SOME DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND ROMANIAN RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Imola-Ágnes Farkas

Abstract: It is a generally accepted fact that Romance languages behave differently from English and other Germanic languages as far as the building of resultative constructions is concerned. The wide availability of resultatives in English is in sharp contrast with their less frequent occurrence in Romanian; not to mention the view according to which there are no such constructions in Romanian at all. In the present paper we focus our attention on some differences between the resultatives in English and Romanian. Most importantly, English resultatives can be built on activity, as well as accomplishment matrix verbs; whereas Romanian allows only resultatives built on accomplishment verbs. This approach is consonant with Kayne's (2005) theory about the existence/non-existence of silent elements in the two (families of) languages; we explain this difference between the two languages in terms of the presence/absence of a silent UP TO element.

Keywords: resultative construction, activity verb, accomplishment verb, silent UP TO element

1. Introduction

Whether Romance languages allow resultative constructions (henceforth RCs) or not has been a matter of some controversy in the literature. Some linguists, notably Merlo (1988) for Italian and Snyder (2001) for French and Spanish point out that these constructions do not exist in Romance languages; others, like Napoli (1992) for Italian and Legendre (1997) for French are in favor of their existence.[1] On the other hand, Mateu (2000) claims that typical AP RCs, like the English *the river froze solid* is at best marginal and at worst ungrammatical in Romance languages. However, the unavailability of such a paradigm case should not be taken as evidence for the unavailability of RCs more generally in that certain language; as a language can be counted as genuinely permitting resultatives only if additional examples are attested.

The paper is organised as follows: In section 2 we discuss true RCs in Romanian, devoting the first subsection to AP RCs and the second one to NP and PP RCs. In section 3 we provide an analysis of Romanian RCs as contrasted to the similar constructions in English. In section 4 we check the compatibility of our approach with the silent UP TO theory. Finally, in section 5 we present our conclusions about RCs in Romanian.

2. RCs in Romanian

In this section of the paper we discuss true RCs in Romanian. First, in subsection 2.1 we focus on AP RCs and in subsection 2.2 we discuss NP and PP RCs.

[1] An important question is whether resultatives are limited to particular syntactic categories; namely, whether the predicate can be expressed by a PP. As such, Simpson (1983) admits that the predicate can be an AP, an NP or even a PP. Many agree with Simpson in admitting PP resultatives. It seems, however, that some works embody the implicit claim that PPs cannot be resultatives; hence, particular languages, especially Romance languages lack resulatives. But if PPs are admitted as XP predicates, these languages surely have resultatives.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

2.1 AP RCs in Romanian

One major difference between English and Romanian as far as the building of RCs is concerned consists in the availability/non-availability of AP RCs denoting change of state. It has been largely argued that English and other Germanic languages abound in AP RCs which are impossible in Romance languages. That the AP is not the preferred category in Romanian in expressing the result state has also been noted by Ionescu (1998: 159), who emphasized that "English exhibits AP, PP and PrtP resultative secondary predicates, whereas Romanian freely exhibits PP resultatives, NP resultatives and much less commonly – AP resultatives".

Interestingly, we found some transitive- and unaccusative-based AP RCs in Romanian which do not contradict the existence of this difference between English and Romanian as far as the building of RCs is concerned, but shed some light on the specificity of Romanian RCs. Some of these constructions are illustrated in the following:

(1) a. Apele au crescut mari. (Secrieru 2001: 12)
waters-PL have grow-PERF big-PL
'The waters have grown big.'

b. Ion a vopsit gardul alb.[2]
John has paint-PERF the fence-SG N white-SG M/N
'John has painted the fence white.'

c. Maria s- a vopsit roşcată /blondă.
Mary REFL has dye-PERF red-SG F /blonde-SG F
'Mary has dyed her hair/herself red/blonde.'

d. Casa a construit- o pătrată.
house has build-PERF CL3rd-SG F square-SG F
'He has built the house square.'

e. Am tăiat hârtia rotundă.[3] (*GALR* 2005: 169-173)
have cut-PERF paper-SG F round-SG F
'I have cut the paper round.'

f. Am fiert ouăle tari. (Lupsa 2004: 123)
have boil-PERF eggs-PL N hard-PL M/ N
'I have boiled the eggs hard.'

