

SEBASTIAN WIELOSZ

RESULTATIVITY AND MANDARIN CHINESE DIRECTIONAL VERB COMPOUNDS*

INTRODUCTION

Mandarin Chinese (MC) is an analytical language, which in typological terms is very different from the Indo-European languages. Therefore, the study of Chinese grammar, which differs significantly from European languages, is of great interest to researchers. Linguists pay close attention to various types of comparative analysis, highlighting distinctiveness at many levels of the language. At present, there is still insufficient focus on conducting comprehensive semantic analyses, possibly due to the distinct morphological rules of MC. When conducting semantic analyses on Chinese-language material, it is necessary to consider elementary semantic units, which are frequently not expressed at the morpheme level, but rather at a smaller, more abstract semantic unit level (semes).

This article summarises an analysis of the semantic value of resultative and directional verb-complement syntagmatic structures. The examination of the semantic relations within these syntagmas, supported by theories from the field of cognitive linguistics, allows for the identification of similarities in both the syntactic and semantic structures of these verb compounds. The article highlights similarities that are not immediately observable and are often overlooked by researchers. The initial two sections present a comprehensive overview of the key information regarding the categories of resultativity and directionality in natural language. The general theoretical framework will not

SEBASTIAN WIELOSZ, PhD – Jagiellonian University, Faculty of Philology, Institute of Oriental Studies; e-mail: sebastian.wielosz@uj.edu.pl; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1902-8751>.

* This publication was funded by the program “Excellence Initiative – Research University” at the Jagiellonian University in Kraków.

be specified down to the level of specific units, as it is irrelevant for the final semantic analysis of Chinese-language material how these categories are expressed in other languages. However, it is important to note that both resultativity and directionality can be expressed in various ways, whether at the level of word structure or more extensive phrases in a sentence. Here, however, the author's aim is only to give an overview of the theories related to the semantics of resultative and directional words and expressions in natural language.

The aim of the analysis was to determine the similarity between Chinese Resultative Verb Compounds (RVCs) and Directional Verb Compounds (DVCs) in terms of their meaning structure. The results showed that although the structures are not identical, they are overwhelmingly similar. Therefore, it is reasonable to include them in one overarching category of completive complements (cf. McDonald 1994, 321). Sinological research has not yet conducted an in-depth study of this structured knowledge of the subject. This can serve as a starting point for further analysis, particularly regarding the semantic structure of the Chinese sentence.

RESULTATIVES IN NATURAL LANGUAGE

Resultativity refers to the category responsible for conveying information about the results or consequences of situations presented in a sentence. It is semantically linked to the event denoted in the predicate, and like other aspectual categories, it depends on the predicative – a verb or an adjective. The nature of resultative expressions is compositional, resulting from the interaction between the predicative and semantic components that directly affect the final aspectual value of the predicate. This encodes information not only about the event and its course, but also about its impact on the reality and its denoted elements, i.e. by the object. This is related to a change of state, transformation, or any reality-influencing outcome. The category of resultativity is also related to perfectivity or telicity, but they are not the same. It is important to note the distinction between these categories, which is especially relevant for MC.

Resultativity is often considered a semantic invariant of perfectivity and a criterion for describing the aspectual value of a predicate, as well as the basis for distinguishing the basic aspectual opposition. Trask (1993, 240) defines resultativity as “an aspectual form expressing a state resulting from an earlier event” and adds, that “this term is often considered a synonym for perfect.” Bussmann (1996, 1004) provides a slightly more detailed definition, stating that it is a “verbal aspect which forms a subclass of non-duratives”, while “resultatives are verbs which refer to an event that comes to a conclusion.” This theoretical basis was also described by Comrie (1976) or Binnick (1991), among others.

Such a view of resultativity involves treating it not as a separate category, but rather as one factor in the description of the temporal relations in the internal temporal structure of the accomplished event. Kokorniak (2018, 58–59) lists it alongside other factors such as totality, telicity, boundedness, definiteness, completeness and change. Kokorniak and earlier researchers, such as Dahl (1985) or Nedjalkov (1988), have made it clear that resultativity is related to, but not the same, as perfectivity. Therefore, treating resultativity as an invariant of a perfective should be avoided. Karolak (2005) proposes a different perspective, considering aspect as a primarily semantic category. As a prominent aspectologist, he has extensively studied the aspectual value of predicates in various languages over the years. His theory is valuable in understanding the semantics of resultativity as a subcategory of aspect. He departs from a description that is only grammatical or lexical. In his research, Karolak explains that resultativity is a two-aspect configuration that is part of the meaning of the verb. This configuration has a causative component in its semantic structure. Nowakowska refers to Karolak's concept and presents the semantic value of the resultative configuration as “*P* happened, which caused *Q* to happen/continue” (Nowakowska 2020, 123, 129). In the cited conception, this configuration is categorised as monomorphemic, a subcategory of the conclusive configuration, with a discontinuous dominant. The complex aspectual value arises from the compositional nature of resultativity, which denotes a single event that concludes with a specific outcome, consisting of at least two sub-events: the preceding event leading to the outcome and the situation after the change of state. Limiting the consideration of resultativity to a specific linguistic unit is not justified by semantic and general considerations. This is because natural languages realise it in different ways, although the final aspectual value of resultative words or expressions converges.

