ON THE INTERPRETATION OF AD-VERBAL LOCATIVES

DESPRE INTERPRETAREA LOCATIVELOR AD-VERBALE

(*Rezumat*)

Adjuncţii locativi în grupul verbal pot exprima fie localizarea evenimentului, fie a unui participant la eveniment. S-a arătat că aceste două citiri sunt corelate cu poziţii sintactice diferite. Voi arăta că noţiunea de locativ referitor la participant oferă o soluţie pentru două probleme puse în lumină de cercetările anterioare: (i) existenţa, în română, a unor locative fără *de* care localizează tema verbelor de posesie şi (ii) faptul că unele predicate non-localizante, precum *a şti*, admit nume nude existenţiale în poziţie de obiect. În final, voi enumera principalele tipuri de locative referitoare la participant.

Cuvinte-cheie: locative, verbe de posesie, structură argumentală, nume nude.

1. Event-oriented and participant-oriented readings

Locative phrases in the VP that are not complements of the verb (constituents obligatory for interpretation, implied by the verb's meaning)[1] can express

[1] This paper does not address locative complements, such as the locative selected by *put*, Ro. *a pune*. GALR (2008) treats locative complements as a special type of "circumstanţial de loc", but the term "circumstanţial" is not appropriate for locative complements. This terminology is inherited from the older academic grammars of Romanian, which did not distinguish locative complements from adjuncts at all. Locative complements include not only insuppressible constituents, but also facultative dependents that express arguments required by the lexical semantics of the verb, which are retrievable from the context when they are not explicitly mentioned: e.g. *pleca* 'leave' presupposes a location (Ground) in which the Theme is placed before the event and is no longer placed after the event.

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

either the location of the event/situation or the location of the participants to the event (see Maienborn 2001, Huddleston & Pullum 2002, ch.8 §4.2):

(1)	a. Am vorbit cu el la Bucureşti (Ro.) : 'I talked to him in Bucharest'	location of the event
	b. L-am văzut în grădină: 'I saw him in the garden'	location of the Theme
	c. Am văzut această constelaţie în Norvegia: 'We saw this constellation in Norway'	location of the event > location of the Experiencer;
	d. Am citit asta într-o carte de istorie : 'I read this in a history book'	location of the Theme
	e. Am citit articolul acasă: 'I read the article at home'	location of the event
	f. Am scris ideile într-un caiet: 'I wrote the ideas in a notebook'	location of the Theme
	g. Am scris romanul la Lisabona: 'I wrote the novel in Lisbon'	location of the event

Maienborn (2001) argues that these different readings are correlated with different structural positions. Besides participant-oriented locatives, which she calls *internal modifiers*, and localizers of the event, which she calls *external modifiers*, she distinguishes a third type, *frame-setting* modifiers, which specify a domain in which the proposition holds, being attached higher, in the periphery of the clause:

(2)	a. Eva signed the contract on the last page.	(internal) (Maienborn 2001:ex.1)
	b. Eva signed the contract in Argentina.	(external)
	c. In Argentina, Eva still is very popular.	(frame-setting)

Based on various test, using German data, she shows that these types of modifiers entertain the following hierarchical relations:

(3) [Frame-setting [Subject [External-Loc [Object [Internal-Loc V]]]]]

Since "frame setting" modifiers can also be called "external", I will use the term "event modifier" for Maienborn's external modifiers.

Some internal modifiers answer to the question "how" instead of "where", but contain nevertheless a preposition which expresses a spatial relation

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

involving the relevant argument, hence they are treated as locative modifiers by Maienborn (for cases such as (4)c, Maienborn claims the locative relation holds between body-parts: "[Paul] is standing in a way such that his remaining body is located on his head" (p. 224)):

(4) a. The bank robbers fled on bicycles.
b. Paul took a shower in his boots
c. Paul is standing on his head / sleeping on the back / jumping in one foot

Internal modifiers don't always localize an overt argument, they can also localize an incorporated argument (see (5)) or an implicit participant (see (6)):

(5) Eva signed the contract on the last page (Maienborn 2001: ex.62c)
(6) Bem în pahare de cristal 'We drink in crystal glasses'

Event modifiers are characterized by supporting the inference *this happened* PP:

(7) a. I wrote the idea in my notebook
|≠ I wrote the idea; this happened in my notebook
|= The idea is in my notebook
b. I wrote the idea in my room
|= I wrote the idea; this happened in my room

In this paper, I will discuss two apparently puzzling facts of Romanian which can be understood by using the notion of participant-oriented locative modifiers.