Napoli (1992) notes that a perfect English RC like *she grew tall* is perceived as redundant in Italian, since the Italian verb *crescere* lexically includes the notion of 'upward'. The Italian equivalent of the English RC mentioned above would simply be *E' cresciuta* instead of **E' cresciuta alta* (cf. Napoli (1992: 82). Although the Romanian equivalent *el/ea a crescut înalt/înaltă/mare* seems a bit redundant and artificial at first sight (more preferred versions are *el s-a înălţat*, *el s-a făcut mare*, *el s-a făcut înalt*), it is not as ungrammatical as its Italian correspondent.

The relevant descriptive generalisation is that there are AP RCs in Romanian. What makes Romanian different from English and other Germanic languages in matter of AP resultatives will be discussed in section 3 of this paper.

[2] Some native speakers also accept the use of a PP predicate, like *Ion vopseşte gardul în alb* (cf. also Irimia 2002).

[3] That the sentence-final element is an AP and not an AdvP is demonstrated with examples, like *poarta au vopsit-o roşie/*roşu*, *au vopsit casele verzi/*verde* where the agreement of this element with the postverbal NP (it is predicated of) in gender and number is a further proof of the subject-predicate relation between them.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

2.2 NP and PP RCs in Romanian

In Romanian RCs the resultative predicate (henceforth RP) is mostly expressed by an NP or a PP. The most important feature of NP and PP RCs in Romanian is that whereas some of them allow a free variation between the NP and the PP variant, others are very strict in the type of their sentence-final RP, which can only be either an NP or a PP.

Some of the RCs allowing a free variation between the NP and the PP variant are: *a (se) rupe/a (se) sparge/a sfâşia (în) bucăţi/bucăţele*, *a tăia pâinea/şunca (în) felii*. Others do not allow any modification of the sentence-final RP, which can only be an NP, like in: *a prăji ceva scrum*, *a bate ouăle/albuşul spumă, a pisa piperul pulbere*, *a sparge geamul ţăndări*, *a rupe rochia zdrenţe*. Romanian RCs allowing only a PP RP are illustrated with examples, like: *a sparge geamul în cioburi*, *a fărâmiţa pâinea în firimituri*, *a săpa/ara ogorul în brazde*, *a măcina cafeaua în pudră* etc.

The generalization about Romanian RCs is that the matrix verb, whether transitive or unaccusative, is a change-of-state verb. The postverbal NP is more often than not a subcategorized NP.[4] Taking into account the fact that most NP RCs are the result of an elliptical PP (cf. the free variation between the PP and the NP variant, like *a tăia pâinea/şunca felii/în felii* and the correctness of the PP variant in RCs without a free variation between the NP and the PP variants and where the RP is modified by any type of AP, like *a rupe rochia zdrenţe*, **a rupe rochia în zdrenţe*, but *a rupe rochia în mii de zdrenţe* (cf. Drăgan 2005), Romanian harmoniously integrates into the class of Romance languages which have mostly RCs built on PP predicates.

3. RCs in Romanian as opposed to RCs in English

Once again, it is very important to emphasize the fact that RCs are far less represented in Romanian than in English, as 'Romanian allows only a restricted range of resultative constructions' (cf. Lupsa 2004: 120). RCs in Romanian are not only lexically, but also syntactically less productive, as they do not follow the same lexical-syntactic rule that operates so productively in a language such as English. We will discuss two major differences in the RCs of these two languages in the following two subsections.

3.1 Difference in productivity

The discrepancy between the two languages in matter of RCs is illustrated with the following transitive-based AP RCs which are not possible in Romanian, at least in a resultative reading. The Romanian equivalent of (2a), illustrated in (3a) is correct only under the reading in which the child pushed the door that was open (depictive) or under the reading in which the child pushed the open door (attributive adjective). The ungrammaticality of the English (2b) in Romanian is illustrated in (3b). That (2b) is not possible in Italian and French either, is illustrated in (4a, b):

(2) a. The child pushed the door open.
b. John hammered the metal flat.

[4] However, in poetry we find some constructions with nonsubcategorised postverbal NPs, like:
'Voce seacă, îngîmfată/Sparge-n ţăndări somnul lui...' (cf. Zeană 1992: 185)

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

(3) a. *Copilul a împins uşa deschisă.
the child has push-PERF door-SG F open-SG F
'The child pushed the door open.'
b. *Ion a ciocănit fierul plat.
John has hammer-PERF the metal-SG M flat-SG M
'John hammered the metal flat.'