The separation of resultatives and perfectives as distinct categories has not been a subject of consensus in the history of linguistic research. However, it is crucial to distinguish between them when analysing the aspectual value of the Chinese predicate. Therefore, attention should be paid to this topic. Nowakowska states that perfectivity is a retrospective view of an event, which is the reason it is being equated with resultativity (145). If something refers to a closed and temporally limited situation, it should theoretically also refer to the completeness of such an event. It is important to distinguish temporal closure from achieving a natural and anticipated endpoint, which is the result. Perfectivity is a subjective category, while resultativity is an objective one. This is because the presentation of an event as temporally closed or open is the sole decision of the speaker – it is through their prism that the situation is described. Meanwhile, the completeness of the event and the achievement of a certain endpoint, which is also a change of state, are objective commentaries on reality. It is due to resultativity being an inherent feature of the predicate. Another differential feature is the distinction between an

arbitrary and a natural endpoint, which may or may not coincide. In this case, the term ‘perfective’ is associated with an arbitrary point, while ‘resultative’ is associated with the natural point. It is important to note that finishing an event does not necessarily equate to completing it or fulfilling the conditions necessary to achieve a particular outcome. This distinction has been pointed out by various authors, including Bybee et al. (1994, 95), Klein et al. (2000, 724), and Liu (2015, 277). This differentiation is much clearer in analytic languages, where aspect is not realised in the morphology of the predicate. It is important to note that the term ‘resultative’ has a broader meaning in English linguistics, where English is the primary research material, than in relation to MC. Moreover, the term’s meaning may vary depending on the language studied. Although not all of the aforementioned theories have been developed based on MC, they can be successfully applied to it. The resultativity, which is an objective feature, is realised in the structure of the verb-complement syntagma and is related to the meaning of the compound semanteme, making it an inherent feature of the whole predicate. In contrast to aspectual grammemes, which semantic value may or may not be added to the predicate, the subjectivity of the speaker determines its accomplishment. The same applies to the natural and arbitrary endpoint mentioned earlier. Two examples below illustrate this:

- (1) 我吃完饭了。
Wǒ chīwán fàn le.
 ISG RVC = to eat + to finish PART
 I ate the meal.
- (2) 我吃了饭，可是没吃完。
Wǒ chī le fàn, kěshì méi chīwán.
 ISG to eat ASP = PRF meal but NEG = PRF RVC = to eat + to finish
 *I ate the meal, but didn’t eat it.

The first sentence suggests that the action has been completed with a natural, anticipated, and assumed endpoint, which is associated with resultativity (finishing the meal). In contrast, the perfective aspect may involve the completion of an eventuality of an event or the interruption of an event, as shown in example (2). This sentence cannot be directly translated into English because the perfective aspect in English has different semantic properties than in MC. In Chinese, it may involve a subjective, arbitrary endpoint, such as the interruption of an eating activity that did not ultimately end with finishing the entire meal. The information coded in the Chinese sentence can be translated into English, but only using different sentence structure, which would also change the aspectual value of the phrase.

Linguists describing resultatives in English devote a relatively large amount of attention to syntactic issues, that also directly affect the semantics and argument structure

of the sentence. Although their considerations are largely irrelevant to MC, some of them make a major contribution to the very understanding of the category in question, including in the context of MC, hence it is worth citing at least a snippet of this discussion. Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2017) note that the semantic structure of aspectual words and expressions, including resultatives, depends on specific combinatorial rules that govern the event's structure. This structure consists of two main elements: 'event template' and 'root'. The former is a kind of skeleton that defines the aspectual scope and causal structure of the event, while the role of the latter is to denote specific parts of reality related to the event being described. In other words, event template categorises events (e.g. CAUSE, BECOME, ACT as mentioned by Beavers and Koontz-Garboden), while the root denotes a part of the reality. For instance, the verb 'swim' is categorised as ACT, with the root denoting the action of swimming.

The above cited theory only applies to expressions that are not aspectually complex, as noted in Karolak's research. Events that end in a specific result are more complex and scalar, primarily due to their specific temporal and causal structure. They combine the meanings of means and result, which cannot always be realised in individual lexemes. Instead, they are usually denoted at the level of more elaborate structures, whether at the morphological or sentence level. Williams (2015, 310–11) points to three different approaches regarding how a resultative is introduced in a sentence: fully syntactic, partially lexical and fully lexical. In the first approach, a resultative expression consists of two independent syntactic components, one of which conveys information about the means and the other about the result, while the final aspectual value is determined by the sum of their independent meanings. This aspectual approach differs the fully syntactic approach from the partially lexical approach, in which the two components are also independent, but one is semantically dominant and determines the resultative interpretation of the denoted event. The third approach refers to the situation where the means and the result are embedded in a single lexeme. The first type can refer to resultative structures in English that are embedded in the sentence rather than in the morphology of the word. This has been pointed out by various scholars, including Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2001, 775) or Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004, 538). In this sentence structure, there are two main components of the resultative expression: the 'verbal subevent', which equals the aforementioned means, and the 'constructional subevent', which corresponds to the result. At the same time, the final semantic value of such resultatives is not only a combination of the meanings of the two sub-events, but rather results from a cause-effect relationship, which was also noticed by Williams (2015, 314).