2. Locatives with Possessed Themes

An example such as (8) is ambiguous:

(8) Petru a cumpărat o casă la Paris 'Peter bought a house in Paris'
(i) event localization: the buying event took place in Paris
(ii) localization of the Theme: the house bought is in Paris

In the interpretation (ii), it is tempting to analyze the locative as adnominal (probably this is why this type has been overlooked in most studies, including Maienborn 2001). Romanian data however show that this is not the case. In

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

Romanian, adnominal locative modifiers (adjuncts) are necessarily introduced by *de* 'of, from'[1]:

(9) a. Casa *(de) la Paris e scumpă
house-the of at Paris is expensive
'The house in Paris is expensive'
b. Am vândut [casa *(de) la Paris]
have.1 sold house-the of at Paris
'I/We sold [the house in Paris]'

As I argued in Giurgea (2014), extraction facts show that the *de*-less locative in (8)(ii) is not adnominal (inside the Theme-DP), but ad-verbal (in the VP): locatives without *de* are freely displaceable in the clause, unlike DP-internal PPs:

(10) a. Unde a cumpărat o casă?
where has bought a house
'Where did he buy a house?' (allows the reading (8)ii)
b. * [De unde]$_i$ a cumpărat [o casă t$_i$] ?
of where has bought a house
c. (La Bucureşti) am cumpărat (la Bucureşti) o casă
at Bucharest have.1 bought at Bucharest a house
(allows the reading (8)ii)
d. * (De la Bucureşti$_i$) am cumpărat (de la Bucureşti$_i$) [o casă t$_i$]

Such Theme-localizers appear with verbs related to possession (see (11)) and are correlated with a non-specific interpretation of the Theme (see (8), (11) vs. (12), (13)):

(11) Ion doreşte / vrea / caută o casă la munte.
Ion desires / wants / looks-for a house at mountain
'Ion wants/is looking for a house (which should be) in the mountains'
(12) Petru a cumpărat casa la Paris.
'Peter bought the house in Paris': only the event-localization reading
(13) Ion doreşte o casă de la munte.
Ion desires a house of at mountain

[1] The only exception concerns locative inside complex event nominals (in the sense of Grimshaw 1990; cf. Cornilescu 2001, Cornilescu et al. 2013): *[Interpretarea operei Aida* ***la Covent Garden****] a fost memorabilă* 'The performance of Aida at Covent Garden was remarkable'. However, this exception is only apparent if we adopt the view, supported by various other facts, that complex event nominals contain a verbal projection embedded under a nominalizer (see Borer 1994, Alexiadou 2001, a.o.)

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

'Ion wants a certain house, which is in the mountains'

I proposed a syntactic analysis that explains these two properties. The starting point of this analysis is the observation that a locative attached to the possessive *have*-construction is interpreted as localizing the Theme (the Possessee):

(14) Ion are o casă în Spania.
Ion has a house in Spain (=> the house is in Spain; ≠> Ion is in Spain)

A further observation is that I-level *have* imposes an indefiniteness constraint on the Theme:

(15) Am o casă / ?? Am casa 'I have {a /??the} house'

Putting these things together, I proposed that *de*-less locative modifiers that localize the Theme of possession-related verbs are syntactically licensed by the possessive component present in the structure projected by the verb, in the form of a small clause with a locative 'coda', as in (14). More precisely, the possessive component, projected as a phrase of the form [Possessor [Relator Possessee]] (where Relator is a P, which can be incorporated into the verb), can be extended with a further predicative layer which introduces a Location applied to the Possessee[1]:

(16) [Possessor [Relator [Possessee Location]]]

The semantic restrictions on the Theme follow from the fact that the structure in (16) is only available for *existential* possessive constructions, which allow locative codas just like existential *be*-construction do (with which they are probably related, see Freeze 1992, Kayne 1993, a.o.)

