

LJILJANA ŠARIĆ

Institutt for litteratur, områdestudier og europeiske språk (ILOS)

Universitetet i Oslo

Pb. 1003, NO-0315 Oslo

Ljiljana.Saric@ilos.uio.no

## SOME REMARKS ON RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN CROATIAN

This paper discusses resultatives, often considered a subgroup of secondary predicates. Resultatives with an adjectival form (i. e., resultatives that can be considered a special form of secondary predicates) occur only rarely in Croatian. This paper highlights the formal and semantic characteristics of these constructions, as well as other possibilities of expressing resultative meaning.

KEY WORDS: *resultatives, secondary predicates, depictives, adverbials, adverbial resultatives, resultative meaning of prefixes*

Typical resultative constructions can be exemplified with the following English sentence:

(1) He hammered the metal *flat*.

Resultatives are often discussed in the literature on secondary predication, in which they are semantically seen as opposed to depictives. Before turning to the discussion of resultatives, a few remarks on depictives and secondary predication are necessary. Following Schultze-Berndt and Himmelmann (2004), the term *depictive secondary predicate*<sup>1</sup> refers to constructions containing two predicative

---

<sup>1</sup> The terms used for secondary predicates in Croatian linguistics are "predicate complement/supplement" (*priložni / predikatni dodatak, predikatna dopuna*) and "predicate attribute" (*predikatni atribut*) referring to adjectives. Among other terms used are "adjunct" (*privezak / adjunkcija*), "temporary attribute", "additional predicate" and "appositive adjective" (*privremeni atribut, dopunski predikat, apozitivni pridjev, pridjev u apozitivnoj službi*). The variety of the terms used illustrates uncertainties connected with the formal and semantic status of the secondary predicate within a sentence. Not many studies are dedicated to this topic apart from short descriptions in grammar handbooks. Among existing grammatical descriptions, more in-depth remarks with numerous literature examples can be found only in Katičić (1986). The only book-length study of this particular topic is Peti's monograph *Predikatni proširak* (1979). In the author's terminology, "predicate extension" as a syntactic category involves the phenomenon usually termed "secondary predicates" in contemporary linguistic literature, as well as obligatory predicate complements. Peti analyzes secondary predicates in the broader sense; i. e., including some categories of circumstantials.

constituents, one of them being the main predicate, the other one expressing a state or event pertaining to one participant in the main predicate, as in the following example:

- (2) Ivan ide ulicom *ljut*.  
'Ivan is walking along the street angry.'

One important semantic characteristic of constructions containing depictives is the temporal dependency of the two predicates involved in the description of the situation: they share a common time frame. The time frame of the main predicate and the time frame of the secondary predicate overlap in the overall eventuality time frame the utterance focuses on. This is made explicit in the paraphrase of sentence (2): *Ivan ide ulicom i Ivan je pritom ljut*. 'Ivan is walking along the street and he is angry while doing it.' However, temporal overlap of the main predicate and the secondary predicate in an utterance does not exclude the possibility that the state/situation expressed by the secondary predicate might have been present before the eventuality time depicted in the utterance.

The most common depictives semantically encode a physical, emotional, or motivational state or condition in a construction with a verb of motion, manipulation/affect, change of state or ingestion:

- (3) Pio je kavu *bladnu*.  
'He drank his coffee cold.'

Typical depictives of this type are adjectives and adjectival participles. Nevertheless, there are many prepositional phrases and prepositionless genitive phrases that are semantically equivalent to adjectival depictives. This type entails subject-related as well as object-related adjectival depictives in different cases.

An important semantic distinction often discussed in literature on secondary predication is the one between depictives and resultatives. Depictives designate an event that holds true at the same time as the event encoded by the main predicate. In contrast, resultatives designate an event that is a consequence or result of the event encoded by the main predicate. Consequently, in a clause with a resultative phrase, two non-simultaneous timeframes are involved: the time frame of the main predicate precedes the time frame of the resultative secondary predicate. Although semantically different, the resultative constructions with an adjectival resultative in (4a) and (b) structurally resemble the adjectival depictives in (4c) and (d):

- (4a) The river froze *hard*.  
(b) Sie schlugen ihn *halbtot*.  
'They beat him [until he was] half dead.'  
(c) She handed him the towel *wet*.  
(d) Er trank seinen Tee *kalt*.  
'He drank his tea cold.'