The second possibility stated by Williams is clearly demonstrated in the structure of resultative verb-complement syntagmas in MC (which will be further described in the third section). The first morpheme of the phrase indicates a specific action, while

the resultative complement provides information about the outcome. For instance, the syntagma 吃完 *chīwán* consists of two morphemes. The first is a verb that indicates the means, which is ‘eating’ (ACT according to the categorisation by Beavers and Koontz-Garboden). The second morpheme indicates the result of this activity, which is its completion with the expected result (finishing the meal). Additionally, it represents the internal temporal and causal structure of the event. This syntagma is not fully lexicalised and cannot thus be included in the third type mentioned by Williams. However, there are compound words that are lexicalised verb-complement syntagmas in MC, such as the verb 打破 ‘to break’, which indicates both means – 打 *dǎ* ‘to hit’ and result – 破 *pò* ‘smashed’.

When discussing directionality in the context of resultativity, it is crucial to consider the aforementioned internal temporal structure of the event. The above considerations reveal certain regularities, but it is important to make them explicit in order to analyse the similarities between resultativity and directionality. As previously stated, an event described by a resultative predicate is not uniform, but rather comprises of sub-events that remain in specific temporal and cause-effect relationships. Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2001, 775) emphasise that these dependencies are not always coextensive; they may develop at different rates and temporal extents. In other words, the final outcome may not be immediate. Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2017, 846) refer to these researchers’ considerations and describe the resultative value of a predicate as a scalar change. According to them, the verb denotes a sub-event that develops scalarly and leads to a particular outcome. This approach appears more reasonable than treating the resultative event linearly because achieving a change of state must involve some build-up or development. It is important to note that although temporal relations are mentioned, they are not deictic. The time axis is irrelevant, and the development in time is only related to the internal temporal structure of the event. This relationship is referred to as a causal chain by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2001, 787), invoking Talmy’s (1976; 2007) theory. This article discusses the force-dynamics relationship, which involves the transmission of a force (the preceding sub-event, or ‘means’) and the resulting change of state or place. For instance, consider the phrase ‘to push something inside’. Here, the action of pushing corresponds to a force, while the direction inwards and the simultaneous change of position of the pushed object represent a dynamic change. A similar semantic structure can be observed in the Chinese directional verb-complement syntagma 推进去 *tuījìnqù*, which consists of three verbs: 推 *tuī* ‘to push’, 进 *jìn* ‘to enter’, and 去 *qù* ‘to move thither’. The first morpheme indicates the force that leads to a particular result, in this case, pushing something thither and inside. The other two morphemes indicate the direction in which the thing was pushed occupying a new place as a result. It is not without reason that ‘place’ appears in this theory alongside ‘state’. This is

because it can also be successfully applied to directional expressions, which will be further analysed below.

DIRECTIONALITY OF AN EVENT

Directionality and resultativity are often closely related and can even express similar meanings, especially in MC. Directionality is used to indicate the appropriate direction of a motion event and to communicate a change in the position of an object. The search for similarities between resultatives and directional expressions centres on this change. Although directionality is expressed differently in various languages, marking an event with it is an objective commentary on the reality, as is the case with resultativity. Directionality is dependent on the context and associated data of the movement, making it a key element in shaping the spatial and cognitive dimensions of language. Cognitive linguistics offers a valuable research perspective on directionality in language, investigating not only the linguistic construct but also the conceptualisation of movement and space. Leonard Talmy's work (e.g. 2007) has made an important contribution to this discussion. In his research on the expression of movement in language, Talmy introduces the concept of conflation, which is used to classify languages based on how the predicate conveys information about 'figure', 'motion', 'path', 'manner', and 'cause'. Talmy categorises the languages of the world into three types using this criterion. The first type uses "satellites" external to the verb structure to denote path, while the verb conveys information about motion and its manner. The second type expresses both movement and path in the verb, and the manner is conveyed through an additional phrase, such as an adverbial. The third type is characterised by verbs that denote both movement and figure. English, Finno-Ugric languages, and Chinese belong to the first type. Romance languages, Japanese, and Korean belong to the second type. The Atsugewi language belongs to the third type (Talmy 2007, 66, 72, 76, 88–89, 96–97). Therefore, MC is classified as a "satellite-framed language", where the path follows the manner in the structure of directional expressions. The satellite in question may be either a bound morpheme, i.e. an affix, or a free lexeme, that remains in a subordinate relation to the verb or its root. The latter is characteristic for MC. This theory has gained significant support and is frequently cited by researchers, including Washio (1997), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2001), and Beavers and Koontz-Garboden (2017). It has also been referenced by Chinese researchers such as Li (1997), Shi (2002), and Wang (2010), among others.

(3) I **ran out** of the house.¹

(4) 家犬神经兮兮跑来跑去，甚至跑出家门外²。

Jiā quǎn shénjīngxīxī pǎolái pǎoqù, shènzhì pǎochū jiāmén wài.

house dog nervously DVC = to run + to move hither DVC = to run + to move thither even

DVC = to run + to move outside house door outside

The family dog was running around nervously and even **ran out** of the house.