Adopting event decomposition in syntax (Hale & Keyser 1993, Ramchand 2008, a.o.), I explained the ambiguity in (8) by the existence of two possible attachment positions for the locative: to the phrase denoting the buying

[1] Note that this structure requires, for interpretation, a mechanism by which the lower predicative layer transfers up the denotation of the possessed entity (the Theme is an argument of both HAVE and the spatial relation). Such a mechanism was proposed by Pylkkänen (2008) for her low ApplP: the lower Pred (Appl in Pylkkänen) denotes a function that is applied to the higher relation, HAVE (P represents the denotation of the locative PP, a property obtained from the P-relation by saturating its inner argument; f stands for the relation denoted by the higher head, HAVE, and x for the Theme; I notate the event type as ev here):

(i) $[[\text{Pred}]] = \lambda P\, \lambda x\, \lambda f_{<e,<e,<ev,t>>>}\, \lambda z\, \lambda e\, [\, f(e,z,x) \wedge P(e,x)\,]$

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

process (for (8)i) or to the phrase denoting the result (for (8)ii), which, here, is a possession relation (the Agent is the possessor of the Theme; I notate the abstract P expressing possession as HAVE):

(17) a. [[$_{\text{InitP}}$John$_{i}$ bought [$_{\text{ProcP}}$ [$_{\text{ResP}}$ x$_{i}$ HAVE a house]]] in Bucharest] ((8)i)
b. [$_{\text{InitP}}$John$_{i}$ bought [$_{\text{ProcP}}$ [$_{\text{ResP}}$ x$_{i}$ HAVE [[a house] [in Bucharest]]]]] ((8)ii)

The co-indexation between the agent of *buy* and the possessor (the subject of the result state) is a lexical property of the verb (Ramchand's system allows an argument to fulfill multiple roles, occupying multiple positions in the argument structure; this possibility is encoded in the verb's lexical entry)[1]. For other verbs, the co-indexation holds between the possessor and a dative argument:

(18) I-am oferit lui Ion o casă la mare.
3SG.CL.DAT-have.1 offered DAT Ion a house at sea
'I offered Ion a house at the seaside.'

A further difference between *buy* and *offer* is that with *offer* the result state is not actual possession, but modalized possession – the Goal acquires the possibility to become possessor of the Theme (HAVE in this case should be read as MAY-HAVE).

(19) [$_{\text{InitP}}$ Agent [offer/sell [$_{\text{ResP}}$ Goal [HAVE Theme]]]]

For desiderative verbs (see (11)), the possession predication cannot occur as a ResP because such verbs are stative (stative verbs lack the Proc and Res layers); nevertheless, a predicational structure in the complement of *want* is likely in view of the fact that *want* normally takes clausal complements. *Want* semantically selects propositions; event nouns can be shifted to a proposition-interpretation (e.g. *I want his success = I want him to succeed*); with object-denoting nouns, the proposition is typically obtained by adding a hidden possessive predicate (see Den Dikken, Larson and Ludlow (1996) and Cinque (2006:ch.1) for this proposal)[2]:

[1] In Ramchand's system, the lexical verb subsequently merges in all the positions of the argument structure, by virtue of its *res*, *proc* and/or *init* categorial features. This implies that instead of HAVE in (17), we must assume incorporation of the possessive relator into the verb *buy*. I keep the notation HAVE in this paper in order to highlight the place in which the possessive small clause is inserted in the verb's argument structure.

[2] *Want* may take other implicit predicates, as well as small clauses: *Vreau la munte* I want <to go> to the mountains.'; *Televizorul îl vrem în dormitor* 'We want the TV-set in the bedroom.'

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

(20) I want the house = I want to have (possess) the house
[Exp$_i$ [want [x$_i$ HAVE Theme]]

The possibility to have a locative referring to the desired state, as in (11), supports the idea that the possessive predication is projected in syntax. This projection is a small clause referring to a state, similar to Ramchand's ResP, but cannot be called ResP because it does not introduce telicity. If we analyze the null head that introduces the possessive relation as a P, this small clause can be labeled PP:

(21) [$_{vP}$ I$_i$ [want [$_{PP}$ x$_i$ HAVE a house]]]

Finally, the possessive relator can also be overtly expressed by a preposition – the preposition *cu* 'with' – if the verb is the light verb *face* 'do/make' (note however that this construction is stylistically marked):

(22) Am **făcut**-o pe Maria **cu** o casă la mare.
have.1 **made**-her.CL.ACC OBJ Maria **with** a house at sea
'I made Maria have a house at the seaside.'