(4) a. *Gianni ha martellato il metallo piatto. (Merlo 1988: 338)
b. *Jean a martelé le métal plat.

English abounds in RCs with fake reflexive objects, as illustrated in (5a); with non-subcategorized inalienably possessed NPs expressing a body part, as in (5b) and other non-subcategorised postverbal NPs, built on unergative or intransitively used transitive verbs, as in (5c) and (5d).

(5) a. Dora shouted herself hoarse. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 35)
b. She danced her feet sore.
c. The dog barked him awake.
d. They drank the teapot dry/empty. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 37)

None of these (and similar) constructions are possible in Romanian, at least in a resultative reading. This is illustrated in the following:

(6) a. *Dora s- a strigat răguşită.
Dora REFL has shout-PERF hoarse-SG F
'Dora shouted herself hoarse.'
b. *Ea şi- a dansat picioarele dureroase.
she REFL has dance-PERF legs-PL N sore-PL F/N
'She danced her feet sore.'
c. *Căinele l- a lătrat trezit.
the dog CL3rd-SG M has bark-PERF awake-SG M
'The dog barked him awake.'
d. *Ei au băut ceainicul uscat/gol.
they have drink-PERF teapot-SG N dry/empty-SG M/N
'They drank the teapot dry/empty.'

What is even more important about these constructions in Romanian is that the sentence-final XP is lexically entailed in the meaning of the matrix verb and hence all it does is to further specify the result entailed in the verb; that is, the natural result of the action of the matrix verb is the achievement of the state lexicalised by the sentence-final RP. Compare the lexically entailed Romanian RCs in (7a, b) with the non-lexically entailed English RCs in (8a, b); none of these latter structures are possible in Romanian under a resultative reading, as illustrated in (8c, d):

(7) a. Apele au crescut mari.
waters have grow-PERF big
'Waters have grown big.'

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

b. Copilul a spart geamul țăndări.
the child has break-PERF the window splinters
'The child has broken the window into splinters.'

(8) a. The earthquake shook him awake.
b. They cut the melon open.
c. *Cutremurul l- a scuturat trezit.
earthquake CL3rd-SG M has shake-PERF awake
'The earthquake shook him awake.'
d. *Ei au tăiat pepenele deschis.
they have cut-PERF melon-SG M open-SG M
'The cut the melon open.'

What remains in Romanian is a short list of RCs based on transitive and unaccusative matrix verbs. So far, we have not found any unergative-based RC in Romanian. The matrix verb is followed by a subcategorised postverbal NP and the sentence-final predicate is mostly an NP or a PP and rarely an AP.

3.2 Difference in rendering telicity

If there is any aspect of resultatives that is completely uncontroversial, it is that they are always telic; that is, they always describe events with a definite endpoint. As stated also in Tenny (1994: 38), "when the resultative predicate is added, the verb phrases are exclusively delimited, with the end of the event defined as the arrival of the direct argument in its new state". In the Vendler (1967) classification, states and activities are always atelic, whereas accomplishments and achievements are telic. Verbs which are of an atelic type (states and activities, but states are excluded from resultatives) may be *converted* to have a telic interpretation by the addition of a verb particle or a resultative secondary predicate. In case the verbs are ambiguous between a telic and an atelic interpretation or they are of a telic type (accomplishments and achievements, but achievements are excluded from resultatives) adding the resultative predicate only *enforces* a delimited reading (that is maybe already there).

Following Lupsa (2004) and Baciu (2007) we argue that there are two ways the telicity of the RC is rendered. The telicity of the construction can be rendered either by the sentence-final RP or the matrix verb.

First, we discuss the cases where the telicity of the construction is rendered by the sentence-final predicate. Resultative XPs derive accomplishments from activities; that is, simple activity verbs are converted into accomplishments by the addition of a telic predicate denoting the state achieved by the postverbal NP as a direct result of the action denoted by the verb. In English this is the case with activity verbs, like *hammer* and *race* which form RCs, like *hammer flat* and *race hungry/sweaty*, as illustrated in (9a, b); none of which are possible in Romanian, as shown in (9c, d). In order to prove that these verbs are activities (non-delimited) and not accomplishments (delimited), we use the classic test of *in an hour*/*for an hour* expressions: *hammer the metal for an hour /*in an hour*, *race the horses for two days/*in two days*.