In (4b), the resultative construction means roughly that the subject made the object acquire a condition designated by the resultative phrase by performing the action expressed by the verb. Although they formally appear identical, resultative constructions must be distinguished from depictive or "current-state" constructions,

which superficially look like resultatives, cf. (4c) and (d). They differ semantically in that depictives do not designate states that are reliant on the action described by the main verb, whereas phrases designating results are dependent upon the action designated by the verb. According to Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), a resultative phrase is an XP that denotes the state achieved by the referent of the NP it is predicated of as a result of the action denoted by the verb in the transitive construction.

A resultative construction may contain a direct object, in which case the resultative phrase follows the object, as in (4b), or a resultative may lack a direct object, in which case the resultative immediately follows the verb, as in (4a). A crucial aspect of the construction is that a resultative denotes a change of state undergone by the object or the intransitive subject. The main verb and the secondary predicate form a type of complex predicate – dependency of the two predicates being semantically stronger than with the depictive – applying to the direct object or intransitive subject such that the verb expresses an activity or achievement, whereas secondary predication expresses the end result of a change of state. The VP's complement structure is not determined by the verb alone, but by the composite effects of the verb and the construction. Resultatives display a great deal of syntactic and semantic variation not only when comparing different languages, but also when comparing this family of constructions within one language.<sup>2</sup> The constructions share some important properties but differ in certain specifics, including the degree of productivity of different means of their realization (morphological, lexical, and syntactic).

Resultatives consisting of an adjective as the main or only element of a resultative phrase occur rarely in Croatian. However, there are some other means of expressing resultative meaning: prefixes, adverbials or adverbial-like expressions, and consequential clauses. It has often been appropriately claimed that resultative constructions of the type (4a) and (b) are not widespread in the Slavic languages. Strigin and Demjjanow (2001, 58ff) state that resultative constructions cannot be found in Russian. They relate this fact to language typology, claiming that the "telic" content present in German and English prototypical resultatives is expressed in the prefixes of Russian perfective verbs. In an insightful analysis of the resultative semantics of Russian verbal prefixes, Spencer and Zaretskaya (1996) claim that prefixing creates a complex lexeme that has the properties of co-predication found in Germanic resultative constructions and in verb particle constructions. Undoubtedly, one characteristic of Slavic languages is the semantic interaction of the semantics of verbal prefixes and the verbal meaning and/or constructional meaning in resultative constructions. Also in Croatian, a composite interaction of prefix semantics, verbal semantics and the semantics of the entire construction often produces resultative effects, for example:

- (5) On je zapio / propio svoju plaću.  
'He has drunk his way through his wage.'

<sup>2</sup> Within the group of resultative constructions as a family of constructions, some other types have often been discussed, such as intransitive path resultatives, in which the verb expresses an emission of sound; cf. Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004).

In addition to being perfectivizers, some perfectivizing prefixes specify that the process results in another state (e. g., *pro-* in *probiti*, *iz-* in *izbrisati*).

However, the resultative effects produced by some prefixes in Croatian do not seem to be as productive as in Russian. Spencer and Zaretskaya (1996) give many examples that cannot be translated into Croatian in such a manner that a single prefixed verb expresses (nearly) the same meaning as in Russian. In some cases, an additional piece of information, phrase, or resultative clause must be added. Cf. Russian examples and their possible Croatian equivalents in (6):

- (6a) Oni naexali etu dorogu.  
'They have worn this road flat by driving on it.'  
(b) Vi doezdili menja. [Russ] (Spencer & Zaretskaya 1996, ex. 48, 54)  
'You have worn me out by driving me around.'  
(a') Oni su uništili / izrovali tu cestu vožnjom / vozeći se po njoj.  
(a'') Oni su toliko vozili po toj cesti da se uništila / izrovala.  
(b') Iscrpili ste me vožnjom / vozeći me okolo.  
(b'') Toliko ste me vozili okolo da sam se iscrpila. [Cro]

In the Croatian examples, the verbal semantics is not sufficient to convey a resultative meaning. Either an additional manner adverbial must be added (i.e., *vožnjom*, *vozeći se* in (6a') and (b')), or the Russian construction can have an equivalent in a consequential clause, as in (6a'') and (b'').