The cases in which the possessive relator is covert and selected by the verb (all the examples we have seen until (22)) can be represented as *incorporation* of P into the V (see Hale & Keyser 1993).

3. Theme-oriented locatives and the licensing of bare nouns

It is well-known that existential bare nouns – and weak indefinites in general – are licensed by *localizing* predicates, i.e., predicates that provide a *spatial* localization for their arguments (McNally 1995, Dobrovie-Sorin 1997, a.o.). Initially, the relevant distinction has been taken to be s(tage)-level vs. i(individual)-level (Carlson 1977):

(23) a. Tourist guides are available (in the living room). (existential reading OK)
a'. Sunt disponibile ghiduri turistice în salon. (Ro.)
b. Tourist guides are interesting. (only generic reading)
b'. * Sunt interesante ghiduri turistice. (Ro., which lacks generic BNs)

But it has been noticed that there are S-level predicates that don't allow weak indefinites, because they are not localizing (they do not introduce an independent Location, because the subject itself is conceptualized as the location of the state):

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

(24) a. Students were tired/worried/sad. (no weak reading)
b. * Erau {trişti / îngrijoraţi / obosiţi} studenţi. (Ro.)
(25) ?? John is tired/sad in the room.

The locative in (25) cannot function as an event localizer (Maienborn's external modifier), but only as a frame-setting modifier, yielding the meaning "When he is in that room, John is sad".

On the other hand, I-level predicates that express spatial relations do allow weak indefinites:

(26) a. Big walls surrounded the city.
a'. Ziduri mari înconjurau oraşul. (Ro.)
b. This manuscript contains errors.
b'. Acest manuscris conţine greşeli. (Ro.)

Discussing the licensing of existential bare nouns, Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea (2015) distinguished two types of localizing predicates: (i) predicates that take locative adjuncts (e.g. *sleep (in the room)*, *dance (in the street)*, *read books (in the garden)*) or locative arguments (e.g., *put*, *arrive*); ii) predicates that express spatial relations between their arguments (e.g. *surround*, *line*, *contain*). They proposed that existential bare nouns are introduced by an existential quantifier that must combine with a relation between properties and events and is defined only if the event provides a way of localizing the argument introduced by the DP:

(27) $[[_D Ø]] = \lambda N\ \lambda P\ \lambda e\ \exists x\ (N(x) \wedge P(x)(e))$, defined iff $\exists y, y \neq x$ such that y=Participant(e) and x is spatially localized wrt. y in e

Predicates of type (i) have a locative thematic role, i.e. a thematic function Location(e) in their neo-Davidsonian representation. For these predicates, the definedness condition in (27) is satisfied by the Location argument/adjunct: e.g., for *Pe stradă se joacă copii* 'Children are playing in the street', the function [[children]](P) is defined for $P=[\lambda x\ \lambda e\ (play(e) \wedge Agent(e)=x)]$ because $play(e) \rightarrow \exists y=Location(e)$ and x is spatially localized wrt. y in e.

For predicates of type (ii), it is the predicate P itself that describes the spatial relation and the localizer of the existentially bound variable is the other argument of P: e.g., in *Ziduri mari înconjurau oraşul* 'Big walls surrounded the city', the function [[walls]](P) is defined for $P=[\lambda x\ \lambda e$ surround(e,x, ιy city(y))] because surround(e,x,z) implies that there is a spatial relation between x and z in e.

I-level predicates do not introduce an event independently localizable in space (cf. Kratzer 1995); therefore, if they do not express spatial relations, they do not allow existential bare nouns.

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

(28) a. Ion seamănă cu fratele său (*în oraş) (possible only with a frame-setting reading)
'John resembles his brother (*in the city)'
b. Aceste pietre seamănă cu *(nişte) oi
these rocks resemble with some sheep

The same holds for most S-level non-verbal predicates (Maienborn 2001) – see (24)-(25) – although not for all, see the ex. of *available* in (23).

