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1. Verb-framed languages and resultative secondary predicates

The presence of resultative secondary predicates (ResSP) is taken to be a robust correlate of ‘satellite-framed’ languages (Talmy 1975, 1985, 2000, a.o.). However, it also appears that languages which might be classified as ‘verb-framed’ under other diagnostics do tolerate some restricted types of resultativity. In order to better understand the sources and limits of the ‘resultative parameter’ (Kratzer 2005), this paper investigates the nature of a largely ignored construction with resultative semantics in Romanian (Romance), the BARE NOUN RESULT (BnRES). These data indicate that cross-linguistic variation in the construction of ResSP is dependent on (at least) two factors: a) distinctions in the featural composition of the functional projections constructing resultativity; b) whether resultativity is dependent on telicity/syntactic directed motion or not (see also Folli and Harley 2006). The paper proposes that the BnRES contains a functional projection specified as TURN-INTO, which introduces a resultative NP, in the absence of syntactic composition of manner and directed motion.

2. The ‘resultative parameter’ (Kratzer 2005)

Starting with Talmy’s (1975, 1985, 2000) formalization of cross-linguistic differences in the expression of motion, a thorny issue in subatomic semantics has been the variation in the realization of adjectival secondary predicates (Dowty 1979, Goldberg 1995, Mateu and Rigau 2002, Borer 2005, Kratzer 2005, Snyder 2001, Zubizarreta and Oh 2007, Acedo-Matellán 2010, etc.). As is well known, English sentences like (1), in which the
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adjectival secondary predicate (SP) carries the interpretation of a result triggered by the main predicate’s event are impossible/non-robust throughout the so-called ‘verb-framed’ language families (Romance, Slavic, Semitic, Turkic, etc.). The absence is even more surprising given the observation that (at least some of) such languages do allow adjectival SPs, whose semantics is generally restricted to non-results (depictive, inchoative, etc.). This is shown in the sentence in (2) from Romanian (Romance), a language in which adjectival SPs with resultative semantics are ill-formed:

(1) **ENGLISH**
The lake has frozen *solid*.

(2) **ROMANIAN (ROMANCE) – NO ADJ. RESSP**
Lacul a înghețat *solid*.
lake.the.NOM. has frozen solid.F.SG.NOM₁.

*Resultative reading:* IMPOSSIBLE
*Depictive reading only:* ‘The lake has undergone the action of freezing, but it was already solid at the initial point of and during the eventuality of freezing.’

However, Romanian does not seem to completely lack RESSPs. Surprisingly, if the SP is a *bare noun*, robust resultative meanings are obtained, as shown in (3):

(3) **ROMANIAN (ROMANCE)**
Lacul a înghețat *bocnă/tun*.
lake.the.NOM. has frozen rock (or ice-block)/cannon
‘The lake has frozen into stone/cannon.’

Despite their apparently ‘metaphorical’ readings, such examples do not form a restricted class as one would expect if they were true idioms. Moreover, they do exhibit some overt resultative morphology (as shown in section Section 5, example 21). Hence they raise non-trivial questions about the nature of resultativity, its typology (Washio 1997), as well as the ‘verb-framed’ vs. ‘satellite-framed’ split.

3. **Subatomic investigations: Manner, Motion, and Path**

The contribution of Romanian examples like (3) is important given that the vast research dedicated to the topic has repeatedly shown that a principled explanation of the nature of resultativity, as well as the limits of this cross-linguistic split are still open questions. Two theoretical incarnations are seen in the literature. From a classic semantic perspective, ResSPs are conceptualized as complex causative constructions in which the adjective is the ‘goal’ found in a relation of directed motion/cause with the matrix predicate (Dowty 1979):