The fact that depictive-like resultatives are not widespread in the Slavic languages is connected with the different distribution of the resultatives (as a family of constructions) concerning their means of expression. Certainly, part of the semantic field of resultative constructions in Slavic is occupied by constructions using prefixed verbs, in which prefixes assume the semantic role of the adjectives found in German and English resultative constructions; compare the Croatian prefixed perfective verbs *ispiti* and *isprazniti* in *Ispio / ispraznio je čašu* 'He drank his glass empty' with the semantically equivalent German example *Er trank sein Glas leer*.

So far, no attention has been paid to resultative constructions that might structurally resemble depictive secondary predicates in Croatian: specifically, deadjectival adverbs. Some constructions containing deadjectival adverbs frequently found in Croatian have constructional near-equivalents in Slovenian. However, resultative constructions of this type in both languages seem to be bounded to some specific contexts, such as recipes:

- (7a) Jaja *tvrd* skuhajte / skuhati.  
'Boil the eggs [until] hard.'  
(b) Jaja i šećer *gusto* skuhajte / skuhati. (Cro)  
'Cook the eggs and sugar [until] thick.'  
(c) Jajca *trdo* skuhamo. (Slo)  
'Boil the eggs [until] hard.'

Although contextually bounded, the examples above can be considered prototypical cases of resultative constructions with a single deadjectival lexeme conveying resultative semantics. The morphological structure of the units conveying resultative semantics is rather typical for an adverb: the forms *tvrd* and *gusto* in

(7a) and (b) resemble that of an adverbial. Synonymous constructions with the same adverbial form integrated into a prepositional phrase with the prepositions *u* / *v* and *na* can be found as well, such as in (8a)–(8c), and even a compound adverb in which an adverb and a preposition form a compound adverbial form,<sup>3</sup> as in (d):

(8a) Jaja skuhajte *u tvrdo* / *u meko*. (Cro)

(b) Jajca skuhamo *v trdo* / *v mehko*. (Sl)

'Boil the eggs [until] hard.'

(c) *Na meko* izdinstamo meso.

'Stew the meat [until] soft.'

(d) Jaja skuhajte *utvrdo* / *umeko*. (Cro)

'Boil the eggs [until] hard.'

It is obvious that the adverbial expressions do not modify the process itself. *Tvrdo* 'hard' and *gusto* 'thick' in (7a) and (b) certainly designate the result of the verbal action; that is, the resultative state of one of the sentence participants after the verbal action took place. The adverbs in question semantically have the same function as *flat* and *hard* in examples (1) and (4a) and cannot be considered adverbial modifiers of the verbal action because they designate the resultative stage the cooked object should reach: the eggs are hard-boiled at the end of the boiling process; the eggs and sugar are thick at the end of the cooking process. These adverbial expressions function as a part of a complex attribute together with the passive participle: Cro. *Meko / tvrdo kuhana jaja* / Sl. *Mehko / trdo kuhana jajca* 'soft-boiled / hard-boiled eggs'.

In the discussion of depictives, the semantic distinction between a depictive secondary predicate and an adverbial has been broadly discussed. The reason is that there are many constructions with a depictive reading that can be interpreted with an event-related meaning as well. This has been often commented on in the literature (e. g., Pittner, 1999; Geuder, 2000; Himmelmann and Schultze-Berndt, 2005). Even if adverbials and depictives can be clearly distinguished at the formal level, the distinction is not as clear at the semantic level. Many adjuncts simultaneously have a participant-related and an event-related semantics. Formally marked adverbials may still have a participant-related component. Semantically, no clear-cut distinction can be made between adverbials and depictives. Even if they morphosyntactically differ in a given language, the semantic distinction is a gradual one. An unambiguous adverbial expression, if the form is considered, might be strongly participant-oriented.

