



Research Article

© 2024 Aida Kurani and Anisa Trifoni.
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

Received: 21 March 2024 / Accepted: 28 May 2024 / Published: 5 May 2024

A Contrastive Study of Resultative Constructions in Albanian and Other Languages

Aida Kurani¹

Anisa Trifoni²

¹Doc. Dr., Aleksandër Moisiu University of Durrës,
Durrës, Albania

²Dr., Aleksandër Moisiu University of Durrës,
Durrës, Albania

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2024-0072>

Abstract

In the last two or three decades, linguists have paid great attention to certain ways and means of expressing result, especially in English and other Germanic languages, but also in Neo-Latin and Slavic languages, as well as in Chinese, Japanese, Korean and the like. As Zhang (2009) notes, resultative constructions have a prominent place in contemporary linguistic studies, because they shed light on the nature of relationship between semantics and syntax. They have been examined not only based on the syntactic composition, but also on the structure of argument and lexical semantics. Formal analysis instruments, as well as functional and cognitive ones have been already used. However, the last word has not yet been said, since there are many other languages where the concept of result and the elements used to express it have not been examined deeply enough. This is especially true for languages spoken outside the Eurasian continent, but also for languages within this area, including Albanian. The following study is focused on different syntactic patterns by which the concept of result is codified in several languages belonging to different families, with the belief that this analysis will help to determine the position of Albanian language amidst these languages concerning resultative constructions in general.

Keywords: resultative constructions, Albanian language, syntax subordinate clause, typology

1. Introduction

Resultative constructions are part of the syntactic constructions that are placed amidst different syntactical units such as: units of time, units of place, conditional units, permissive units, etc. Traditionally, in Albanian syntax, they have been examined in the framework of complex sentence syntax and in particular complex sentences with circumstantial subordinate clauses.

Taking a comprehensive look at the resultative constructions, which are the object of our study, we have expressed the **cause-and-effect** relationship, with the aim of adding to previous studies, even the hypothesis of studying them in simple sentences.

The philosophical concept of **cause-effect** relationship does not exist in all cultures, therefore it is not codified in every language, which means that there are languages that do not have resultative constructions at all. However, it can be said that resultative constructions are common in most languages, but these languages conceptualize the meaning of the result in diverse ways, so there are

both similarities and differences, either between different language families or even within the same family.

Therefore, in our paper we focused on the different syntactic models according to which certain languages belonging to different families codify the meaning of result, with the conviction that this will help to determine the place of Albanian language among these languages, in relation to the resultative constructions in general. We will start with a short typology of these constructions in different languages, focusing, in particular, on their description in English (in the quality of the international language, but also as the first language with which Albanian language exchanges today in every field of scientific, economic, cultural, political, military life, etc.), we will also provide some suggestions that we think are useful for a more accurate formal expression of the resultative meanings in these languages.

2. Literature Review

The review of literature is based on grammars and studies on the Albanian language, from the most recent to some of the earliest ones: Academy of Sciences, Albanian Language Grammar II, Akademia e Shkencave e Shqipërisë (1996), Camaj (1984), Cipo (1952), Domi (1969), Floqi (1965), Prifti (1971), Sheperi (1927), Totoni (1990), Totoni (2000), Mikeli (1916), Rrota (1943) Xhuvani (1922). From the above studies on resultative sentences, we notice that the interest shown in resultative constructions has not been absent in Albanian grammar or syntactic studies, but the treatment of the topic in question has been incomplete. Although each of the above-mentioned authors has contributed to the recognition and treatment of the resultative sentence, the educational purpose and often scholastic character of their point of view has made their treatment incomplete.

In relation to this syntactic unit, there has been no in-depth study. So, in general, we can say that the consequence of the event or state indicated in the main sentence is expressed through the resultative constructions: their definition and their features are given in approximately the same way, without many changes.