(4) **He sweeps the floor clean.**

[[He sweeps the floor] *cause [become [the floor is clean]]]*

---

₁Abbreviations: 1, 2, 3 = person, ACC. = accusative, CL. = clitic, DAT. = dative, EPENTH. = epenthetic (vowel), F. = feminine, INF. = infinitive, M. = masculine, NOM. = nominative, PL. = plural, PST. = past, PST. PRT. = past participle, SG. = singular, SPECF. = specific, SUP. = supine, TRNSL. = translative (Case).
From a morpho-syntactic perspective, most contemporary formal accounts implement Talmy’s (1975, 1985, 2000) intuitions. Under these assumptions, in languages like English a process of conflation (understood as direct merge) of Manner and (delimited) Motion is active; Romance, on the other hand, blocks such direct merge. The impossibility of Manner and Motion conflation in Romance is what explains the absence of ResSPs and similar directed motion constructions. This is further shown in Table 1, using Talmy’s examples for English (see also Borer 1994, Ritter and Rosen 1998, Mateu and Rigau 2002, Snyder 2001, Zubizarreta and Oh 2007, Acedo-Matellán 2010, a.o. for more remarks on the connection between the formation of resultative secondary predicates and the manner-of-motion construction).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SATELLITE-FRAMED (SF, ex. English)</strong></th>
<th><strong>VERB-FRAMED (VF, ex. Romanian)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- conflation of manner and dynamic motion</td>
<td>- manner and dynamic motion exclude each other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roll**: Move + manner

1. The rock rolled down the hill.
   (a) *Directed motion reading*: the ball got down the hill by rolling
   (b) *Locational reading*: the ball was at the foot of the hill while rolling
   → impossible under directed motion reading
   → possible under a locational reading only (the ball was at the foot of the hill while rolling)

2. I scared him out of his hiding place.
   (example from Talmy, 2000)
   → impossible

**Table 1. Satellite vs. verb-framed languages**

Syntactically, recent implementations of resultativity (see especially Mateu 2011) assume that a process of ‘direct/external merge’ (or conflation) of a root (standing for the manner component) with a dynamic motion light verb is what accounts for the construction of resultativity and manner-of-motion (as schematically shown in 5). Crucially, this type of syntactic conflation is absent in (many) verb-framed languages, among which Romance:

(5) **MANNER AND MOTION CONFLATION**

```
      .....  
     / \  
    CAUSE /   
       / \  
      float  Result 
         / \  
        /   \  
  vGO  'float  'manner' component  
    /  
  main translational motion  self-contained motion (oscillation, rotation, etc.)
```
The generalization is that in order to allow resultative secondary predicates, a language must at least conflate \textsc{motion} with dynamic/non-stative manners. The question is then: if Romanian does not permit the relevant type of syntactic process responsible for the assembly for ResSPs, what is the nature of the BnRes? In order to provide the answer to this problem, it is necessary to first present the characteristics of this puzzling class. This is the topic of section (4).

4. \textbf{Bare Noun Resultatives: the limits of the class}

Interestingly, Romanian \textit{Bare Noun Resultatives} (BnRes) are possible in bi-eventive configurations under semantic lexicalization patterns seen with canonical AdjRes in typical satellite framed languages. This is shown by the parallel examples below from Romanian and two typical adjectival Res. languages (Icelandic, Hungarian):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(6)] \begin{tabular}{ll}
\textsc{Verb-framed} & \textsc{Satellite-framed} \\
\textsc{Romanian} & \textsc{Icelandic} \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{enumerate}
\item a) \textsc{A răci cobză}. \textsc{a')} Hann öskraði hálsin sinn \textbf{hásan}. To catch cold violin \textsc{He shout.pst. throat.the. his hoarse.} \textsc{→ the voice sounds coarse as a result of catching a cold/shouting} \\
\textsc{Romanian} & \textsc{Hungarian} (Surányi 2010: p. 55, fn. 20, ii) \\
\item b) \textsc{A îngheța bocnă}. \textsc{b')} János kövé dermedt. \textsc{To freeze stone/ice. Janos stone-TRNSL. froze.} \textsc{‘To freeze stiff like a stone’}. \textsc{‘Janos froze stiff like a stone’}. \\
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

BnRes might appear to trigger metaphoric extensions which could indicate an idiomatic nature; nevertheless, the construction is robust, with new members being created easily. More examples are provided in (7):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(7)] \textsc{Romanian}
\begin{enumerate}
\item a) \textsc{A bate măr}. \textsc{To beat apple.} \textsc{‘To beat up somebody until they become like an apple (red).’} \\
\item b) \textsc{A adormi buștean}. \textsc{To fall asleep log.} \textsc{‘To fall asleep into a log’ (so deeply so that you become a log).’} \\
\item c) \textsc{A curăța (casa) lună/ oglindă} \textsc{to clean house.the moon/ mirror.} \textsc{‘To clean (the house) and as a result it becomes (like the) moon (= spotless)’.} \\
\end{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