Hence, adverbials are not exclusively event-oriented, but instead might be semantically oriented towards a participant. The adverbial or attributive reading of a sentence can be disambiguated by a paraphrase. Adverbials denote the manner of the development of an action or a process. However, a characteristic of an action/process might be directly or indirectly related to a participant. Which interpretation is more suitable depends on the semantics of the concrete adjective or adverb used.

<sup>3</sup> A productive model of derivation of compound adverbs in Croatian is the transformation of a prepositional phrase containing a preposition and noun into a single word: *u večer* → *uvečer* 'in the evening(s)', *u jesen* → *ujesen* 'in the autumn'.

In the following examples, the forms *brzo* 'quickly' and *ljutito* 'angrily' are morphologically clearly adverbs. However, *ljutito* relates not only to the process of walking, but also to the participant's state / mood,<sup>4</sup> whereas *brzo* solely describes the characteristics of the process of walking home.

(9a) Hodao je kući *brzo*.  
'He was walking home quickly.'

(b) Hodao je kući *ljutito*.  
'He was walking home angrily.'

Consequently, strongly participant-oriented adverbials can be considered (semantic) depictives as well. The distinction between event-orientation and participant-orientation is important in the analysis of resultative semantics as well. Adverbial expressions are often found in resultative constructions. Resultative adverbials are strongly participant-oriented, as illustrated by (7a) and (b), and therefore function semantically as adjectives proper found in resultative constructions in other languages.

An adjectival form typical for depictives does not usually occur in Croatian resultative constructions. Nevertheless, adjectives also occasionally appear in resultative constructions. One frequently found resultative is *sit* 'satiated, full' in the following two examples:

(10) Najeo se *sit*. / Najela se *sita* / Najelo se *sito*.<sup>5</sup>  
'He / she / it ate his / her / its fill.'

The adjective agrees in number and gender with its covert controller (*sit*, *sita*, *sito*). Typical depictives follow the same principle of case agreement with their controllers. Rare resultative constructions with a form that is clearly adjectival are considered idiomatic.<sup>6</sup> However, the example below, with two resultative adjectives, indicates the possible productivity of the model:

(11) Najela se *sita* i *zadovoljna*.  
'She ate until she was full and content.'

*Zadovoljna* 'content' is a resultative state applying to the subject participant after the action of eating. The state expressed by the resultative secondary predicate is not necessarily the *intentional* consequence or result of the verbal action. The following example exhibits the same structure:

<sup>4</sup> At the very least, pragmatic factors strongly indicate participant orientation in addition to event orientation.

<sup>5</sup> Similar examples can be found in the corpus *Hrvatska jezična riznica* (Croatian Language Corpus), available at: <http://riznica.ihj.hr/>: (...) *krava se je sita najela trave* 'The cow ate her fill of grass.' Prepositional phrases containing the preposition *do* are semantic equivalents of similar examples: *Strogo postiti znači samo jedan put na dan do sita se najesti*. 'To fast strictly means to eat one's fill only once a day.' *Nikad ih se nisam mogao dosita najesti*. 'I never could eat my fill on them.' (both examples from a Google search, 19 Jan. 2008).

<sup>6</sup> Bujas (2001) equates *sit* in *Najeo sam se sit* 'I ate until I was full' with the adverb *dosita* in *Dosita sam se najeo* 'I ate my fill'. He cites also the example *Dosita sam se natrčao* 'I ran all I wanted', in which *dosita* means 'all one wants, to one's heart's content'.

(12) *Natočim si čašu punu.*<sup>7</sup>  
 'I fill my glass full.'