These examples demonstrate how ‘satellite-framed languages’ express the category of directionality in a sentence, as explained by Talmy. The difference between English and Chinese in this regard will be discussed in detail later. However, as the sentences above show, in the English example, the preposition ‘out’ serves as the satellite indicating the path. In contrast, a Chinese sentence with a comparable predicate demonstrates that the path is expressed through the verb that forms the DVC. To ensure clarity in both examples the satellites have been highlighted in bold.

Talmy’s force-dynamics and causal chain theory, already cited in the section devoted to the resultatives (Talmy 1976; 2000), is another aspect of his research relevant for directionality. This theory can be applied to the directional sentences, which are directly linked to the event of movement. Talmy provides a detailed description of this theory (2000, 409–70), but it can be summarised as follows: where there is a force, there is also a reaction. According to Talmy (1976, 53), there are two types of events: the caused event and the causing event. This theory can be applied to directional expressions, where the setting into motion and its maintenance correspond to the force (the causing event), while the course of motion and direction correspond to the reaction to that force (the caused event), as presented in the second section of this article. Similar to resultative expressions, the denoted event can be divided into at least two sub-events, even if only one verb is used. Just as resultatives inform about the sub-event preceding the achievement of the result-state change sub-event, directional expressions inform about the movement sub-event preceding the position change sub-event. In both cases, such sub-events are scalar and result from a causal chain. One entails the other.

The abovementioned similarities do not mean that there is no semantic difference between resultative and directional expressions. Firstly, resultatives are inherently terminative, whereas directional expressions are not. This means that an event terminated by a natural endpoint cannot be continued. For example, reading a book in its entirety simultaneously makes it impossible to continue reading it. Instead, you would need to start reading it again or begin reading another book, initiating a new event. Directionality does not imply a terminative endpoint. Giving a movement a direction does not

¹ Talmy (2007, 141).

² This and all other Chinese sentences below are sourced from the BCC corpus: <http://bcc.blcu.edu.cn>.

necessarily mean that the event has ended, as it can continue beyond the initial movement. For instance, leaving a house does not necessarily imply that the performer of the movement stops and goes no further. Instead, a turning point in the event's structure has been reached, which may or may not coincide with the endpoint. The main consideration, particularly in relation to MC, is that the pivotal moment being referred to could also signify the conclusion.

When comparing resultatives and directional expressions, it is important to also consider other arguments, e.g. transitivity. The classification of resultatives in language is not solely based on the structure of the event. Carrier and Randall (1992, 173) identify two types of resultatives: transitive and non-transitive. The transitivity of the verb in resultative expressions is also analysed by Rappaport Hovav and Levin (2001), as well as Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004). It requires the presence of an object in the sentence. A resultative expression followed by an object is considered transitive, and the resultative is semantically associated with a change in the state of the object denoted by the complement. Non-transitive resultatives, which naturally connect semantically with a change in the state of the person denoted by the subject, do not take an object. At the same time, it affects the argument structure of resultative sentences, making it a topic of interest for researchers analysing such sentences in the context of syntactic and semantic relations. Washio (1997, 7) proposes a different division, which also alludes to transitivity: strong resultatives and weak resultatives, based on the semantic conditions of the verbs and adjectives used in their structure. Strong resultatives are realised by a verb and an adjective that are completely unrelated in meaning. The second subcategory concerns configurations where the verb and adjective are semantically related, and the verb is transitive. When it comes to directional expressions, the argument structure of sentences with is also directly related to the main verb. If the subject of the sentence performs a movement described by the verb, then a direct object is naturally excluded because the verb is non-transitive. When the verb, which is then transitive, describes setting an object in motion, the argument structure of the sentence changes. It is necessary to include an object denoting what was set in motion. This similarity is another argument for considering resultative and directional structures in natural language as semantically related.

When analysing directional phrases, it is crucial to focus on the elements that directly indicate the direction of movement. These elements can include bound morphemes like affixes, dependent lexemes such as prepositions, and full lexemes like verbs. MC is characterised by the use of two types of verbs that indicate directional movement. The first type comprises the light verbs 去 *qù* 'to move thither' and 来 *lái* 'to move hither'. These verbs are limited to conveying information about the orientational direction of movement, without specifying the manner. The second type includes the words 上 *shàng* 'to move up', 下 *xià* 'to move down', 进 *jìn* 'to move inside', 出 *chū* 'to move

outside’, 过 *guò* ‘to pass’, 回 *huí* ‘to move back’, 起 *qǐ* ‘to rise’, and 开 *kāi* ‘to move away’. These verbs convey information about the vectorial direction in space and again, not the manner. Each verb listed can function as a predicate in a sentence and perform other functions based on its position in the sentence, as MC is an isolating language. Therefore, directional verbs in sinological linguistics are often discussed in the context of Chinese directional complements.

MANDARIN CHINESE RVCS AND DVCS

In MC, complements are frequently used as part of the verbal group. Semantically and syntactically, they complement the predicate’s content. They are postpositional to the predicate, which distinguishes them from the adverbials. Syntagmatic constructions are the most relevant complements for the present discussion, so no further explanation on other complements will be necessary. Resultative and directional syntagmas in MC consist of a main root verb and a complement, which can be a verb, an adjective, or a combination of verbs. In linguistics, this syntagma is referred to as a verb compound. Chinese resultative and directional complements have been extensively studied in the linguistics literature, so it is impossible to cite even a brief summary of proposed theories here. These can be found in the research of many linguists, including Thompson (1973), Miao (1990), Liu (1998), Zajdler (2005), Liang (2007), Li (2012), Hu (2012), to name a few. For the purposes of this article, a detailed overview of the research is not necessary.