One important distinction between the Romanian BnRes and the canonical AdjRes in satellite-framed languages is that the former are also possible with (stative) adjectives. In such examples the interpretation the BnRes obtains appears to be intuitively related to a ‘high degree’ specification of a characteristic/state. This is illustrated in (8) below. As expected under an ‘intensification’ interpretation, overt degrees of comparison with adjectives are not possible if the BnRes is present:
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(8) a) supărat/deştept/frumos foc; b) prost grămadă
‘angry/smart/beautiful/ to the extent of idiot to the extent of being like a pile’
turning into fire (= red/bright)

(9) *foarte/*mai îngheţaţi bocnă (cf. 6b)
very/more frozen. M.PL. stone.

However, there is also compelling evidence that the source of intensification with BNRES. is not syntactically the same as in canonical degree of comparison formation. For example, overt degree morphology normally precedes Romanian adjectives\(^2\) (10), while BNRES. can only be seen post adjectivally/verbally (10, 11 and 12 vs. 7 and 8). This syntactic behavior rather unites them with other types of secondary predicates (e.g. depictives) which can only follow the main predicate (as seen in 13):

(10) foarte frumos/mai frumos/*frumos foarte/*frumos mai.
very beautiful/more beautiful/beautiful very beautiful more.
‘very/more beautiful.’

(11) *foc frumos\(^3\)/supărat/deştept/frumos
fire beautiful/angry/smart/beautiful

(12) *a lună curăţa (*to moon clean)

(13) ROMANIAN DEPICTIVE – POSTVERBAL POSITION
a alerga vesel/*a vesel alerga/*vesel a alerga
to run cheerful/to cheerful run/cheerful to run
‘to run cheerful’ (to run and be cheerful while running).

Another puzzling property of ‘stative’ BNRES is that they are possible only if attached to those (adjectival) roots which can also surface as verbs; no examples of category-immutable adjectival primary predicates could be found with BNRES. Also, BNRES are preserved when the primary predicate root is nominalized (although some nominalization strategies are excluded). A morphological decomposition of the nominalizations is provided under the sentence in (14):

(14) Preserved under transcategorical alternations, with very subtle restrictions:
Curăţenie/*curăţare/curat lună este ceea ce îmi doresc.
Cleanness/cleaning/cleaning. SUP. moon is that what I.DAT. desire
‘Cleanness/cleaning moon is what I want.’ (stative/state result/action reading)

\(^2\) Romanian degrees of comparison can only be formed analytically.

\(^3\) Some BNRES. can take a preposed position only if the linker *de* (morphologically identical to the preposition *de* of, from’) intervenes, forming a pattern which is formally similar to the well-known ‘N de N’ construction in Romance:

i) foc de frumos.
fire of beautiful
‘beautiful fire’
curățenie = √curat + Epenth. V. *e* + Noun suffix:*- nie
curățare = √curat + Inf. – *a* + Nominalization (action) suffix:*- re
curat = √curat + Ø nominalization (action) [the supine pattern]

V→Adj. casă curățată/curățată lună. (cf.7c)
house.F.SG. clean. F.SG./cleaned.PST.PRT.F.SG. moon.
‘House clean/cleaned moon (= spotless).’

Adj. → V a supără/a se dăbeşte/a se face frumos foc.
to make angry/to SE become smart/to SE make handsome fire.
‘to make angry/to become smart/to become handsome fire.’

Such constructions can only be internal-argument oriented; there don’t appear to be any examples in which the result could be predicated of an external argument or indirect object. Therefore, BnRES don’t seem to be possible with verbs that would qualify as unergatives (*smile, laugh*, etc.). This is a property they share with adjectival resultatives in languages like English. But, as opposed to canonical resultatives in satellite-framed languages they do not trigger obligatory telicity/delimitation. When tested under the ‘in/for’ diagnostics, Romanian BnRES give rise to a quantization puzzle (see Filip 1999, among others), in that *both* temporal adverbials are acceptable. Note that the ‘for’ adverbiais does *not* trigger an iterative reading:

(15) Hoţul a bătut oamenii măr în zece minute/timp de zece minute.
‘The thief has beaten the people up in ten minutes/for ten minutes.’