The theory of locative modifiers discussed in this paper leads to a refinement of Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea's (2015) system, by adding the following possibility:

(29) A predicate can provide a location for just *some* of its arguments

This nicely accounts for examples such as (30), acknowledged to be problematic by Dobrovie-Sorin & Giurgea (2015), because *know* does not introduce an event with an independent Location (which would allow event-localizers) and does not express a spatial relation either:

(30) a. I know lawyers. (existential BN)
b. Cunosc avocaţi. (Ro.)
know.1SG lawyers.

Note now that *know* provides a location for the object, although not for the whole state and, a fortiori, for the Experiencer – in other words, it allows a Theme-oriented locative, but not an event-modifying locative:

(31) Cunosc pe cineva în această instituţie
'I know somebody in this institution'
|= the Theme is in the institution
|≠ the Experiencer or the state of knowledge is in this institution

We can thus explain why *know* allows object bare nouns: it provides a location for the Theme, therefore the condition in (27) is satisfied for Themes. On the other hand, the Experiencer is not localized; therefore, it cannot be an existential bare noun:

(32) a. * Asta cunosc avocaţi / *Avocaţi cunosc asta (Ro.)

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

a′. Lawyers know this (only generic)
b. Pe procuror îl cunosc *(nişte) avocaţi
OBJ district-attorney CL.ACC know.3PL some lawyers
'Some lawyers know the district attorney'

Psychological verbs that do not localize the object do not allow existential BNs ((34) shows that with *hate*, a locative modifying the Theme can only be introduced as an adnominal modifier, marked in Romanian by *de*, as explained in §2 above):

(33) a. I hate lawyers. (only generic)
b. * Urăsc avocaţi. (Ro.)
hate.1SG lawyers
(34) Urăsc pe cineva { ??în / din} această instituţie (Ro.)
hate.1SG OBJ somebody in of-in this institution

Summarizing, there are three types of localizing predicates: (i) predicates that introduce an event with an independent Location; (ii) predicates that license a Location for one of their arguments; (iii) predicates that express spatial relations.

4. Summary of internal readings

There appear to be a variety or participant-oriented readings, depending on the properties of the verb. In this concluding section, I would like to present the main types I found in my research until know, without pretending exhaustivity:

(i) Environment of the perceived object, with experiencer verbs (here we can include *know*, discussed in §3 above):

(35) a. I saw stars in the northern part of the sky
b. I heard voices in the lobby
c. I know somebody in her class

(ii) Localization of the Theme in a result state of possession (discussed in §2 above):

(36) I bought/want an apartment in Bucharest

(iii) Localization of a created object:

(37) He wrote his name on the desk

(iv) Localization of the arguments in a modalized result state:

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

(38) a. Angela hat sich mit Bardo im Museum verabredet (Germ.)
(Maienborn 2001)
Angela has 3REFL.DAT with B. in-the museum arranged-to-meet
b. Angela şi-a dat întâlnire cu Bardo la muzeu (Ro.)
Angela 3REFL.DAT-has given date with Bardo at museum
'Angela arranged to meet Bardo in the museum'

(v) Support of an argument in motion (question-word *how*):

(39) a. The cook brought the fish on a silver plate
b. They fled on bicycles
c. Am fript carnea pe grătar 'I roasted the meat on the grill'

(vi) Contact between body (part) and piece of clothing (question-word *how*):

(40) a. He's taking a shower in his shoes
b. She walked in the park in her pijamas

(vii) The part of an argument used as a support (characterizing position); the question-word is *how*; this construction seems restricted to specific verbs:

(41) a. Paul stă în cap 'Paul is standing on his head'
a′. * Paul mănâncă / vorbeşte în cap
'* Paul is eating/talking on his head'
b. Ana sare într-un picior
'Ana is jumping on one foot'
b′. ??Ana mănâncă/vorbeşte într-un picior
'*Ana is eating/talking on one foot'
c. Tata dormea pe burtă
'Father was sleeping on his front'
c′. ?? Tata citea/vorbea pe burtă
'??Father was reading/talking on his front'

(viii) Some internal locatives are not attributed to an argument during the event, but specify the part of the argument directly involved in the event:

(42) a. He hit her in the head (Ro.: 'El a lovit-o în cap')
b. He patted her on the shoulder (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: ch.8, §4.2)
c. He was wounded in the foot (Ro. 'El a fost rănit la picior') (ibid.)