Thus, the resultative constructions have not been examined in their entirety, but they have been limited to the treatment of complex sentences with subordinate resultative clauses. They have been viewed from the perspective of complex sentence syntax and particularly complex sentences with circumstantial subordinate clauses. But, in addition to complex sentences with subordinate clauses, they can also be expressed with simple sentences, with compound sentences, with complex sentences, with sentences without connectors, as well as beyond the complex sentence, at the text level. Therefore, we found it appropriate to dwell upon the approaches of researchers' latest foreign language theories: Dowty (1979), Simpson (1983), Hoekstra (1988), Nedjalkov (1988), Talmy (1991, 2000), Carrier and Randall (1992), Napoli (1992), Kuzar (1998), Levin and Hovav (1994), Wechsler (1997), Rappaport Hovav and Levin (1998), Boas (2003) and Goldberg and Jackendoff (2004). We will start with a short typology of these sentences in different languages, by focusing especially in their description in English (as an international language, but also as the first language with which Albanian language exchanges today in every moment and in every field of scientific, economic, cultural, political, military life, etc.), we will also provide some suggestions that we think are useful for a more accurate formal expression of the resultative meanings in these languages.

3. Methodology

Our methodological approach is primarily descriptive and comparative. Starting from the methodological principles of comparative linguistics, we have tried to give a typological reflection of resultative constructions in different languages of the world, with the conviction that such a thing helps to determine the place of Albanian language among these languages in relation to resultative constructions in general. Such comparisons, in addition to allowing the study of differences between languages, also increase students' linguistic awareness for a non-spontaneous acquisition of the

language. Such studies are also useful for teachers dealing with foreign language teaching. In this study we have also used the statistical method. In the light of contemporary linguistics, the method of comparison plays a significant role in the acquisition of a foreign language, and it should definitely be compared with the mother tongue and other languages known by students. The comparative method has played a decisive role in the scientific research of modern linguistics, consequently, it can be successfully used in teaching as well.

4. The Typology of the Ways and Means of Expressing Result

It has been estimated that out of about six thousand languages spoken in the world, only about a tenth of them are studied at least to some extent, therefore, like any other linguistic phenomenon, even for resultative constructions cannot be made absolute generalizations nor can be given a complete typology of them. However, we think that an overview of expressing results in various languages will not only help us to create a general idea about their nature, but it will also give us the opportunity to raise several issues of theoretical importance. Kurani, A. (2011)

The philosophical concept of cause-effect relationship does not exist in all cultures; therefore, not every language codifies this concept, which means that there are languages that do not have resultative constructions. Nevertheless, it can be said that such constructions are common in most languages, but these languages conceptualize the meaning of result in different ways. For this reason, there are similarities as well as differences not only among different language families, but also within the same family.

Dahl (1985, 134-135) notes that the term "result" can be used in two meanings, a broad one and a narrow one. In the broader sense, everything that causes an event can be said to be a consequence of that event. Thus, for example, the joy we can feel is likely to come because of the success we have achieved, likewise, boredom or sadness may be the result of failure, loss etc. Whereas in the narrow sense, a state is seen as a consequence of an event that has an intrinsic connection with this state. Thus, for example, the healing of a person brings as a result the state of being "healed"¹. Furthermore, it is possible to distinguish another dichotomy in the meanings expressed by result; the one between a meaning that we are referring to as "internal" and the one we are referring to as "external". To clarify our point, let us take the following three sentences in English:

- a. *John hammered the metal flat.*
"Xhoni **shtyp**i (ose **petëzoi**) metalin" ("Xhoni rrahu metalin **të shtypur**.")
- b. *John hammered the metal; consequently, the metal became flat.*
"Xhoni rrahu metalin; **si rrjedhim, metali u bë i shtypur**."
- c. *John hammered the metal; consequently, the neighbors woke up.*
"Xhoni rrahu metalin; **si rrjedhim, fqinjët u zgjuan**."

As you can see, sentence (1b) is structurally similar to sentence (1c), but semantically it is synonymous with sentence (1a); both sentences (1a) and (1b) show the situation where ends the realia indicated by the noun in the function of the object *metal* ("metal") as a result of the action expressed by the verb *hammer* ("rrah"). Whereas in sentence (1c) it is indicated what is suffered by an "external" element (Neighbours "fqinjët"), which is not part of the argument structure of the main verb in the sentence. Therefore, we can say that resultative meanings in the first two sentences are *internal*, whereas the third sentence has an external resultative meaning.