Acceptability with both tests might indicate that the BnRES is a type of adjunct; the *in/for* phrases could be taken to target the main predicate only, with variation being due to its alternating aspectual make-up. But this assumption is problematic in several respects. First of all, BnRES do not behave like typical adjuncts, which in Romanian (as elsewhere) permit syntactic variability. With the exception of a past participial with the semantics of turn in (which will be discussed in detail in the next section) no other material can occur between the main predicate and the BnRES:

(16) *a curăţa casa pe care a cumpărat-o oglindă a curăţa oglindă casa…..
to clean house.the Acc. that has bought it mirror/ to clean mirror house.the.

BnRES are also morphologically different from other instances of ‘adverbial nouns’ with temporal or spatial interpretations. Under such uses Romanian nouns normally show definiteness marking, or allow both definite and indefinite inflections depending on readings related to a broad stage-level/individual-level distinction:

(17) El nu lucrează duminica.
He not works Sunday.the
‘He doesn’t work on Sunday (in general).’
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(18) El nu lucrează duminică.
    He not works Sunday.
    ‘He doesn’t work on Sunday (this coming Sunday, not in general).

BNRES on the other hand must be bare. No DP-related functional material (det., plural, quantifiers, degree, etc.) is ever possible:

(19) a bate oamenii măr/*mere/*un măr/*mărul.
    to beat people.the apple/*apple.pl/*an apple/*apple.the

The BNRES is hence a mysterious construction with resultative semantics in a language which does not usually tolerate resultative secondary predicates. Its robust presence, combinatorial permissibility with verbs of various aspectual (aktionsart) types, regardless of transitivity status, as well as its preservation under transcategorical alternations are other interesting facets. And even more unexpected is its syntactic behavior as a typical complement (as opposed to adjunct), although it fails the telicity test. Section 5 provides an analysis that can account for these properties, and clarifies the nature of resultativity in a resultative-less language.

5. Why not adjectival secondary predicates?

Given the characteristics listed in section 4, three questions are particularly salient: i) what is the nature of the BNRES? b) if resultativity is available in a verb-framed language, how is it constructed? c) why are Adj. Res. impossible? This section proposes an analysis whose main line of argumentation is that conflation of manner and directed motion is not the only resultative strategy. A second option is made available by UG: conflation of a static v encoding a static scale set to its highest degree/a static maximal PATH with a (verbal manner) root can also construct resultativity. The difference between Romanian and English basically reduces to the following parameter: if in English a \( v_{\text{go}} \) representing dynamic motion can be conflated with a root encoding manner, in Romanian motion conflation can only be possible if the ‘motion’ component is static. Intensification/degree specifications can be seen as the ‘static’ correspondent of motion; they specify that an eventuality holds to its highest degree. But as the crucial ingredient is ‘static motion’, the functional projection introducing the SP, cannot be a dynamic RESULT/BECOME head. What is expected instead is a ‘static becoming’. As will be seen shortly, a functional projection specified as TURN INTO can play this role.

In order to implement the analysis more formally, remember Dowty’s entry for ResSP, provided in (4) and repeated in (20) below:

(20) He sweeps the floor clean.  
    (Dowty 1979, p.93, ex.5)
    [[He sweeps the floor] CAUSE [BECOME [the floor is clean]]]

ResSPs trigger the coming into being of an eventuality as a result of the eventuality of the matrix predicates. As already shown in (5), recent syntactic accounts also assume
that resultative secondary predicates are realized by a special process of conflation/direct merge of a root containing the manner component and a \( v \) with the semantics of dynamic/directed motion or cause.

