THE PATH ARGUMENT OF RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS

Imola-Ágnes Farkas*

Abstract: The premise of the paper is that resultative constructions involve an abstract Path argument by which the secondary predicate is treated as an endpoint to a path of a change of state/location, rather than a pure state/location. The discussion in this paper revolves around the way in which Ramchand's (2008) *res*P, a structural position in the syntactic skeleton of resultative constructions, corresponding to the abstract Path argument, differs in English and in Romanian. The paper offers a unified account of state and location resultatives in light of this abstract argument.

Keywords: resultative construction, Path argument, *res*P, English, Romanian

1. Introduction

A resultative construction of the surface form DP-VP-(DP)-XP is defined as a secondary predicate construction with a preparatory/causing process expressed by the VP and a consequent/resultant state or location supplied by the XP predicate (where XP = DP/NP, AP, PP or Prt). The main aim of the paper is to provide evidence in favour of the existence of a Path argument relating the preparatory process with the consequent state or location and to discuss the difference between English and Romanian resultatives in light of this abstract argument, represented in Ramchand's (2008) first phase syntax as the *res* functional head. We show that a unified account of state and location resultatives from the perspective of this functional head sheds light on the basic difference between these predicate structures in the two languages.

The paper is organized as follows: in section 2 we bring semantic and crosslinguistic evidence in favour of the existence of a Path argument in resultative constructions. Our conclusion is that contrary to other secondary predicate structures, resultatives include a Path argument and the state/location denoted by the XP predicate is treated not as a pure state/location, but rather as an endpoint to a path of a change of state/location. In section 3 we turn to the l-syntactic analysis of these predicate structures in English and Romanian. On the one hand, the Path argument of state resultatives, represented by the *res* functional

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

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

head can be null[1] in English, thus generating canonical AP state resultatives within the phenomenon of Result Augmentation. On the other hand, Romanian state resultatives are much more restricted and allow structures where the *res* functional head is either incorporated in the l-syntactic representation of the verb or it is overtly expressed by a bounded PP predicate. Location resultatives seem to share the same pattern in the two languages. Finally, in section 4 we conclude our comparative analysis of English and Romanian resultative constructions.

2. The Path argument of resultative constructions

As opposed to depictives, where the sentence-final predicate expresses the property that the subject/object DP *has at the time* when the action of the verb occurs; in state resultatives the predicate expresses the property that the object DP (or rarely the subject DP) *acquires as a result* of the action of the verb. Hence, state resultatives, as opposed to depictives, necessarily involve an abstract Path argument, treating the predicate not as a pure state, but rather as an endpoint to a path of a change of state. In terms of Lexical Conceptual Structure (LCS), the resultative in (1) would be represented as in (2), where the variables *x* and *y* are the arguments that are projected into the syntax:

(1) The gardener watered the flowers flat.
(2) [x CAUSE [y BECOME (AT) z] BY [x 'water' y]] Levin and Rapoport (1988: 282)

What (2) tells us about the resultative in (1) is not that the flowers (*y*) were flat (*z*) when the gardener (*x*) watered them, but that the gardener (*x*) caused the flowers (*y*) to become flat (*z*) by watering them. Thus, in (1) there is "more" than the linearization of the matrix verb *water*, the postverbal DP *the flowers* and the result phrase *flat*; as the secondary predicate denotes not the pure state of the flowers, but the end state from a series of states of flatness and the activity of watering is over once the state of (complete) flatness is achieved. This resultative involves either a temporal interpretation as 'The gardener watered the flowers until/up to (the moment) the flowers were flat' or a causal one as 'The gardener watered the flowers and, as a result, the flowers became flat'. Some may argue that such a construction is also amenable to a consecutive interpretation of the type 'The gardener watered the flowers for so much time that they became flat'.

[1] A terminological note is in order here: the term "null" that we borrow from Ramchand (2008) is used to designate those cases where *res* is neither contained in the l-syntactic representation of the verb, nor overtly expressed by a bounded PP predicate. Thus, the *res* head incorporated in the l-syntactic representation of the verb is not null, but it can still be phonologically silent.

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

An interesting point here is that Goldberg (1995), arguing for a distinct treatment of constructions expressing the resulting state (resultative) and those expressing the resulting location (caused-motion construction) views the resultative as a metaphorical extension of the latter structure. Although we do not agree with her distinct treatment of state (resultative) and location (caused-motion) constructions, as there is no principled reason to say that result states are resultative predicates, but result locations are not; we do agree with her claim that equally to location structures which involve an overt Path argument along which the event of motion takes place up to the final location, state resultatives also involve an (abstract) Path argument which implies the "interpretation of the result phrase as a metaphorical type of goal" (Goldberg 1995: 81). In this sense, in our previous example, the flowers metaphorically move from the initial state of non-flatness to the final state of (complete) flatness; see also the LCS representation in (2).

Evidence in favour of the Path argument of resultative constructions also lies in the existence of some AP resultatives with the *until*-variant. Whereas in the first pair of examples both (a) and (b) are felicitous, in the second pair (a) is considered slightly infelicitous:

(3) a. She beats the egg whites creamy/fluffy.
b. She beats the egg whites until creamy/until fluffy.
(4) a. *? She beats the egg whites stiff/foamy/thick.
b. She beats the egg whites until stiff/until foamy/until thick.