The verb-complement syntagma consists of two or three words that can function independently. The relationship between them is hierarchical and determined solely by their position in the sentence structure. Zhang (2003, 59) describes this relationship as causal, which aligns with the general considerations outlined above. In this discussion, we will focus on two types of verb compounds: Resultative Verb Compounds and Directional Verb Compounds. Some researchers also identify Phase Verb Compounds (PVCs) (i.e. Yong 1997, 1). RVCs can also be referred to as cause-result compound verbs, based on their semantic properties (Wang 2010, 72–73). A resultative construction consists of a root verb, which is the core of the syntagma, and a verb or adjective (also classified as a stative verb) that acts as a complement extending the meaning of the syntagma to include the meaning of the result. The choice between a verb or an adjective as a complement has a significant impact on the semantics of the whole syntagma. This is because the adjective can convey additional information about the resulting state of the event. Non-stative verbs do not have the same properties as stative verbs. They only convey information about the result, which is an indefinite consequence and not a continuing

state. In contrast, stative verbs describe a continuing state that is the outcome of a situation. The following sentences illustrate this difference:

- (5) 你给我一块抹布，一桶水，我把你的柜台洗干净。
Nǐ gěi wǒ yī kuài mābù, yī tǒng shuǐ, wǒ bǎ nǐ de guìtái xǐgānjìng.
 2SG give 1SG 1 CLASS rag 1 bucket water 1SG PART 2SG PART countertop RVC = to wash + clean
 Give me a rag and a bucket of water and I will wash your countertop clean.
- (6) 我陪你去，帮你一起洗，让你尽快把衣服洗完。
Wǒ péi nǐ qù, bāng nǐ yìqǐ xǐ, ràng nǐ jǐnkuài bǎ yīfú xǐwán.
 1SG to accompany 2SG to move thither to help 2SG together to wash to let 2SG quickly PART clothes RVC = to wash + to finish
 I will go with you and help you wash, so you can finish washing your clothes quickly.

The examples above compare sentences that use the same verb ‘to wash’ (洗 *xǐ*), but with different resultative complements. In sentence (5), the complement is the adjective ‘clean’ (干净 *gānjìng*), which indicates the state of cleanliness achieved by washing. Example (6) is different in that the verb ‘to finish’ (完 *wán*) appears in the complement function. What is missing is the naming of the directly achieved state. It denotes a change in the situation which brings the event to a natural endpoint.

Directional verb-complement syntagmas are syntactically similar to RVCs. They consist of a root verb and a second, directional verb, or two directional verbs, functioning as complements. Adjectives do not appear in this type of syntagma. The result of such an event is a change of position rather than the attainment of a particular state. Therefore, this kind of syntagma can be called a cause-motion compound verb (Wang 2010, 72–73). Similar to the RVCs, the initial morpheme in the syntagma indicates the cause of the movement, while the second or second and third morpheme indicate the direction of the movement. Only the directional verbs mentioned in the previous section, including vectorial and orientational verbs, as well as combinations of both types, can function as directional complements. The only exception is the verb 起 *qǐ*, which only combines with 来 *lái* (Liu 1998, 1; Liang 2007, 1). The following examples illustrate all three options.

- (7) 我踏上洁白的路面，匆匆向机关走去。
Wǒ tàshàng jiébái de lùmiàn, cōngcōng xiàng jīguān zǒuqù.
 1SG to step foot pristine white PART road in a hurry towards the office DVC = to walk + to move thither
 I set foot on the pristine white road and hurriedly walked towards the office.
- (8) 走上楼梯的时候，我看到他们在行刑室被吊起来。
Zǒushàng lóutī de shíhòu, wǒ kàndào tāmen zài hángxíngshì bèi diàoqǐlái.
 DVC = to walk + to move up PART time 1SG RVC = to watch + to reach 3SG execution hall PASS to hang ASP = INCH
 As I walked up the stairs I saw them being hanged in the execution hall.

- (9) 因为就在上一层楼，所以他决定从楼梯走上去。

Yīnwèi jiù zài shàng yī céng lóu, suǒyǐ tā juéding cóng lóutī zǒushàngqù.

because just to be located high 1 floor so 3SG to decide from stairs DVC = to walk + to move up + to move thither

As it was on the upper floor, he decided to walk up the stairs.

Sentences (7)–(9) all use the root verb ‘to walk’ (走 *zǒu*) in a verb-complement structure, but each example includes a different directional complement: orientational ‘to move thither’ (去 *qù*), vectorial ‘to move up’ (上 *shàng*), and vectorial-orientational ‘to move up and thither’ (上去 *shàngqù*).