(9) a. John hammered the metal flat.
b. The jockeys raced the horses hungry/sweaty. (Carrier and Randall 1992: 184)
c. *Ion a ciocănit fierul plat.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

John has hammer-PERF the metal-SG M flat-SG M
'John has hammered the metal flat.'

d. *El a gonit caii flămânzi /transpirați.
he has race-PERF the horses-PL M hungry-PL M /sweaty-PL M
'He raced the horses hungry/sweaty.'

Second, the telicity of the construction can be rendered by a telic, change-of-state matrix verb, in which case the XP predicate does not act as a mark of telicity, but simply describes the resultant state inherent in the semantics of the verb. This is the case of verbs, like *break* and *cut*, respectively *a sparge* and *a tăia* which form RCs, like *break into splinters*, *cut into pieces*, illustrated in (10a, b); respectively *a sparge țăndări* and *a tăia în bucăți*, illustrated in (10c, d). Again, the *in an hour/for an hour* expressions are good tests of delimitedness/non-delimitedness; the compatibility of the matrix verb with the *in*-phrase is a proof of its accomplishment status, cf. *break the window in two seconds/*for two seconds, cut the dress in half an hour/*for half an hour*.

(10) a. The child broke the window into splinters.
b. She cut the dress into pieces/short.
c. Copilul a spart geamul țăndări.
the child has break-PERF the window splinters
'The child has broken the window into splinters.'
d. Ea a tăiat rochia în bucăți /scurtă.
she has cut-PERF dress-SG F in pieces /short-SG F
'She has cut the dress into pieces/short.'

Coming back to subsection 2.1, Romanian allows only those AP RCs where the sentence-final predicate only further specifies the state entailed in the verb.

Third, we have to say a few words about neuter verbs some RCs are built on. These verbs, depending on the context, allow both a telic and an atelic reading and in this case the sentence-final predicate only enforces the telic interpretation. This is the case of the English verbs *boil* and *sweep* which form RCs with the predicates *hard*, respectively *clean*. As we see in (11a, b), English allows both of these verbs to form true RCs, whereas Romanian presents certain restrictions to this paradigm, illustrated in (11c, d). These verbs are compatible with both the *in* and the *for* time adverbials, as illustrated in *boil the eggs in five minutes/for five minutes* and *sweep the floor in half an hour/for half an hour*.

(11) a. I boiled the eggs hard.
b. She swept the floor clean.
c. Am fiert ouăle tari.
have boil-PERF the eggs-PL N hard-PL M/N
'I have boiled the eggs hard.'

d. *Ea a frecat podeaua curată. [5]
she has wipe-PERF the floor-SG F clean-SG F
'She has wiped the floor clean.'

[5] There is no true RCs in Romanian built on the matrix verb *a freca*, the construction *a freca podeaua lună/oglindă* is rather idiomatic and is based on comparison.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

The generalisation that we get from this presentation is that Romanian RCs can only be built on accomplishment change-of-state verbs or, in cases, on neuter verbs, but they can never be built on activity verbs.[6]

Another piece of evidence that English allows RCs built on activity as well as accomplishment matrix verbs, whereas Romanian allows RCs built only on accomplishments verbs, is supported by the comparison of the following English and Romanian 'cooking' examples. The verbs *fry* and *burn* are accomplishment change-of-state verbs, hence the grammaticality of (12a, b) and (12d, e), whereas the verb *cook* is an atelic activity verb, hence the grammaticality of (12c) in English, but the ungrammaticality of (12f) in Romanian.

(12) a. He fried the meat to ashes.
b. He burnt something to ashes.
c. He cooked the turkey to ashes.
d. El a prăjit carnea scrum.[7]
he has fry-PERF the meat ash
'He has fried the meat to ashes.'
e. El a ars ceva scrum.
he has burn-PERF something ash
'He has burned something to ashes.'
f. *El a gătit ceva scrum.
he has cook-PERF something ash
'He has cooked something to ashes.'

That English freely admits other XP predicates with the same accomplishment or activity verbs are illustrated in the following examples, none of which are possible in Romanian:

(13) a. He fried the bacon crisp.
b. He burnt the toast dry/black.
c. He cooked the stove/the food black.
c. He cooked the meat/the pot dry.