According to researchers, the most typical way of conveying result consists of the forms of non-

¹ In contrast to many other languages, Albanian formally distinguishes this meaning through the participle with an article in front of it, thus turning it into an adjective, even though the participle itself may have a resultative meaning apart from the "descriptive" one. Also, we should add that a state that has come as a result of an event may itself be an event that serves as the cause of a result in the broad sense. Thus, for example, the death of a man may be caused by an illness, an accident, etc., and can bring grief to his relatives as a result etc.

durative verbs that denote a process with its completion are they are known as *resultative verbs* or *closure verbs*, such as demolish, burn, open etc. Thus, for example, the sentence *Iliriana opened the door* entails that Iliriana's actions caused it to be the case that the door is open. Though with a different argument structure, the verb *open* in the sentence *Indrit dug a hole* is a resultative verb. As resultative verbs could also be interpreted verbs like *die*, *enjoy* etc, that we mentioned earlier, which, even though may not have an explicit cause, still have an implied cause why they happen, thus they come as a consequence of it.

However, apart from simple verbs, different languages of the world have a variety of semantic and syntactical means and ways of expressing the relationship of cause and effect. These are prefixes, compound predicates etc, but the primary means, at least in the major European languages and in a number of languages spoken in Asia, are the so-called resultative predicates or resultative constructions with a secondary predicate, as well as result complex sentences. We should emphasize that here the term "resultative complex sentence" includes not only the complex sentence with a resultative clause, but also complex sentences that do not have a connective that expresses result. Here is included also closing complex sentences as well as sentences where the dependent clause is linked with the main clause with the conjunctions: as, until etc.²

According to Tomioka (2007), resultative constructions were first noticed by Halliday (1967) in his article "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English. Part I". Halliday (1967) referred to them as "resultative attributives", but then gradually began to gain ground the term "resultative constructions", widely spread today, or simply "resultatives". Among the resultative attributives, Halliday includes constructions with adjectival and adverbial phrases³ such as:

- a. *He painted the door green.*
"Ai e leu derën **me të gjelbër**" ("Ai e leu derën **të gjelbër**")
- b. *She washes them clean.*
"Ajo i lau" ("Ajo i lau **të pastër/të pastra**")
- c. *She became friendly.*
"Ajo u bë **miqësore** (ose **e dashur**)"

More than a decade later, Simpson (1983) presented a somehow different classification of resultative constructions by including in this category expressions that include an action verb and a phrase that describes the situation caused by the verb. Based on this perspective, sentences (1a) and (1b) express result, whereas sentence (1c) does not. The later describes only a shift in a given state (in this case in the state of being friendly), but not how it happened.

According to Washio's (1997) point of view, resultative constructions relying on the meaning of the main verb can be classified into weak, strong, and fake or pseudo-resultative constructions. In weak resultative clauses, as for example in Japanese:

- d. *John-wa niku-o yawarakaku ni-ta.*
"Xhoni e zjeu mishin **derisa u zbut**" ("Xhoni mishin **të butë** zjeu")

The semantics of the main verb determines how the object will be at the end of the action expressed by the verb, whereas in strong resultative clauses as in English constructions:

- e. *The dog barked the neighbours awake.*
"Qeni i **zgjoi** fqinjët me të lehura." ("Qeni lehu fqinjët **të zgjuar**")
- f. *She danced into the room.*
"Ajo hyri **në dhomë** duke kërcyer." ["Ajo kërcyeu **në** (the preposition *në* in this case indicates displacement not a fixed position) **dhomë**"]

The meaning of the verb and that of the adjective are independent from each other and "it is

² For a discussion concerning the latter refer to the third part of this study

³ The term 'phrase' is used with the meaning that we find in contemporary linguistic literature, particularly in English, thus as a "grammatical unit that may consist of one or more words and that is one of the classes of components in which simple sentences can be divided" Leech (2006) pg. 8

impossible to predict in what kind of situation will be the receiver (of the action) as a result of the action denoted by the verb" (Washio, 1997, 9). On the other hand, pseudo-resultative constructions, as the name suggests, are not considered as real resultative sentences, because they resemble only superficially to the later and they do not comply with scheme "X caused Y to become Z". Some of the researchers are of the opinion that resultative sentences should be called only those that have an adverbial phrase. For example, in Albanian we have: *E mbylla derën fort*" which cannot be paraphrased as: *"*E mbylla derën duke e bërë të fortë*". However, we can summarize that different languages have diverse types of resultative sentences and resultative constructions. Some of them have simple strong resultative sentences, as well as weak ones, whereas others rely only upon weak resultative sentences, since in the later there is a logical connection between the meanings of the verb - predicate and resultative phrase, which require less effort from the speakers to elaborate.