If Romanian cannot conflate \textsc{motion} with \textsc{manner}, how is the \textsc{bnres} constructed? The answer proposed in this paper is that both resultative functional projections (\( v_{\text{go}} \) and \textsc{res.}) come in (at least two) sub-varieties. One way to avoid the impossibility of \textsc{motion} with \textsc{manner} conflation but still assemble resultativity is if a projection that contains the semantics of \textit{independent becoming} is selected. More specifically, if a ‘becoming’ could be realized without the causing intervention of another eventuality, further allowing two predicates to be merged, what would be obtained is resultativity which is rather static. The Romanian examples are obtained by specifying the main eventuality to the highest degree such that a comparison with a \textsc{turning into} of a new entity/eventuality becomes possible. Crucially, such mergers involve static categories. Functional heads specified as \textsc{turn into} appear to signal the coming into being of eventualities/individuals in a ‘static’ independent way; thus the input of another causing eventuality is not necessarily required.

Interestingly, the Romanian \textsc{bnres}. does contain an overt head whose semantics appears to be that of \textsc{turn into} – the participial \textsc{făcut} (from the verb \textit{face} – ‘to make’, ‘to do’, ‘to create’; here seen under its reflexive-inchoative reading \textit{a se face} – ‘to turn into’). This is illustrated in example (21). Note that if the participial \textsc{făcut} is replaced by the participial of \textit{become (devenit)}, or \textit{create (created)} the construction becomes ungrammatical (22 and 23):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(21)] \textsc{proști făcuți} grămadă/*grămezi]\textsuperscript{.} \textit{idiot/stupid. M.PL. turned into. PST.PRT M.PL. pile/*pile.F.PL.}
  \textit{‘idiot(plural) turned into pile’}
  \item[(22)] *\textsc{proști deveniți} grămadă/*grămezi. \textit{idiot/stupid. M.PL. become. PST.PRT.M.PL. pile/*pile. F.PL.}
  \textit{‘idiot(plural) who have become (a) pile’}
  \item[(23)] *\textsc{proști creați} grămadă/*grămezi. \textit{idiot/stupid. M.PL. created. PST.PRT.M.PL. pile/*pile. F.PL.}
  \textit{(OK, under a non-resultative reading)}
\end{itemize}

More explicitly, the Romanian strategy is to create an independent eventuality/entity that comes into being separately and to attach it to the main eventuality via a non-resultative (depictive, comparative) head:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(24)] ...... \textsc{asp}
    \begin{itemize}
      \item \textsc{asp} \textsc{v}
        \begin{itemize}
          \item \textsc{v} \textsc{direct merge/conflation}
            \begin{itemize}
              \item \textsc{dep} \textsc{path/scale_max} \textsc{v/a}
                \begin{itemize}
                  \item \textsc{dep} ‘as’ \textsc{turn into}
                    \begin{itemize}
                      \item \textsc{√freeze} \textsc{v/a} \textsc{turn-into} \textsc{√stone}
                    \end{itemize}
                \end{itemize}
            \end{itemize}
        \end{itemize}
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
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This structural specification can explain the quantization puzzle, introduced in example (15) and repeated here under (25); the PP can attach to the TURN-INTO NP or to the activity beat:

(25) Hoţul a bătut oamenii măr în zece minute/
Thief.the has beat people.pl.the apple in ten minutes
timp de zece minute.
time of ten minutes.
‘The thief has beaten the people up for ten minutes/in ten minutes.’

The featural/structural make-up of this type of resultative not only explains its ‘static’ nature, but also its interactions with intensification interpretations. PATH/SCALE$_\text{MAX}$ is a static functional projection, which specifies the root it conflates with as holding to its highest degree. In other words, we are dealing here with ‘static motion’, if one can say so. TURN-INTO is also normally non-durative; it appears to be required in contexts which entail a sudden transformation. Cross-linguistically, these types of instantaneous, independent changes of state impose categorical restrictions, in that they seem to allow nouns only. Hence, the exclusive presence of nouns is due to the categorical constraints imposed by the functional projection.