As a preliminary conclusion, we can say that there are RCs based on inherently telic verbs (accomplishments), where the sentence-final RP is not a mark of telicity, but it only further specifies the state entailed in the meaning of the matrix verb. These RCs are available in both English and Romanian. RCs based on inherently atelic verbs (activities), where the sentence-final RP is the mark of telicity and which derive accomplishments from activities are only found in English and other Germanic languages, but not in Romanian. RCs based on neuter verbs, which, according to the context, are either telic or atelic, present some restrictions in Romanian.

[6] That in Romanian RCs the sentence-final predicate only further specifies the state entailed in the matrix verb is supported by the definition of some verbs the constructions can be built on; cf. *a creşte = a se mări*, *a deveni mai mare* (cf. *apele au crescut mari*), *a măcina = a preface diverse boabe/materiale în pulbere* (cf. *a măcina cafeaua în pudră*), *a pisa = a zdrobi*, *a sfărâma o substanță/un corp solid pentru a le preface în praf* (cf. *a pisa ceva pulbere*), *a rupe = a face bucăți* (cf. *a rupe ceva în bucăți*), *a sparge = a preface în bucăți*, *în cioburi* (cf. *a sparge geamul țăndări/în cioburi*).

[7] In these and similar constructions it is more preferred to use the matrix verb *a face*, cf. *a face carnea scrum*, *carnea s-a făcut scrum*, *a face geamul/paharele țăndări*, *a face hainele zdrențe* etc.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

4. RCs in Romanian and the silent UP TO theory

How can we explain this systematic difference between Germanic and Romance languages, notably English and Romanian in our case? Why are AP resultatives like *hammer the metal flat* found with great productivity in English and why are they not present in the Romance languages?

Some researches have tried to explain this difference in terms of the presence/absence of some other syntactic constructions in the two families of languages. Snyder (1995, 2001), Beck and Snyder (2001) investigate from child language acquisition and cross-linguistic variation the possibility of a strong association between complex predicates (notably AP RCs, verb-particle constructions, double object constructions) and morphological compounds. Their basic argument is that the syntax of a language permits complex predicate constructions if and only if the morphology of that language freely permits compounding of open-class lexical items. They illustrate the extreme productivity of endocentric compounding in English with the compound *frog man* which can denote a man with almost any type of connection to frogs; whereas in French, which is less productive in compounding, *homme grenouille* is restricted to its original, lexical sense of *underwater diver*.

Closer to our analysis, Ramchand's (2008) First Phase Syntax argues in favor of the existence of a null *res* head which must license a Specifier to host the postverbal NP and which must provide the 'leads-to' semantics necessary for a result interpretation. She argues that it is a special fact about English that this null *res* head is available (note that the presence of an overt PP makes the construction ungrammatical, cf. *Ariel ran her shoes ragged/to rags* versus **Ariel ran her shoes to ragged*). Thus, she explains the availability of most AP resultatives in English by claiming that this language possesses a null lexical item with the requisite semantics; but as Italian does not have a null *res* head, it cannot have productive AP RCs.

In this paper we also argue that the large availability of English (AP) RCs is in sharp contrast with their almost complete lack in Romance languages owing to the presence/absence of another phenomenon in the two families of languages.

It has been argued by Kayne (2005) that there are silent nouns in English, as in (14a) where the adjectival character of *few* can be reconciled with its occurrence with *a* if we take *few* to directly modify a noun distinct from the visible plural noun *books*. The noun in question is a silent counterpart of the overt NP *number*, as in (14b):

(14) a. a few books
b. a few NUMBER books [8]

This hypothesis carries over in an obvious way to *little* and *much*, which modify the silent noun AMOUNT, as well as to color adjectives which modify either the overt noun *color* or its silent counterpart COLOR, as in:

(15) a. Children should eat only a little AMOUNT chocolate.
b. John bought a blue COLOR car yesterday.

Turning now to age context, we see that in English the following examples are possible:

[8] The notation with capital letters is taken from Kayne (2005) to indicate lack of phonetic realization.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

(16) a. At the age of seven YEARS, John could ride a bicycle.[9]
b. Even at two and a half YEARS, John could not talk.