The lexico-grammatical nature of the resultative phrase in simple sentences can also serve as another criterion for the classification of constructions. In this way we can make a division into:

- a. constructions with resultative adjectival phrases:
(German) *Er trank das Glas leer.*
"Ai e piu gotën të gjithën." ("Ai piu gotën të zbrazët.")
- b. constructions with resultative adverbial phrases:
(English) *She painted the house beautifully.*
"Ajo e leu shtëpinë bukur."
- c. constructions with resultative prepositional phrases:
(Spanish) *Juan fue/vino a la tienda.* (Tomioka, 2007) p. 127)
"Huani shkoi/erdhi në shitore."
- d. constructions with resultative performative phrases⁴:
(English) *John painted the barn a fiery red*
"Xhoni e leu stallën me një të kuqe të ndezur." ("Xhoni leu stallën një të kuqe të ndezur.")
- e. constructions with resultative nominative phrases⁵:
Sally painted the room a beautiful shade of blue.
"Selli e leu dhomën me një nuancë të bukur të kaltrë" ("Selli leu dhomën një nuancë të bukur të kaltrë.")

Again, we can say that in different languages may exist one, two or all three of these types of sentences, but from a quick interlanguage analysis it can be concluded, that if a language has simple sentences with adjectival resultative phrases, it also has sentences of one of the two other types, or both. However, the vice versa may not be true: the analysis of the studied languages showed that in any of them exist only resultative adjectival phrases.

Another potential classification concerning resultative constructions is based on what we call *transitivity* of their verb - predicate. On this basis, these constructions can be divided into two types: with a transitive verb as the predicate and with an intransitive verb as the predicate.

In a resultative construction with a transitive verb, the result phrase enters into secondary predicative relationship with the object, not the subject, or more precisely with the so-called outside argument of the predicate. This is often known as "Simpson's Law" or "Limitation of direct object". If the phrase enters in predicative relation with the subject, it is not resultative. For example, (1a) means that the metal was suppressed as a result of John beating it. If we would like to say that John was tired because of the metal beat, we would not be able to express it by the sentence *John hammered metal*

⁴ Not all the scholars include these constructions in their taxonomies of constructions with resultative phrases. However, regarding the reason why they are so rare and why they usually contain terms that denote colour, you can refer to Simpson (1983, p. 153, note.2).

⁵ We believe that even in constructions with nominative resultative phrases applies the same note as for the above-mentioned constructions with resultative performative phrases made by Simpson.

tired ("Xhoni e rrahu metalin i lodhur"), because here the phrase *tired* ("i lodhur") is related to the subject *Xhoni* and the sentence has a so-called descriptive meaning (i.e John was already tired when he started beating the metal and not got tired beating the metal)⁶.

However, there are scholars (like Rappaport, Hovav and Levin) who have questioned the "Simpson's Law", whereas others, like Ji and den Dikken, tried to prove that none of the examples given by the above-mentioned linguists constitutes a violation of this law. However, it must be said that Simpson (1983) emphasizes that the law that bears his name, is not applicable in all languages: for example, it does not apply in Warlpiri. In order to illustrate it let us consider the following:

a. *Puluku-rlu kapu-lu marna nga-rni kuntukuntu-karda.*

"Mëzetërit do të hanë bar sa do të shëndoshen." ("Mëzetërit bar do të hanë të shëndoshë")

Thus, in this example, the resultative adjectival phrase *kuntukuntu - karda* ("të shëndoshë") relates to the subject *puluku - rlu* ("mëzetërit") and not to the direct object *marna* ("bar"). According to Simpson, resultative phrases in Warlpiri are adjuncts, whereas structurally they are identical with descriptive phrases, as in many other languages. Different languages of the world are different in this aspect as well: depending on the case when resultative phrases are adjuncts⁷ or complements: English does not allow the establishment of predicate relationships between resultative phrases and external verb arguments⁸, whereas Warlpiri does.