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

Of course, if the verb allows event-localizers, participant-oriented modifiers can co-occur with event modifiers, obeying the due hierarchical relations (see (3)):

(43) a. I [[bought an apartment in Paris] in this office].
b. She's [[standing on her head] in the park].

Further research is needed in order to decide whether argument-oriented locatives occupy a position projected by the verbs as part of their argument structure (even if it is an optional position), as proposed by Giurgea (2014) for a sub-type of Theme-related locatives (those with possession-related verbs, see §2 above), or are adjuncts freely available in syntax and interpreted as localizing a participant made available by the conceptual knowledge associated to the verb, as proposed by Maienborn (2001), who assumes that all types of internal modifiers combine with a relation between individuals and events via a general functor MOD^{v}.

REFERENCES

Alexiadou, Artemis, 2001, *Functional Structure in Nominals*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Borer, Hagit, 1994, "On the Projection of Arguments", în Benedicto, Elena, Jeff Runner (ed.), *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 17*, Amherst, GLSA, p. 19–48.

Carlson, Greg N., 1977, "A unified analysis of the English bare plural", *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1, p. 413–457.

Cinque, Guglielmo, 2006, *Restructuring and Functional Heads*. *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, Volume 4*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Cornilescu, Alexandra, 2001, "Romanian nominalizations: Case and aspectual structure", *Journal of Linguistics* 37, nr. 3, p. 467–501.

Cornilescu, Alexandra, in coll. with Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, Ion Giurgea, Elena Soare, Camelia Stan, 2013, "Deverbal Nouns", in Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, Ion Giurgea (eds.), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian*. *I: The Noun Phrase*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, p. 663–718.

den Dikken, Marcel, Richard Larson, Peter Ludlow, 1996, "Intensional 'transitive' verbs and concealed complement clauses", *Rivista di Linguistica* 8, p. 331–348.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, 1997, "Classes de prédicats, distribution des indéfinis et la distinction thétique-catégorique", *Le Gré des Langues*, p. 58-97.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, Ion Giurgea, 2015, "Weak Reference and Property Denotation. Two Types of Pseudo-Incorporated Bare Nominals", in Borik, Olga, Berit Gehrke (eds.), *The Syntax and Semantics of Pseudo-Incorporation*, Leiden, Brill, p. 88–126.

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)

Freeze, Ray, 1992, "Existentials and other locatives", *Language* 68, p. 553–595.
GALR, 2008: Guţu-Romalo, Valeria (coord.), *Gramatica limbii române*, Bucharest, Editura Academiei.
Giurgea, Ion, 2014, "Romanian adnominal locative PPs and Argument Structure", in Veselovská, Ludmila, Markéta Janebová (eds.), *Complex Visibles Out There. Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2014: Language Use and Linguistic Structure*, Olomouc, Palacký University, p. 107–126.
Grimshaw, Jane, 1990, *Argument Structure*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
Hale, Kenneth L., Samuel Jay Keyser, 1993, "On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations", in Hale, K., S. Kayser (eds.), *The view from building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, p. 53–109.
Huddleston, R. & G.K. Pullum, 2002, *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Kayne, Richard, 1993, "Toward a modular theory of auxiliary selection", *Studia Linguistica* 47, p. 3–31.
Kratzer, Angelika, 1995, "Stage-level and individual-level predicates", in Gregory Carlson (ed.), *The generic book*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, p. 125–175.
Maienborn, Claudia, 2001, "On the position and interpretation of locative modifiers", *Natural Language Semantics* 9, p. 191–240.
McNally, Louise, 1995, "Bare plurals in Spanish are interpreted as properties", in Morrill, Glyn, Richard Oehrle (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1995 ESSLLI Conference on Formal Grammar*.
Pylkkänen, Liina, 2008, *Introducing Arguments*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
Ramchand, Gillian, 2008, *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon. A First Phase Syntax*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Ion GIURGEA
Institutul de Lingvistică al Academiei Române
„Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti", Bucureşti

BDD-V4276 © 2017 Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:58:31 UTC)