The possibility of having silent YEARS licensed by a numeral in the context of *age* and AGE is not made automatically available by Universal Grammar, as shown by the impossibility of the previous examples in Romanian, French and Italian:

(17) a. La vârsta de şapte *(ani) Ion nu putea să meargă cu bicicleta.
at age of seven years John not can-PERF to go with bicycle
'At the age of seven, John could not ride a bicycle.'
b. Chiar şi la doi *(ani) şi jumătate Ion încă nu vorbea.
even and at two years and half John yet not talk-PERF
'Even at two and a half, John could not talk.'
c. À l'âge de sept *(ans), Jean….
d. All'età di sette *(anni), Gianni….

Turning now to RCs, it has been largely argued that these constructions, as opposed to locatives or depictives, are compatible with the 'until' paraphrase and involve an abstract 'path' argument corresponding to degrees along the scale denoted by the XP predicate, treating the final state as an endpoint to a path (of a change of state), rather than just a pure state (cf. Simpson 1983), Irimia (2002), Wechsler (2005) etc [10]. Referring to property RCs, the XP predicate treats the final state as an endpoint to a path of a change of state providing the scale along which we can assess the state of the postverbal NP. In (18), for instance, the event of hammering ends when the maximum or complete flatness of the metal has been achieved; in other words, when the metal reaches the end of the path:

(18) John hammered the metal flat.

The AP *flat* denotes the final state from a series of states of flatness. This could be illustrated as in (19),where [flat $_n$] denotes the final state (let's not forget that RCs are always telic) and the construction has the meaning that *John hammered the metal up to (complete) flatness/up to the point of being flat*.

(19) John hammered the metal flat $_1$ … flat $_2$ … flat $_3$ … flat $_n$

What we borrow from Kayne's (2005) theory is the argument about the existence of silent/null elements in English which do not exist in any of the Romance languages. Now, talking about resultatives, the silent element that exists in English is a silent UP TO element.

[9] An example, like *at the age of seven, John could ride a bicycle* can only have YEARS, but not WEEKS or DAYS as a silent noun. The latter two are not available as silent elements in English.
[10] It has been stated by Irimia (2002) that an RC like *a vopsit gardul (în) roşu* is not a real RC, as the sentence-final AP/PP does not specify the result of the action of the verb, but the manner in which the action was performed. What this RC says, according to her, is that the house is red as a result of the action of painting it and not that the house was painted until it became red or that the house was painted so that it became red. This phrase is not part of the basic thematic structure of the main verb and is not a true resultative. The same is true for the French *peindre les murs en rouge* or the Italian *ha dipinto la casa di rosso* (cf. Irimia 2002: 65-66).

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

However, not all RCs involve this abstract 'path' argument, respectively this silent element. At a closer inspection, we notice that this UP TO element is present only in the activity-based RCs where the addition of the resultative XP is used to map the activity into an accomplishment and not in the accomplishment-based RCs where the resultative XP further specifies the inherent state that is part of the meaning of the verb. Compare the activity-based RCs in (20a, b) with the accomplishment-based RCs in (20c, d):

(20) a. John hammered the metal UP TO/UNTIL flat.
b. The jockeys raced the horses UP TO/UNTIL hungry/sweaty.
c. *The child broke the window UP TO/UNTIL into splinters. [11]
d. *She cut the dress UP TO/UNTIL into pieces/short.

In Romanian only those RCs are available which are incompatible with the silent UP TO element, namely the accomplishment-based constructions.

Romance languages abound in PP resultatives, where the silent UP TO element is replaced by an overt *up to* PP. In most cases an English AP RCs can have as a Romanian counterpart a paraphrase of the predicate preceded by the overt *up to* element (*până ce, până la*). Compare (21a) with (21b, c) and (22a) with (22b, c):

(21) a. John beat Paul UP TO dead.
b. *Ion l- a bătut pe Paul mort.
John CL3rd-SG M has beat-PERF PE Paul dead-SG M
'John beat Paul dead.'
c. Ion l- a bătut pe Paul până ce a murit.
John CL3rd-SG M has beat-PERF PE Paul up to has die-PERF
'John beat Paul up to/until he (Paul) died.'

(22) a. The girls danced themselves UP TO tired.
b. *Fetele s- au dansat obosite.
girls-FEM PL REFL have dance-PERF tired-FEM PL
'The girls danced themselves tired.'
c. *Fetele au dansat până ce au devenit obosite.
girls-FEM PL have dance-PERF up to have become-PERF tired-FEM PL
'The girls danced up to/until they became tired.'

