructions and Japanese weak resultatives: both the directional particle and the resultative adjective specify the Path/Result incorporated in the verb. Such a parallelism is in tune with Washio’s (1997: 43) claim that Romance is more similar to Japanese than to English with respect to Levin & Rappoport’s (1988) “lexical subordination” phenomena. Finally, another interesting fact that is also nicely predicted by Talmy’s (1991, 2000) typology is that Japanese precisely lacks the resultative V-V compounds of the ‘unselected object’ type, which can be found in Chinese.

- Beavers et al. (2010: 20): “since nearly all languages have path verbs, then nearly all languages have at least one verb-framed encoding option”. For instance, although English and Chinese are considered satellite-framed languages in Talmy (1991, 2000), examples of verb-framedness like the ones in (45) can be found in these languages.

(45) a. The bottle entered the cave.  
   b. pingzi  jin-le   dongxue.   (Chinese)  
   bottle   entered-perf.  cave

4 See Nishiyama (1998: 184), for some arguments that make it clear that the main verb in Japanese V-V compounds is the second one.

5 See also Volpe (2004), for the proposal that consumption verbs (e.g., *drink, eat*, etc.) are unergative verbs.

6 Kratzer’s (2005: 38) preliminary remarks on serialization and resultatives (see [i]) could be valid if Chinese (but not Japanese) resultative V-V compounds are understood as serialization in (44b). Furthermore, resultatives in (i) should be understood as strong resultatives (i.e., those ones that involve conflation with a null light verb).
In contrast, it is more difficult to find clear examples of the co-event conflation pattern in Talmy’s (2000) verb-framed languages (e.g., Romance, Japanese, Greek, etc). Unfortunately, cases of misinterpretation of Talmy’s (1991, 2000) typology are quite frequent, this being partly due to its lack of formal precision.

For example, Italian data with complex PPs like those in (46) have been argued to be counterexamples to the Talman generalization according to which Romance languages cannot form goal of motion structures without relying on a verb-framed strategy (e.g., see Folli 2008). However, examples like (46) are not true counterexamples since they can be claimed to involve adjunct PPs (see Gehrke [2008], Real-Puigdollers [2010], and Mateu [2012], for relevant discussion).

(46) a. La barca ha galleggiato dentro alla grotta. (Italian)
   the boat has floated inside to the cave
   ‘The boat floated into the cave.’
   b. Gianni ha camminato fino alla spiaggia. Gianni has walked until to the beach
   ‘Gianni walked up to the beach.’

The following example is more relevant for the present topic (i.e., ‘unselected object constructions’). Despite appearances, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou’s (2011) example in (47a), can be claimed to involve incorporation of Path/Result into the verb rather than Manner conflation (cf. also It. lavare via ‘wash away’). Otherwise, (i) there is no way to explain why both examples in (47) are grammatical in English but not in Greek, (ii) there is no way to explain why the very same contrast in (47) holds in Spanish (cf. [48]), and (iii) there is no way to explain the contrast between English and Spanish in (49), i.e., why the PP is obligatory in (49a) but not in (49b).

(47) a. O Jannis skoup-is-e ta pesmena fila apo to patoma (Greek)
   the Jannis swept the fallen leaves from the floor
   ‘The Jannis swept the fallen leaves from the floor’
   b. ?/*O Jannis skoup-is-e ta pesmena fila ston dromo
   the Jannis swept the fallen leaves up to the street
   ‘The Jannis swept the fallen leaves up to the street’

(48) a. Jannis barrió las hojas del suelo. (Spanish)
   Jannis swept the leaves from the floor
   ‘Jannis swept the leaves from the floor’
   b. *Jannis barrió las hojas a la calle.
   ‘Jannis swept the leaves to the street’

(49) a. Jannis swept the leaves? (off the sidewalk). Cf. Jannis swept the sidewalk.
   ‘Jannis swept the leaves (from the sidewalk).’
   ‘Jannis swept the sidewalk’

Furthermore, if the present analysis of the Germanic vs. Romance differences is on the right track, the relevant contrasts in (50) through (53), which once again are predicted by Talmy’s typology, can also be explained on the basis that the Romance verbal bases in these examples do encode a Path/Result component, while the English corresponding ones do not: indeed, the Romance counterpart of wipe in (51b) through (53b) means ‘remove/get out’:

(50) a. John washed the stain? (away).
   b. Gianni ha lavato (via) la macchia. (Italian)
   ‘Gianni has washed away the stain’

(51) a. John wiped the fingerprints *from the table/away…).
   b. Juan fregó las huellas (de la mesa). (Spanish)
   ‘Juan wiped the fingerprints from the table.’

(52) a. John wiped the dust *from the table).
   b. Jean a essuyé la poussière (de la table). (French)
   ‘Jean wiped the dust from the table.’

(53) a. John wiped the stains *from the door).
   b. En Joan fregà les taques (de la porta). (Catalan)
   ‘Joan wiped the stains from the door.’

The ungrammaticality of the English examples in (50a) to (53a) would then run parallel to that of the examples in (54). As shown by Hoekstra (1988, 1992,), the resultative PP/AP is compulsory in (54) since it is the Small Clause Result predicate (and not the verb) that licenses the direct object as its argument.8

(54) a. John danced the night *(awake).
   b. He talked us *(into a stupor).
   c. The dog barked the chickens *(awake).

In contrast, the Romance verb in (50b) through (53b) can be argued to incorporate the abstract predicative head of the SC-like resultative structure which encodes Path/Result. Given this, the Romance counterpart of wipe in (51b) through (53b) means ‘remove/get out’:

(55) a. John barrió las migas (awake).
   b. John barrió las migas (off the table).
   ‘John swept the crumbs’ (see ib).

8 See also Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998: 118-122), for an alternative semantic explanation of the ill-formedness of examples like the one in (ia):
In conclusion, the English strong P-verb construction in (55), whose formation involves conflation, should be distinguished from the Italian weak P-verb construction in (36b), repeated in (56), whose formation involves incorporation.

\[ (55) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{v'} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{PathP (ResultP)} \\
\text{WASH} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Path'} \\
\text{the stain} \\
\text{the dirt} \\
\text{Path} \\
\text{X} \\
??/*(away/off/…)
\end{array} \]

\[ (56) \]

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{v'} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{PathP (ResultP)} \\
\text{LAVA} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Path'} \\
\text{la macchia} \\
\text{Path} \\
\text{X} \\
\text{(Part)} \\
\text{via}
\end{array} \]
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