The given sentences illustrate the semantic structure of directional syntagms. The verb 走 *zǒu* expresses the movement and its manner, which is the causative sub-event. The verbs in the complement express the direction of the movement and, therefore, the sub-event to which the movement leads – a change of position. This is consistent with Talmy’s (2007) theory, which highlights the causal chain. According to Talmy’s research, the verb indicating movement and its manner drive the dynamic change of position expressed by the directional complement, which is considered a satellite. However, the movement and change introduced by the DVC are coextensive and cannot unfold in different temporal extents. Slobin (2004) and Wang (2010) take a polemical approach to Talmy’s research. The authors correctly note that in MC, the complement in question is not a preposition or a function word, but an independent lexeme that can have a predicative function. Therefore, they consider such a construction to be a series of verbs (Slobin 2004, 228; Wang 2010, 19–20). As a result, Slobin proposes to classify MC as an “equipollently-framed language”. However, it has to be noted, that in the case of RVCs, the complement syntactically depends on the root verb. This fits into the typology of isolating languages, where the position of the word indicates its function. The validity of this claim can be verified by a simple test, which is deleting one of the verbs in the syntagma. Removing the root verb is either impossible or changes the meaning of the sentence. The same procedure with the complement would deprive that meaning of only one component, the result or direction. Wang’s claim that the complement is not a compound verb but a composite of two stem verbs cannot be hence considered valid. Let us compare the slightly modified example (4) cited in the second part of the article with the following sentence (11), in which the root verb was taken out.

- (10) 它跑出门外。

Tā pǎo chū jiāmén wài.

3SG DVC=to run+to move outside house door outside

It ran out of the house.

- (11) 它出门外。

Tā chū jiāmén wài.

3SG to go out house door outside

It went out of the house.

As MC is an isolating language, the position of a word determinates its category and function. The word 出 *chū* can function as both the predicate and a part of it, as the resultative complement. When comparing sentences (10) and (11), we can observe a change in the categorisation of the word. 出 *chū* changes from a resultative complement (a satellite) to the main verb of the sentence (the predicate). Additionally, the meaning of the predicate is altered as it no longer specifies the mode of movement.

When considering the semantic similarities between RVCs and DVCs, it is important to take into account the temporal aspect of the event they describe. Some convergences can be observed in this field as well. RVCs that denote intrinsically non-temporal events cannot co-occur with the time complement, which indicates the duration of an event. Therefore, it is impossible to modify the sentence (1) as follows:

(12) * 我把你的柜台洗干净五分钟。

Wǒ bǎ nǐ de guìtái xǐgānjìng wǔ fēnzhōng.

1SG PART 2SG PART countertop RVC = to wash + clean 5 minute

* I will wash your countertop clean for 5 minutes.

Directional verbs, and as a consequence also some DVCs, allow for the appearance of a time complement in the sentence structure. However, this complement has a different meaning from that of other predicates. It does not indicate the duration of the denoted event, but rather the time that has passed since its occurrence.

(13) 只回来几天，整个家庭都载满了他在家的重量。

Zhǐ huílái jǐ tiān, zhěnggè jiātíng dōu zàimǎn le tā zàijiā de zhòngliàng.

only DVC = to go back + to move hither few days whole CLASS home all to weigh

ASP = PRF 3SG in house PART weight

He only returned a few days ago and the whole family felt the burden of him being home.

In the example above, the DVC 回来 *huílái* ‘to go back and move hither’ is followed by the time complement 几天 *jǐtiān* ‘a few days’, which, however, does not convey information about a journey of a few days, but a stay of a few days at home from the moment of return. This implies that the event denoted by DVCs, like RVCs, does not extend over time. They rather tend to focus on the final moments of an event. Therefore, the overarching category of completive complement is also adopted for them (McDonald 1994, 321).

In the discussion of the relationship between RVCs and DVCs, it is worth mentioning Thompson’s (1973, 362–65) argument, which straddles the boundary between syntactic

and semantic considerations. Both types of compounds allow for the formation of a more complex syntagma with a potential complement 得 *de* and 不 *bù*, which distinguishes them from compound words in MC. This compound syntagma indicates the potential (得 *de*) to make a change in the situation or the lack thereof (不 *bù*). It can refer either to a result of a terminative nature or a result of a change of position.

- (14) 她能做什么呢? 她逃得出去吗?

Tā néng zuò shénme ne? Tā táodechūqù ma?

3SG can to do what PART 3SG POT DVC = to flee + to go out + to move thither

What can she do? Is she able to flee outside?

- (15) 他们无处可逃, 也逃不出去。

Tāmen wúchùkětáo, yě táobùchūqù.

3PL NEG place can to flee also POT = NEG DVC = to flee + to go out + to move thither

They have no place to run, they also cannot flee outside.

The final argument in this analysis is that the DVCs have a tendency to metaphorise and even lexicalise. This includes situations where a directional complement is juxtaposed with a verb that does not indicate movement. These are known as “ostensibly directional complements” (Zajdler 2012, 329). Additionally, it is common for a DVC to undergo metaphorisation and have a resultative meaning. The semantic component of direction becomes irrelevant, and the achieved result becomes the focus.

- (16) 我心里在想着那块钱, 可是我没说出来。

Wǒ xīnlǐ zài xiǎng zhe nà kuài qián, kěshì wǒ méi shuōchūlái.