Concerning constructions with an intransitive verb as a predicate, they can be further divided into constructions with accusative verbs and constructions with unaccusative verbs. Resultative constructions with accusative verbs differ from those with unaccusative verbs not only from the syntactical point of view, but also from the so-called argument structure. The subject of sentences with an accusative verb is seen as the doer of the action marked by the verb, whereas the subject of sentences with an unaccusative verb has primarily been an object and is seen as the receiver of the action. Thus, while English verbs like *die*, *arrive* etc. are unaccusative and are used with the auxiliary verb *to be*, their respective forms in Albanian (*vdes*, *mbërrij*) are accusative forms and make the compound tenses with the auxiliary *have*. Unaccusative verbs usually form resultative sentences normally, whereas accusative verbs need a so-called "false object" to achieve that. Thus, the verb - predicate in the English sentence *The river froze solid* ("Lumi ngriu" literally "Lumi ngriu **i fortë**") is unaccusative and we can prove this by removing the adjective or, as it is called in this case, the secondary resultative predicate - *solid*: what remains of this sentence is still grammatical (*The river froze "Lumi ngriu"*). On the other hand, the verb *shouted* in *They shouted themselves hoarse* ("Thirrën **sa u ngjirën**"; literally: "E thirrën veten **të ngjirur**") is accusative: if we leave out the secondary predicate *hoarse* or the reflexive pronoun *themselves* the sentence is meaningless. Both **They shouted themselves*, and **They shouted hoarse* are not complete sentences.

5. A Brief Interlanguage Overview of Result Constructions

Researchers have gradually expanded the focus of their attention from the analysis of the way result is expressed in different languages or in two specific languages by comparing them with each other (one of which is usually English) in an interlanguage investigation of resultative constructions to capture better the mechanism of work of these constructions.

⁶ In reality, the sentence *John hammered the metal tired* may also have a figurative resultative interpretation that is considered "acceptable": iron can be personalized. In this case the literal translation of this sentence in Albanian would be *"*Xhoni e rrahu metalin të lodhur"*, whereas the correct translation would be with the complex sentence *"Xhoni e rrahu metalin derisa e lodhi"*.

⁷ We decided to keep the respective form in Albanian based on the translation of the English term "adjunct" in the work of John Lyons (2001), by prof. E. Lika. See *ibid* (p. 320-321) concerning the distinction between adjuncts and complements.

⁸ External verb argument is called the verb argument that includes the subject.

As noted above, result constructions are common in most languages, but these languages conceive resultative meaning in various ways, this explains the similarities and differences between different language families, as well as within the same family.

If we have a look at result constructions in different languages, we can conclude that some of them have both strong and weak result constructions, whereas other languages allow only the use of weak resultative sentences. This means that there are no languages that allow only the use of strong resultative sentences. On the other hand, resultative phrases, may be either adjectival phrases (AP) and prepositional phrases (PP) in certain languages, or only prepositional phrases (PP) in others. Furthermore, we can deduce that there is no language that uses only adjectival resultative phrases.

Morita (2009), provides an overview of resultative phrases' distribution in five different languages as follows:

Table 1:

	English	German	Dutch	French	Italian
Weak result constructions	AP, PP	PP	AP, PP	PP	PP
Strong result constructions	AP, PP	AP, PP	AP, PP	There are no such structures	There are no such structures

As you can see from the table above, English has a wide range of result models, along with other Germanic languages such as German and Dutch, whereas the two Neo-Latin languages presented in the table, namely: French and Italian, do not have strong resultative constructions nor adjectival resultative phrases.

Zhou, however, provides a more complete and clearer typological picture of resultative constructions based on Washio (1997), including two Asian languages, namely Japanese and Korean as well as the criterion of transitivity.

Table 2:

		English German	Japanese Korean	French Italian
Transitive result constructions	a) fake	Yes	Yes	Yes
Intransitive result constructions	b) weak	Yes	Yes	?
	c) strong	Yes	*	*
	d) strong	Yes	*	*

Table 2 shows that Germanic languages (English and German) are richer than the other languages presented in the table when it comes to instruments of expressing result, by using both transitive resultative constructions as well as intransitive ones, differently from Neo-Latin languages like French the Italian (also Spanish etc.), which, despite being geographically nearer and historically in closer contact with Germanic languages, in terms of typological features of result constructions are similar to languages spoken in the Far East, like Korean and Japanese, genetically unrelated with. However, as you can see from the table, whereas Korean and Japanese allow only the formation of weak constructions and pseudo-resultatives, but not of strong constructions, even though they are formed with intransitive verbs. The same cannot be affirmed for Neo-Latin languages, which allow only the use of pseudo-resultatives, whereas concerning weak constructions it is thought they are rarely encountered in Italian, but not in French and Spanish. On the other hand, even English and German, two languages that have strong resultative constructions, have differences between them as well