*Punu* 'full' matches the form of an indefinite adjective. With the definite form and changed word order (*Natočim si punu čašu*), the adjective acquires a strong attributive reading. In this case, the sentence is odd because it implies that the glass was full at the beginning and at the same time someone made it full by pouring something into it. An alternative expression to (12) would be *Natočim si čašu do vrha* 'I fill my glass to the brim'. However, examples of the type \**Popio je čašu praznu* 'He drank his glass empty' are not acceptable when *prazan* 'empty' is used with the intention of describing the resultative state of the object participant after the subject has performed the action of drinking.

As for the semantics of resultative constructions, *Marko je nalio čašu punu* 'Marko filled his glass full' does not only mean that Marko both poured something in the glass and made the glass full. It implies the relation of two subevents: Marko made the glass full by pouring something into it. The subevent expressed by the verbal stem is in many cases the means by which the second subevent takes place. The distribution of the arguments in the subevents is as follows: *Marko* is the agent of both subevents, *čaša* is the patient of both subevents, and *puna* is the resulting property in the second subevent (*Marko je nalio čašu. [Kao rezultat] čaša je bila puna* 'Marko poured (something) into the glass. [As a result,] the glass was full'). With the subject in the controller role, the subevent expressed by the resultative phrase is typically a change of state.<sup>8</sup>

When dealing with phrases such as *najesti se sit* 'to eat one's fill', an interesting question arises. The semantics of verbal prefixes has often been claimed to be resultative; that is, the prefix is semantically considered the primary predicate, as in English phrasal verb construction (Spencer and Zaretskaya, 1996: 1). *Na-* in *najesti se* 'to finish eating/eat one's fill' entails a resultative semantic component, so that there should be no necessary reason to add *sit* 'full'. However, the resultative semantic component seems to be weak in the semantics of some verbs. The same holds for the following example, in which the adjective *gol* 'naked' can be substituted for the adverbial *dogola* 'to the skin' or a prepositional phrase *do gola*:

(13a) *Skinuo se / svukao se gol.*  
 (b) *Skinuo se do gola / dogola.*  
 'He stripped naked.'

Resultative prepositional phrases using the preposition *do* can be frequently found; compare the following example, similar to (10):

(14) *Najeo se do sita. / Najela se do sita. / Najelo se do sita.*  
 'He / she / it ate his / her / its fill.'

<sup>7</sup> This example was found in a Google search on 19 Jan. 2008. Compare also: *Natočio sam punu čašu i ispio na dušak*. 'I filled my glass full and drank it up in one gulp.' This example is from the corpus *Hrvatska jezična riznica* (Croatian Language Corpus), available at: <http://riznica.ihj.hr/>.

<sup>8</sup> Goldberg (1997) provides some generalizations about what types of semantic relationships are likely to be allowed between verbal and constructional subevents within one language and across languages.

The form *sita* is neither that of an adverb (*sito*) nor an adjective agreeing with its controller: *sita* applies to all genders. *Sit* does not morphologically agree with its controller – otherwise it should be *do sita* (MASC / NEUTR), *do site* (FEM). Its ending matches the feminine adjective form, but its accent does not. The adjectival form in the prepositional phrase in the Slovenian example in (15) has the form of the masculine/neuter adjective showing no agreement with its controller – the plural object *zrna fižola* 'beans' – whose resultative stage it describes:

- (15) *Zrna fižola skoraj do mehkega skuhamo z listom lovorja.*  
'Cook the beans with a bay leaf until they are almost soft.'

Resultatives as prepositional phrases using the genitive preposition *do* and a noun denoting state as result can frequently be found in Croatian and Slovenian. Those prepositional phrases are often equivalents of resultative constructions containing an adjective; cf. the English sentence in (16a) and its Croatian equivalent in (16b):

- (16a) She shouted herself *hoarse*.  
(b) *Vikala je do promuklosti.*

Resultative expressions in the form of a prepositional phrase *do* + GEN are very productive, as following examples show:

- (17a) *Smijati se do suza.*  
'To laugh to tears.'  
(b) *Radio je do iznemoglosti.*  
'He worked until he was totally exhausted.'  
(c) *Tražili su do očaja.*  
'They were desperately seeking.'  
(d) *Tukli su ga do smrti.*  
'They beat him until he was dead.'