1SG ASP = PROG to think ASP = DUR that CLAS money bur 1SG NEG = PRF to speak out loud (DVC = to speak + to move outside + to move hither)

I was thinking about that yuan, but I didn't say it out loud.

In the above example, there is a syntagma 说出来 *shuōchūlái* that appears to be a DVC at first glance. However, in this case, it has been metaphorically used to mean ‘to say out loud’ instead of denoting movement or direction. Sometimes the metaphorization is even further developed. Liu (1998, 14–17) and Li (2012) describe DVCs that are essentially RVCs. Li calculated the percentage of directional complements that have resultative meaning based on corpus studies. For instance, the author discovered that i.e. the verb 起 *qǐ* has this meaning in 49% of cases (2012, 60), while 上 *shàng* has a percentage of up to 70% (2012, 35). This additionally illustrates the significant semantic similarity between DVCs and RVCs, which aligns with the aforementioned points. This topic among with the relationship between directionality and resultativity is an intriguing research area. The theoretical introduction provided here can serve as a foundation for further analysis of this phenomenon. However, due to space limitations,

this article cannot delve deeper into this subject, which will be undoubtedly expanded in future research.

SUMMARY

The aim of the analysis above was to compare the event-related categories of resultativity and directionality, particularly in the context of MC. The research collected and the proposed argumentation demonstrate that RVCs and DVCs are closely semantically and syntactically related, even though they ultimately extract different semantic features. Directional expressions do not necessarily assume the existence of a terminative natural endpoint, yet the temporal structure of the denoted event remains the same as of those denoted by the resultatives. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that RVCs and DVCs belong to the category of completive verb compounds. In both cases, the cause-effect chain leads to a change of state or position resulting in a new situation. The meaning of such VCs is the final outcome of the event, which often results in their analysis being conflated with research on resultativity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beavers, John, and Andrew Koontz-Garboden. 2017. "Result Verbs, Scalar Change, and the Typology of Motion Verbs." *Language* 93 (4): 842–76. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2017.0060>.
- Binnick, Robert. 1991. *Time and the Verb. A Guide to Tense and Aspect*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195062069.001.0001>.
- Bussmann, Hadumond, and Gregory Trauth. 1996. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203980057>.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar: Tense, Aspect and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carrier, Jill, and Janet Randall. 1992. "The Argument Structure and Syntactic Structure of Resultatives." *Linguistic Inquiry* 23 (2): 173–234.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Östen. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goldberg, Adele E., and Ray Jackendoff. 2004. "The English Resultative as a Family of Constructions." *Language* 80 (3): 532–68. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2004.0129>.
- Hu, Xiaohui 胡晓慧. 2012. *Hànyǔ qūxiàng dòngcí yǔfǎ huà wèntí yánjiū* 汉语趋向动词语法化问题研究 [A study on the grammaticalisation of Chinese directional verbs]. Guangxi Normal University Press.
- Karolak, Stanisław. 2005. *Semantyka i struktura aspektu w językach naturalnych*. Kielce: Wyższa Szkoła Umiejętności.

- Klein, Wolfgang, Ping Li, and Hemriette Hendriks. 2000. "Aspect and Assertion in Mandarin Chinese." *Natural Language & Linguistics Theory* 18 (4): 723–70. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006411825993>.
- Kokorniak, Iwona. 2018. *Aspectual Modelling of Mental Predicates in English and Polish: A Cognitive Linguistic Perspective*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Li, Fengxiang. 1997. "Cross-Linguistic Lexicalization Patterns: Diachronic Evidence from Verb-Complement Compounds in Chinese." *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 50 (3): 229–52. <https://doi.org/10.1524/stuf.1997.50.3.229>.
- Li, Yan 李燕. 2012. *Xiàndài hànǔ qūxiàng bǔyǔ fānhóu yánjiū* 现代汉语趋向补语范畴研究 [Research on directional complement category in Modern Chinese]. Nankai University Press.
- Liang, Yinfeng 梁银峰. 2007. *Hànyǔ qūxiàng dòngcí de yǔfǎ huà* 汉语趋向动词的语法化 [Grammaticalisation of Chinese directional verbs]. Xuelin Publishing House.
- Liu, Meichun. 2015. "Tense and Aspect in Mandarin Chinese." In *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Linguistics*, edited by William S-Y. Wang and Chaofen Sun, 274–89. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199856336.013.0070>.
- Liu, Yuehua 刘月华. 1998. *Qūxiàng bǔyǔ tōng shì* 趋向补语通释 [General explanation of directional complements]. Beijing Language and Culture University Press.
- McDonald, Edward. 1994. "Completive Verb Compounds in Modern Chinese: A New Look at an Old Problem." *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 22 (2): 317–62.
- Miao, Jin'an 缪锦安. 1990. *Hànyǔ de yǔyì jiégòu hé bǔyǔ xíngshì* 汉语的语义结构和补语形式 [Semantic Structure and Complement Forms in Chinese]. Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P., and Sergiej J. Jaxontov. 1988. "Typology of Resultative Constructions." In *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, Typological Studies in Language 12, translated by Bernard Comrie, edited by Vladimir P. Nedjalkov, 3–62. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.12.06ned>.
- Nowakowska, Małgorzata. 2020. *Rezultatywność w języku francuskim i polskim*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka, and Beth Levin. 2001. "An Event Structure Account of English Resultatives." *Language* 77 (4): 766–97. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2001.0221>.
- Shi, Yuzhi. 2002. *The Establishment of Modern Chinese Grammar. The Formation of the Resultative Construction and its Effects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.59>.
- Slobin, Dan I. 2004. "The Many Ways to Search for a Frog: Linguistic Typology and the Expression of Motion Events." In *Relating Events in Narrative*, vol. 2, *Typological and Contextual Perspectives*, edited by Sven Strömquist and Ludo Verhoeven, 219–57. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1976. "Semantic Causative Types." In *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 6, *The Grammar of Causative Constructions*, edited by Masayoshi Shibatani, 41–116. New York: Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368842_003.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantic*, vol. 1, *Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6847.001.0001>.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2007. "Lexical Typologies." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, edited by Timothy Shopen, 66–168. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511618437.002>.
- Thompson, Sandra. 1973. "Resultative Verb Compounds in Mandarin Chinese: A Case for Lexical Rules." *Language* 49 (2): 361–79. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412459>.