Linguists have tried not to focus their studies only in the description of interlanguage differences in the formation of resultative constructions, but they have also attempted to find an explanation why some languages allow the use of certain types of constructions and some others do

not. When asked what makes languages differ in terms of presenting structurally resultative constructions, they have given different answers, but the greatest impact was held by those linguists who were based on the classification made by the well-known semantician Leonard Talmy, who recognises the so-called composite events and the subsequent division between *satellite-framed languages* and *verb-framed languages*, which we will analyse in detail below.

Talmy (1991, 2000) has tried to explain the difference that exists in different languages based on the classification of composite events in six semantic elements, labelled: *motion* (the existence of the event itself or the location of motion), *figure* (a moving subject occupies a particular location), *ground* (entity that operates as a fixed reference point in space for the movement or location of the figure), *path* (path that traverses the figure in movement and the place it occupies in relation to the base), *manner* (the movement of the image along the way) and *cause* (of the movement). It focuses particularly on how a particular language encodes from the grammatical point of view the *manner* and *motion* to express movement, extending his analysis in result constructions of diverse types. Talmy divides the languages of the world into two groups, based on the model conceptual structure is projected in a syntactic structure. These two groups are composed respectively of the languages that express the main event by the verb, and those that express it through verb satellites⁹. In some languages *motion* often melts in *manner*, whereas *path* is mainly expressed by satellites, for this reason these languages are called, as mentioned before, satellite-framed languages. According to Talmy, in these languages are to be included all Indo-European languages apart from Neo-Latin languages¹⁰, Finno-Ugric languages, Chinese, Warlpiri etc. Thus, in English we have:

a. *The bottle floated into the cave.*

“Shishja hyri **në shpellë** (duke pluskuar)”; (literally: “Shishja pluskoi **për në shpellë**)

b. *Mary ran into the house.*

“Meri hyri **në shtëpi** (duke vrapuar)”; (literally: “Meri vrapoi **për në shtëpi**”).

Whereas other languages such as Neo-Latin languages, Japanese, Korean, Semitic languages, Polynesian languages, Tamil language, etc., are classified as verb-framed languages, where *motion* is often merged into *path*, not *manner*, which is expressed as an adjunction, as can be seen from the translation of sentences in (6) respectively in Spanish and Korean language:

a. (Spanish.) *La Botella entro a la Cueva (flotando).*

“Shishja hyri në shpellë (duke pluskuar).”

b. (Korean.) *Mary has chip-ey (twi-e) pulp-and-has-(a) ss's.*

“Meri hyri në shtëpi duke vrapuar”.

As can be seen, the *path* component, expressed mainly in prepositional phrases in English (*into* “për në”), merges with the *motion* verb in Spanish (*entró* “hyri”), whereas in Korean the *path* of movement is expressed through one of a string of verbs such as ((*tul* “hyj”). Also, it is clear from the translation that we made in Albanian that there are semantico-structural similarities in result constructions in these three languages. Therefore, it can be stated unequivocally that Albanian, as well as the Spanish and Korean belongs to verb-framed languages.

Motion, in Spanish, Korean and Albanian is expressed as an adjunction since it is not part of the main verb in the so-called directed movement constructions and as such can be omitted.

⁹ According to Talmy, satellite is called “the grammatical category of each component, with the exception of noun complement or the complement expressed by a prepositional phrase” (2000, p. 222). Thus, “satellites are called the verb particles in English, the separable and inseparable verbal prefixes in German, the verbal prefixes of Latin and Russian, the verb complements in Chinese, etc.” (Ibid.)

¹⁰ Later we will see that Albanian, though an Indo-European language, not a Neo-Latin one, is actually a verb-framed language.