As a provisional conclusion we can say that for a resultative interpretation the idea of an abstract 'path' must be implicit somewhere in the construction. English is capable of explaining the idea of 'path' with a pure AP; whereas Romanian and generally Romance languages cannot express 'path' by means of this. This is in line with recent proposals in the literature and reflects the difference between English and Romance languages.

The silent UP TO element is interestingly illustrated in path RCs. Although there are path RCs in both languages, there are differences in the ways telicity is expressed in these constructions. These languages use different strategies in path constructions and this fact has been accounted for in terms of a parameter which shows that English is a satellite-framed language, while Romance languages are verb-framed languages (Talmy 1985). Namely,

[11] From a different point of view one could claim that the silent UP TO element cannot be compatible with these and similar cases because the result denoted by the sentence-final XP is attained instantaneously. However, the instantaneity of the result is related to the aspectual classification of the matrix verb.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

English and Romance languages map conceptual categories, such as 'manner' and 'path' onto syntactic ones (VPs and PPs) in different ways. While in English 'manner' is encoded in the verb (*dance*) and 'path/goal' in the PP (*into the room*); in Romanian 'path' is encoded in the verb (*a intra*), so that the accompanying PP is interpreted as denoting 'location' (*în cameră*) and 'manner' is expressed by means of an adjunct (*dansând*). The following pair of example illustrates this:

(23) a. He danced into the room.
b. El a intrat în cameră dansând.
he has enter-PERF in room dancing
'He entered the room dancing.' (He danced into the room.)

As opposed to Romanian, English unergative manner-of-motion verbs, like *dance*, *swim* and *walk* can be coerced into telic predicates if they are followed by a PP furnishing the 'telos' of the process denoted by the verb.

Another possibility of having telic constructions from locatives in Romanian is by means of morphologically complex PPs (e.g. *până în/până la*). Here, the first PP (*până*) has the semantic function to measure out the distance involved in the event of motion and the second (*în/la*) has the semantic function to indicate the final location of the event. (23a) could be reformulated into:

(24) El a dansat până în cameră.
he has dance-PERF until in room
'He danced up to/until in the room.' (He danced into the room.)

If the verb fails to encode 'path' and there is no morphologically complex PP, the construction will encode a located motion interpretation. This is illustrated in the following:

(25) El a dansat în cameră.
he has dance-PERF in room
'He danced in the room.'

More interestingly, the French and Romanian examples in (26b) and (26c) are correspondents of the English (26a). But whereas (26a) is ambiguous between a directed motion and a location interpretation, the corresponding Romanian and French examples have an unambiguous locative interpretation:

(26) a. The boat floated under the bridge.
b. Barca a plutit sub pod. [12]
boat has float-PERF under bridge
'The boat floated under the bridge.'
c. Le bateau a flotté sous le pont.
the boat has float-PERF under the bridge
'The boat floated under the bridge.'

[12] As suggested by a native speaker, the equivalent construction in Italian can have a (colloquial) directed motion interpretation if it is built not with the auxiliary *avere* 'have', but with the auxiliary *essere* 'be'.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

The English example in (26a) has both a telic/path interpretation (*float* UP TO *under the bridge*), as well as an atelic/locative interpretation (*float under the bridge*). The French and Romanian examples have only a locative interpretation. In order to include the idea of 'path', both of these latter structures must include an overt *up to* element. The Romanian correspondent is *până*, whereas the French is *jusqu'a*. The telic correspondents of (26b) and (26c) would look like this:

(27) a. Barca a plutit până sub pod.
boat has float-PERF up to under bridge
'The boat floated up to under the bridge.'
b. Le bateau a flotté jusqu'a sous le pont.
the boat has float-PERF up to under the bridge
'The boat floated up to under the bridge.'

The theory of the silent UP TO element, borrowed from Kayne (2005) is compatible with the approach presented in this paper. The silent UP TO paraphrase can only be applied to RCs built on inherently atelic, activity verbs, where the verb – XP predicate complex gets a telic interpretation by the addition of the predicate. As such, *hammer the metal flat* means 'hammer the metal UP TO the metal is flat' and *race the horses hungry/sweaty* means 'race the horses UP TO the horses are hungry/sweaty'. This is not the case with RCs built on accomplishment verbs, like *cut the meat into pieces* or *paint the fence red*. In Romanian only tis latter type of RC is available.