- Trask, Robert L. 1993. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203393369>.
- Wang, Qi. 2010. *Dòngcí duǎnyǔ jiégòu yánjiū* 动词短语结构研究 [A Study on Verb Phrase Structure]. Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press.
- Washio, Ryuichi. 1997. "Resultatives, Compositionality and Language Variation." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6 (1): 1–49. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008257704110>.
- Williams, Alexander. 2015. *Arguments in Syntax and Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139042864>.
- Yong, Shin. 1997. "The Grammatical Functions of Verb Complements in Mandarin Chinese." *Linguistics* 35 (1): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ling.1997.35.1.1>.
- Zajdler, Ewa. 2005. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka chińskiego. Składnia i Semantyka*. Warszawa: Dialog.
- Zajdler, Ewa. 2012. "Składniowe dopełnienie komplementywne jako kontekst gramatyczny kierunkowości i rezultatywności we współczesnym języku chińskim." In *Kognitywistyka*, vol. 3, *Empatia, obrazowanie i kontekst jako kategorie kognitywistyczne*, edited by Henryk Kardela, Zbysław Muszyński, and Maciej Rajewski, 327–39. Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.
- Zhang, Meilan. 2003. *Zǔtángjí yǔfǎ yánjiū* 《祖堂集》语法研究 [The Study on the Grammar of the *Anthology of the Patriarchal Hall*]. Henan University Press.
- BLCU Corpus Center corpus: <http://bcc.blcu.edu.cn>.

RESULTATIVITY AND MANDARIN CHINESE DIRECTIONAL VERB COMPOUNDS

Summary

Resultativity in natural language is closely tied to the category of aspect. It is semantically close to the perfective aspect, so it often receives little attention. The focus of this discussion is primarily on syntax, specifically how this category is realised in a sentence. Due to the typological differences between Mandarin Chinese and English or other Indo-European languages, the description of resultatives has to be oriented towards Chinese syntax, particularly Resultative Verb Compounds (RVCs). In addition to these verb-complement syntagmas, Directional Verb Compounds (DVCs) are also common in MC. Although directionality is not typically considered a category related to aspect or resultativity, there are visible similarities between Chinese RVCs and DVCs. This article aims to provide a general framework that outlines these categories and similarities between them. The semantic approach is especially relevant to this discussion, which adopts a basis of semantic research combined with cognitive linguistics.

Keywords: complement; resultative; directionality; DVC; RVC; Mandarin Chinese

KATEGORIA REZULTATYWNOŚCI I CHIŃSKIE
DOPEŁNIENIA KOMPLEMENTYWNE KIERUNKOWE

Streszczenie

Rezultatywność w języku naturalnym jest powiązana z kategorią aspektu i przez wielu aspektologów rozpatrywana w kontekście aspektu leksykalnego jako jego podkategoria. Jednocześnie jest semantycznie bliska dokonaności, w związku z czym często poświęca się jej niewiele uwagi. Przypadek języka chińskiego jest szczególnie – jego odmiennność typologiczna powoduje, że opis kategorii rezultatywności musi być ukierunkowany na konkretne rozwiązania syntaktyczne w tym języku. Powszechne są w nim rezultatywne syntagmy, których budowa podyktowana jest nieznanym w językach indoeuropejskich zjawiskiem składni wewnątrzwyrazowej. Funkcjonujące w chińszczyźnie dopełnienia rezultatywne są istotną częścią badań aspektologicznych – szczególnie dlatego, że jako nośniki rezultatywności są odrębne od aspektu dokonanego, realizowanego przez partykuły aspektowe. Obok tych dopełnień w języku chińskim powszechnie używane są dopełnienia kierunkowe. Choć pozornie kierunkowość nie jest kategorią powiązaną z aspektem, a co za tym idzie również z rezultatywnością, to są pokrewne i istnieją takie konteksty, w których dopełnienia kierunkowe mogą mieć wartość rezultatywną lub semantycznie zbliżoną. Celem niniejszego artykułu jest omówienie kategorii rezultatywności w kontekście chińskich dopełnień komplementywnych kierunkowych.

Słowa kluczowe: dopełnienie komplementywne; rezultatywność; kierunkowość; aspekt; język chiński