However, some *do* + GEN constructions might be ambiguous, implying both event-related and participant-related interpretation. *Tukli su ga do besvijesti* 'They beat him unconscious' might imply the interpretation that the object lost consciousness at the end (*Tukli su ga dok nije izgubio svijest* 'They beat him until he lost consciousness'). However, the interpretation implying that the adverb metaphorically means 'ad infinitum', thus modifying verbal action, is more likely. In the same context with *smijati se* 'to laugh', *do besvijesti* also acquires an unambiguous adverbial reading ('long, without end'): *Smijali smo se do besvijesti* 'We were laughing without end.' Yet, with a semantically different verb, the resultative component of *do besvijesti* and its participant orientation might become stronger (*Pili su do besvijesti* 'They drank themselves into oblivion'). Resultatives and depictives share ambiguous interpretations in that that in many cases they might be considered adverbials or ambiguous cases.

Accusative prepositional constructions using the preposition *na*, usually considered phraseological, also carry a resultative meaning:

- (18) *Pretukli su ga na smrt.*  
'They have beaten him to death.'



An additional grammatical type of resultative phrase uses the preposition *u* / *na* and a form resembling that of an adverb. These are frequent with verbs with the meaning 'to color / dye'. Verbs of the type *obojiti* 'to color / paint / dye' entail resultative semantics, but they often require a component specifying color. The resultative complement is either a prepositional phrase with *u* (Croatian) or *na* (Slovenian), or an adverb, cf.:

- (19a) Najstarije splitsko kino će se obojiti *u crveno*.  
'The oldest cinema in Split will be painted red.'  
(b) Tablete će neoprane naslage na zubima obojiti *crveno*.  
'The tablets will color deposits left on the teeth red.'  
(c) Lasi barvam *na temnorjavo*.  
'I dye my hair dark red.'  
(d) Listi se jeseni obarvajo *karminasto rdeče*.  
'The leaves become carmine red in the autumn.'

Resultatives in an adjective-like form, which is typical for secondary predicates in some languages, are not frequent in Croatian or in Slavic languages in general. Other means of expressing resultativeness predominate (e. g., verbal prefixes, adverbial phrases, and resultative subordinated clauses). Resultative constructions found among adjectival secondary predicates have marginal status. Nonetheless, some examples demand further (comparative) investigation.

This analysis focused on various resultative constructions in Croatian that semantically, and to a certain level morphologically, resemble typical adjectival resultatives found, for example, in English or German. Among these, adverbs and adverbial expressions using the preposition *u* can be found (*u tvrdo* / *utvrdo*), as well as prepositional phrases using the preposition *do* followed by a noun in the genitive case (*do suza*). Strongly participant-oriented adverbials in one language can semantically function as adjectives proper found in resultative constructions in other languages. The semantic interrelation of various resultative constructions must be examined in more detail in future research. Some remarks concerning Slovenian in this article show that similarities and differences among the Slavic languages in conveying resultative meaning are an intriguing research topic. The inclusion of comparative research when discussing the (non)existence of resultative constructions in Slavic is clearly valuable. This article has addressed some issues that deserve further detailed research, such as a typology of Slavic constructions that are semantically equivalent to English and German resultatives. Further research should also seek to account for the semantic and syntactic differences between different constructions enabling a resultative interpretation (e. g., *najeo se sit* 'he ate his fill' vs. *naslage na zubima će se obojiti crveno* 'deposits left on the teeth will become red'), and the semantic and syntactic (in)dependency of Slavic resultative or resultative-like phrases.