6. Resultative Constructions in Albanian

Traditionally in Albanian syntax, but not only, the term "resultative constructions" has not been widespread and to our knowledge, there is no study related to predicative resultative constructions in this language. This is probably because it has been thought, as noted in "Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe II (Sintaksa)" of the Academy of Sciences (p. 493), that in simple sentences there are no resultative reports, which according to the authors, is evidenced by the lack of resultative djuncts, versus the existence of complex sentences with dependent resultative clauses. However, even in Albanian there are syntactic units which are said to perform the function of resultative adjuncts. An example of this kind is the phrase *për vdekje* in "rrah (godas, qëlloj) **për vdekje (dikë)**", a phrase which is synonymous with the dependant resultative clause (**aq**) *sa e vdes*.¹¹

However resultative relationships exist in our view even in those constructions where they are not specifically expressed from the lexical point of view, in other words when there are phrases, mainly in the role of adjuncts – that are thought to express other reports in sentences, according to which they are named. Thus, for example, there is a result meaning even in sentences where appears as a second limb a reason adjunct, although in these constructions result reports are intertwined with causative relations. (Kurani, Aida (2015). In this way, adjunct constructions expressed by nouns with prepositions, nouns in ablative, or verbs in the gerund such as *U mek nga të qeshurit (së qeshuri; duke qeshur)* can be rephrased with a dependent complex sentence of cause (*U mek ngaqë qeshi*), perhaps sounding more natural - with a dependent complex sentence of result (*Qeshi sa u mek*). Likewise, even the adverb *copash* and its equivalent locution *copa-copa* in *E thyej xhamin copash (copa-copa)*, that would traditionally be interpreted as manner adjuncts, to our opinion are result adjuncts, which is proved by the paraphrase with resultative complex sentences: *E thyej xhamin aq shumë (aq keq), sa e bëj copash (copa-copa)* or *E thyej xhamin sa e bëj copash (copa-copa)*.¹²

On the other hand, in certain dependent complex sentences of result are sometimes left out some types of complex sentences where, to our opinion, the result relationship is the main one. We are talking about complex sentences that are linked with the conjunctions that join **as**, **until** etc. In some Albanian grammars, for example in that of Martin Camaj (1984), these sentences are classified as resultatives, but in others, such as *Gramatika II (Sintaksa)* of the Academy of Sciences of Albania, they are considered as dependent complex sentences of time with result overtones. We believe that in their interpretation should be considered to some degree the remark made in *Gramatika II (Sintaksa)* (p. 574), according to which, if in these sentences predominates time or resultative meaning, it depends on the context. Thus, the complex sentence "Qeshi **sa i dolën lot nga sytë**" should be taken as resultative (it can be paraphrased with a dependent complex sentence of result such as *Qeshi aq shumë, sa i dolën lot nga sytë*, and not with one that shows duration like **Qeshi për aq kohë sa i dolën lot*) whereas in the sentence *E skuqim qepën sa të marrë ngjyrë të verdhë* it is difficult to say if the main meaning is the time meaning or the resultative one (as in the paraphrase *E skuqim qepën për aq kohë sa të marrë ngjyrë të verdhë*, and *E skuqim qepën aq sa të marrë ngjyrë të verdhë* are both appropriate). However, one can say with certainty that this type of complex sentence can always be given a resultative interpretation, which cannot be said for the time

¹¹ However, we cannot say the same for constructions of the "mërzis (bezdis) (dikë) për vdekje", where *për vdekje* has an indirect meaning and plays the role of an amount or manner adjunct.

¹² The paraphrase may very well serve as a litmus test to determine what kinds of reports are expressed in a sentence, or at least the type of adjunct it contains. Thus, although the sentence *E bëj xhamin copash (copë-copë)* is synonymous with *E thyej xhamin copash (copë-copë)*, it cannot be paraphrased with a result complex sentence: we cannot say, for example, **E bëj xhamin aq shumë (aq keq), sa e thyej copash (copa-copa)* or **E bëj xhamin sa e thyej copash (copa-copa)*. Hence, we may conclude that *copash (copë-copë)* in *E bëj xhamin copash (copë-copë)* shows the degree of change in the state of realia which the noun indicates in the function of the object (*xhamin*), therefore it can be considered as manner adjunct.

meaning. This justifies, in our opinion, their classification alongside other sentences.

7. Conclusions

At the beginning of the paper, we presented a typological overview of resultative constructions in different languages of the world. These languages use different means and ways to express states that come as a result of a previous action. They can choose between simple resultative constructions and consequential periods, although not every semantic-structural type that exists in one language can be found in another language. Differences among languages regarding the forms of expressing result are numerous, however based on the classification of languages in two categories we can draw the following typology: satellite-framed languages and languages of verbal expression. As far as Albanian is concerned, it belongs to the languages of the second group, along with Romance languages and other languages. Therefore, resultative constructions in Albanian bear many similarities to those found in languages such as French, Italian, and Spanish.