5. Conclusions

The general conclusion is that Romanian RCs are based only on transitive and intransitive unaccusative matrix verbs. The verb is followed by a subcategorised postverbal NP and the sentence-final predicate is mostly an NP or a PP and rarely an AP. The matrix verb is mostly a change-of-state accomplishment verb implying the result state lexicalised by the sentence-final RP. This is in sharp contrast with the RCs in Germanic languages which abound in RCs based on different types of verbs, followed by fake reflexives and non-subcategorised postverbal NPs and where the RP is expressed by a large variety of lexically-entailed and non-lexically entailed NPs, PPs and APs. Romanian covers only a subpart of the resultatives available in Germanic languages.

Our approach has been shown to be compatible with the silent UP TO theory taken from Kayne (2005). The presence/absence of the silent UP TO element in resultatives is correlated with the presence/absence of activity matrix verbs in these constructions. English allows the presence of a silent UP TO element in constructions based on atelic, activity matrix verbs (cf. *hammer the metal flat*), whereas Romanian and generally all Romance languages disallow the presence of the silent UP TO element. Romance languages allow only accomplishment-based constructions (cf. **a ciocăni fierul plat*, *a sparge ceva în bucăți*).

"Babeş-Bolyai" University
Faculty of Letters, Cluj-Napoca
farkas_imola_agnes@yahoo.com

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

References

Baciu, I. 2007. Aspect şi construcţii rezultative. *Limba română. Stadiul actual al cercetării. Actele celui de al 6-lea colocviu al catedrei de limba română*, 51-58. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Beck, S., Snyder, W. 2001. Complex predicates and Goal PP's: Evidence for a semantic parameter. In A. H.-J. Do, L. Dominguez and A. Johansen (eds.). *Proceedings of the 25th Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 114-122. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Carrier, J., Randall, J. 1992. The argument structure and the syntactic structure of resultatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 173-234.

Drăgan, R. 2005. On resultative constructions and *ÎN/IN (-EN)* prepositions/prefixes in Romanian and English. *Conference on British and American Studies*, 99-104. Braşov: "Transylvania" University.

GALR. 2005. Gramatica limbii române. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Ionescu, D. C. 1998. *Small Clauses in English and Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Irimia, M. 2002. Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Secondary Predicates. MA Dissertation, University of Toronto.

Kayne, R. 2005. *Movement and Silence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Legendre, G. 1997. Secondary predication and functional projections in French. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 1-45.

Levin, B., Rappaport Hovav, M. 1995. *Unaccusativity. At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lupsa, C. D. 2004. Resultative Phrases as Modifiers. PhD Dissertation, Tohoku University.

Mateu, J. F. 2000. Why can't we wipe the slate clean? A lexical-syntactic approach to resultative constructions. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 8: 71-95.

Merlo, P. 1988. Secondary predicates in Italian and English. In J. Powers, K. De Jong (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Eastern States Conference/ESCOL*, 338-348. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.

Napoli, D.-J. 1992. Secondary resultative predicates in Italian. *Journal of Linguistics* 28: 53-90.

Ramchand, G. 2008. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Secrieru, M. 2001. *Cumulul de funcţii sintactice în limba română („elementul predicativ suplimentar")*. Iaşi: Editura Universităţii "Alexandru Ioan Cuza".

Simpson, J. 1983. Resultatives. In L. Levin, M. Rappaport and A. Zaenen (eds.), *Papers in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, 143-157. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Snyder, W. 1995. Language Acquisition and Language Variation: The Role of Morphology. PhD Dissertation, MIT.

Snyder, W. 2001. On the nature of syntactic variation: Evidence from complex predicates and complex word-formation. *Language* 77: 324-342.

Talmy, L. 1985. Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms. In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. III, *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 57-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tenny, C. 1994. *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Vendler, Z. 1967. *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Wechsler, S. 2005. Resultatives under the 'event-argument homomorphism' model of telicity. In N. Erteschik-Shir and T. Rapoport (eds.), *The Syntax of Aspect*, 255-273. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zeană, I. 1992. *Cântitsi tră armănami. Cîntece pentru aromâni: versiune paralelă aromână-română*. Syracuse, NY: Cartea Aromână.

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)

BDD-A9823 © 2009 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-26 16:59:48 UTC)