## REFERENCES

- Vladimir Anić, 1998: *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, Novi Liber, Zagreb.
- Eugenija Barić, Mijo Lončarić, Dragica Malić, Slavko Pavešić, Mirko Peti, Vesna Zečević, Marija Znika, 1997: *Hrvatska gramatika*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- John Baylin, 2001: "The syntax of Slavic predicate case", *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 22, 1–23.
- John Bowers, 2001: "Predication", in: M. Baltin, C. Collins (eds.): *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, Blackwell, Cambridge, MA.
- Željko Bujas, 2001: *Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rječnik*, Globus, Zagreb.
- Zlata Derosi, 1971: "Predikatni atribut", *Jezik*, 1, pp. 26–32.
- Johannes Dölling, 2000: "Reinterpretations in adverbial modification: a general approach", in: C. Fabricius-Hansen, E. Lang, C. Maienborn (eds.): *Approaching the Grammar of Adjuncts*, ZAS Papers in Linguistics 17, pp. 27–52.
- Wilhelm Geuder, 2000: *Oriented Adverbs. Issues in the Lexical Semantics of Event Adverbs*, University of Tübingen, dissertation, available at: <http://deposit.ddb.de/cgi-bin/dokserv?idn=964908301> (2008-1-19).
- Adele E. Goldberg, 1997: "Relationships between verb and construction", in: Marjolijn Verspoor and Eve Sweetser (eds.): *Lexicon and Grammar*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 383–398.
- Adele E. Goldberg, Ray Jackendoff, 2004: "The English resultative as a family of constructions", *Language*, 80, 3, pp. 532–568.
- Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, Eva Schultze-Berndt, 2005: "Issues in the syntax and semantics of participant-oriented adjuncts: an introduction", in: Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), *Secondary Predication and Adverbial Modification*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 1–27.
- Monica-Alexandrina Irimia, 2005: Types of secondary predication, *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics*, 25, pp. 20–29.
- Josip Jernej 1963. "O predikatnoj dopuni u hrvatskosrpskom jeziku", *Filologija*, 4, pp. 77–81.
- Radoslav Katičić, 1986: *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*, JAZU-Globus, Zagreb.
- Beth Levin, Malka Rappaport Hovav 1995: *Unaccusativity. At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Tomo Maretić, 1931: *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*, Zagreb.
- Mirko Peti, 1979: *Predikatni proširak*, Znanstvena biblioteka HFD, Zagreb.

Karin Pittner, 1999: *Adverbiale im Deutschen*, Stauffenburg, Tübingen.

Eva Schultze-Berndt, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, 2004: "Depictive secondary predicates in crosslinguistic perspective", *Linguistic Typology*, 8, 1, pp. 59–131, [http://www.linguistics.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/projects/kopraedikate/papers/Depictives\\_xling.doc](http://www.linguistics.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/projects/kopraedikate/papers/Depictives_xling.doc) (2008-1-19)

Andrew Spencer, Marina Zaretskaya, 1996: "Copredication in Russian - lexical resultatives", <http://www.essex.ac.uk/linguistics/clmt/papers/misc/> (2007-6-13)

Anatoli Strigin, Assinja Demjanov 2001: "Secondary predication in Russian", *ZAS Papers in Linguistics*, 25, pp. 1–79.

#### NEKE NAPOMENE O REZULTATIVNIM KONSTRUKCIJAMA U HRVATSKOME

##### SAŽETAK

Članak se bavi rezultativnim konstrukcijama koje se u lingvističkim analizama često smatraju podskupom sekundarnih predikata. Rezultativno značenje u njemačkom i engleskom često se ostvaruje pridjevima koji su na prvi pogled slični depiktivima. Takvi su rezultativi u hrvatskom vrlo rijetki. U analizi se upućuje na alternativne načine ostvarivanja rezultativnog značenja u hrvatskome, posebno na konstrukcije s priložima i priložnim izrazima. Cilj je članka otvaranje pitanja koja zaslužuju detaljniju analizu u budućim istraživanjima: je li doista održiva tvrdnja nekih teoretičara da u slavenskim jezicima rezultativa nema, koje su prednosti komparativnog proučavanja slavenskih jezika u analizi ove skupine konstrukcija, koje bi podskupine konstrukcija trebalo semantički i sintaktički supostaviti u izradi tipologije, u kojoj su mjeri rezultativi kao podskupina sekundarnih predikata sintaktički i semantički neovisni.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: *rezultativi, sekundarni predikati, depiktivi, adverbijali, adverbijalni rezultativi, rezultativno značenje prefiksa*