As in other language, overt TURN INTO projections selecting nouns cannot be replaced by BECOME heads. Examine the fragments below from a Romanian fairy tale. The eventualities of turning into bird or stone are intended to be instantaneous given the plot of the story – a princess tries to run away from a monster. The (more) durative BECOME would be at least infelicitous in such instances, while the overt TRANSFORM is more accurate and closely renders the intended readings:

(26) …S-a ascuns în cameră,….zmeul a dat năvală supărat foc; ea s-a făcut pasăre imediat, si a zburat; zmeul a încercat să o prindă, însă ea s-a făcut stană de piatră…. (Romanian fairy tale)

(27) … (the princess) hid in her room, but the monster burst in, being angry (to the point of turning into) fire; the princess turned into a bird immediately and flew away; the monster tried to reach her, but she turned into a rock (in order to avoid her being caught by the monster)….

(28) ……… *a devenit pasăre,….., * a devenit stană de piatră…. 
(a deveni = become)

(29) ……… s-a transformat în pasăre (transformed herself into a bird)

All these structural correlates can explain other differences between the static resultatives in Romanian, and the canonical dynamic resultatives in English. As is well known, English resultatives of the pound flat type can be constructed from activities, while states and achievements are normally excluded (see Rapoport 1992, a.o.), due to their dynamic specification on the one hand, and the non-instantaneous motion projection on the other hand. The Romanian BnRES is possible with achievements (a răci cobză, as in 6a) and states (the adjectival examples in 8).
Adjuncts are inherently gradable; what we see above is the state that holds (at the initial or) final stage of the scale.

6. Conclusions and further questions

This short paper has examined the nature of a puzzling construction with resultative semantics, the bare noun result (BNRES), in a language in which resultative secondary predicates are normally excluded. After an analysis of its properties, it was shown that as opposed to better known dynamic resultatives from English, the BNRES is assembled from static ingredients. The ‘motion’ component is in fact a functional projection whose specification is that the eventuality holds to its highest degree (PATH/SCALE_{MAX}). The category obtained after the direct merge of PATH/SCALE_{MAX} with a root further merges with a TURN INTO functional projection, as opposed to a more dynamic BECOME/RES in satellite-framed languages like English. Regarding the big picture, it has also been proposed that cross-linguistic variation in the construction of ResSPs is sensitive to two factors: a) distinctions in the featural composition of the functional projection constructing resultativity; b) whether resultativity is dependent on telicity/syntactic directed motion or not (see also Folli and Harley 2006). Languages that do not compose manner and directed motion syntactically can build ResSPs via the use of a maximal scale/path ingredient. This analysis supports the findings reached by Folli and Harley (2006) who conclusively demonstrate that telicity might not be necessary for the formation of motion causatives and ECM resultatives in English, although it can be a property of such constructions. However, the account presented here is preliminary, as not much is known about the interactions between stativity and resultativity. An analysis following Dowty’s (1979) lines obviously blocks stative main predications from merging with resultatives. The same conclusion is emphasized by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) who assume that stative main predicates cannot function as matrix predicates in resultatives because of restrictions pertaining to the ontology of events: there are no delimited states (see Simpson’s 1983 classic deviant sentence *Medusa saw the hero into stone*). However, there are languages (for example, Mandarin Chinese; see Li 2008, among others) where true stative predicates are possible in resultative constructions. Another aspect which needs further investigation is the prohibition of DP-related material on the bare noun results in Romanian. Kratzer (2005) notices a similar restriction in German: adjectives functioning as resultative secondary predicates cannot carry inflection, although (attributive) adjectives can be inflected in the language. The explanation provided is that resultatives are subject to a process of serialization at root-level, which implies that no further functional material is possible above the adjectival root: “resultative(s)…are marginal cases of serialization that are possible in German or English (but not in Romance, for example) because in those languages, adjectival roots cannot enter syntactic derivations without inflection” (Kratzer 2005, page 177). This would predict that adjectives functioning as resultative secondary predicates must be bare. However, such restriction does not hold cross-linguistically. One famous example is provided by Icelandic, a satellite-framed language with robust adjectival secondary predicates. What one sees in Icelandic is that adjectival
resultatives must be highly inflected, the only morphological marking absent being that for definiteness.

(30) Icelandic
Hann öskraði hálsin sinn hásan.
He shout.PST. throat.M.SG.ACC.the his.ACC. hoarse.M.SG.ACC.
‘He shouted his throat hoarse.’

Such examples indicate that there is further parametric variation in the construction of resultatives, whose nature is still to be understood.
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