References

- Akademia e Shkencave e Shqipërisë. (1996). *Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe 2*. Tiranë.
- Boas, H. C. (2003). *A Constructional Approach to Resultatives*. Stanford, California: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Camaj, M. (1984). *Albanian grammar: with exercises, chrestomathy and glossaries*. O. Harrassowitz.
- Carrier, J., & Randall, J. H. (1992). The argument structure and syntactic structure of resultatives. *Linguistic inquiry*, 173-234.
- Cipo, K. (1952). *Sintaksa shqipe*.
- Dahl, Ö. (1985). *Tense and Aspect Systems*.
- Domi, M. (1969). *Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe*, Sintaksa për shkollat e mesme, Prishtinë.
- Dowty, D. R. (1979). *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Floqi, S. (1965). Periudha me fjali të varur rrjedhimore në shqipen e sotme. *Studime filologjike*, (2), 55-102.
- Goldberg, A. E., & Jackendoff, R. (2004). The English resultative as a family of constructions. *language*, 532-568.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1967). Intonation and Grammar in British English. Mouton: The Hague.
- Hoekstra, T. (1988). "Small clause results". *Lingua* 74, f. 101-139.
- Kurani, A. (2011). *Resultative Constructions in Albanian and English*. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2011.v2n3p316>
- Kuzar, R. (1998). Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 29(3), 359-362. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166\(97\)81937-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-2166(97)81937-6)
- Leech, G. (2006). *Glossary of English grammar*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Levin, B., & Hovav, M. R. (1994). *Unaccusativity: At the syntax-lexical semantics interface* (Vol. 26). MIT press.
- Lyons, J. (2001). *Hyrje në gjuhësinë teorike*. Dituria.
- Mikeli, G. (1916). *Gramatika e gjuhës shqipe*.
- Morita, C. (2009). A crosslinguistic observation of resultative constructions. *Linguistic Research*, 25, 43-55.
- Napoli, D. J. (1992). "Secondary resultative predicates in Italian". *Journal of Linguistics* 28, f. 53-90.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. (1988). Typology of resultative constructions. *Typology of resultative constructions*, 1-596.
- Priifti, S., *Sintaksa e shqipes*, Tiranë, 1962, ribotuar në Prishtinë, 1971.
- Rappaport Hovav, M., & Levin, B. (1998). Building verb meanings. *The projection of arguments: Lexical and compositional factors*, 97-134.
- Rrota, J. (1943). *(Sintaksa e gjuhës shqipe (ose Sintaksi i shqipes, 1942) për klasën II, III, IV të shkollave të mesme, Shkodër, shtypshkronja At Gj. Fishta, Shkodër,*
- Rappaport Hovav, M., B. Levin (2001). "An event structure account of English resultatives". *Language* 77, f. 766-797.
- Simpson, J. (1983). "Resultatives". Në L. Levin, M. Rappaport, A. Zaenen (redaktorë). *Papers in Lexical-Functional Grammar*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club, f. 143-157.
- Talmy, L. (1991). "Path to Realization: A Typology of Event Conflation". *Proceedings of BLS* 17, f. 480-519.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Tomioka, S. (2007). Pragmatics of LF intervention effects: Japanese and Korean wh-interrogatives. *Journal of pragmatics*, 39(9), 1570-1590.

- Totoni, M. (2000). *Fraza me nënrenditje*, Tiranë.
- Totoni, M., "Klasifikimi strukturor-semantik i frazave me fjali të nënrenditura", *Studime filologjike*, 1990/2.
- Washio, R. (1997). "Resultatives, Compositionality, and Language Variation". *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6: 1, f. 1-49.
- Wechsler, S. (1997). "Resultative Predicates and Control". Në *Proceedings of the 1997 Texas Linguistics Society Conference*, f. 307-321.
- Xhuvani, A. (1922). *Njohunit e para te Syndakses Shqipe... per Klaset e Nalta te Fillores prej A. Xhuvanit. (Grundbegriffe der albanischen Syntax fd Oberklassen d. Volksschule.)*(alban.). Vlora.
- Zhang, S. (2009). The Role of Input, Interaction and Output in the Development of Oral Fluency. *English Language Teaching*, 2, 91-100.