Moreover, there are some languages which overtly express the Path argument of resultatives with a predicate-final suffix. It is notably the case of Finno-Ugric languages which have an extremely rich case system and which mark different secondary predicates with different suffixes. In Hungarian, the result phrases are mostly sublative or translative case-marked with the attachment of the suffixes *-ra/-re* 'onto', respectively *-vá/-vé* 'into' to the bare state APs or to DPs. These suffixes express a state, a property or a function into which the postverbal DP (or the subject DP) enters or the end point of a change:

(5) Mari feketé-**re** /szén-**né** égette a pírítós-t.[2]
Mary black-SUBL/coal- TRANS burn-PERF ART toast- ACC
'Mary has burned the toast black/to a cinder.'

On the other hand, in depictive constructions the predicates are essive case-marked with the attachment of the suffixes *-an/-en/-on*. In some English cases, like (6a) where both a resultative and a depictive reading are possible, the ambiguity between the two interpretations can easily be clarified, owing to the sublative, respectively the essive case-marked predicates:

[2] The consonant of the suffix is totally assimilated by the last consonant of the root word; thus *szé**n**+**vé*** = *szé**n**+**né*** 'coal-into'.

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

(6) a. Mary cooked the fish dry.
b. Mari száraz-**ra**/ száraz-**on** sütötte a hal(a)-t.
Mari dry- SUBL / dry- ESS cook-PERF ART fish- ACC
'Mary has cooked the fish dry $_{res}$/dry $_{dep}$.'

Similarly to Hungarian, in Finnish the resultative predicates are translative case-marked by the attachment of the suffix *-ksi* 'into'. The translative case occurs in events that have or presuppose structures involving change of state comprising a prior state of affairs and a resulting state:

(7) Ravist-i-n mato-n puhtaa-**ksi**. (Fong 2003: 203)
shake-PERF-SG carpet-SG ACC clean- TRANS
'I shook a/the carpet clean.'

In these Finno-Ugric languages the sublative and translative case-marked predicates of resultatives express that the postverbal DP direct object has acquired the state expressed by them.

All these pieces of evidence illustrate that resultatives involve an abstract Path argument and that the sentence-final AP predicate is not the overlapping state holding during the event of the verb, but the state acquired as a result of the action of the verb. In other words, the result can be understood as an abstract Path (see also Talmy 1991).

While it is logically possible, within comparative syntax that the absence of an overt functional element in language A corresponding to a functional element visible in language B indicates that language A entirely lacks that functional element, there is a substantial tradition that has profitably taken the opposite; namely, if language B visibly has some functional element, then all languages must have it, even if in some or many it fails to be pronounced at all (see also Kayne 2005). The syntactic projection corresponding to the abstract Path argument of resultative constructions is the *res* functional head in Ramchand's (2008) l-syntactic analysis.

3. The syntax of resultative constructions

The syntactic structure of resultative constructions has been a matter of lively debate throughout the history of generative syntax, most linguists assigning them a small clause structure, others considering that they form a complex predicate and still others proposing that they have a ternary branching VP structure. We believe that a uniform small clause analysis is conceptually superior over the other syntactic accounts proposed in the vast literature. As the present paper demonstrates, Ramchand's (2008) first phase syntax is eligible not only from a syntactic point of view, but also from a cross-linguistic perspective.

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

3.1 The background

The distinct arguments or role types which participate in the construction of eventive predicates in Ramchand (2008) are INITIATOR/CAUSER, UNDERGOER, RESULTEE, PATH or RESULT-RHEME. Based on these argument types, Ramchand's event structure syntax contains three subevental components: the vP introducing the causation event and licensing the external argument (the INITIATOR), the VP specifying the nature of the change/process and licensing the entity undergoing change of process (the UNDERGOER) and the RP giving the result state, the "telos" of the event and licensing the entity that comes to hold the result state (the RESULTEE). In the same way as Rizzi's (1997) left periphery of the phrase, the CP is split up into several phrases, like ForceP, TopP, FocP and FinP; Ramchand's proposal is a maximal possible decomposition of the VP where the lexical semantics of the verb is syntactically represented. In case the lexical-encyclopaedic content of the verb identifies both the initiational transition and the process, the verb is listed as an [init, proc]-type of verb. In case it identifies the content of all three causationally related subevents, it is listed as an [init, proc, res]-type of verb. Possible connections to the traditional Vendlerian aspectual classes run in the following way: activities correspond to [(init), proc]-type of verbs; accomplishments are [init, proc]-type verbs with incremental theme or PATH complements and achievements are [(init), proc, res]-type of verbs.

Ramchand's l-syntactic structure of the VP is carried over to resultative constructions, the author embracing the fundamental syntactic model of these predicate constructions by assigning them a small clause structure, labelled SC, as depicted in the following:

(8)



(Ramchand 2008: 39)

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

The *res* head, which is meaningful and makes active semantic contribution to the expression in which it appears, is doubly necessary. On the one hand, it licenses the RESULTEE DP_1 in [Spec, RP] and on the other hand it mediates the predication relation between the subject RESULTEE DP_1 and the XP predicate of the small clause providing the 'leads to' semantics, by which the RESULTEE DP_1 acquires the state or arrives at the location expressed by the predicate.

3.2 Resultatives in English

3.2.1 State resultatives

An important type of state resultative is the one built on (change-of-state) [init, proc, res]-type of verb where the *res* functional head is included in the l-syntactic representation of the verb, as illustrated in the following:

(9) Raid kills $_{[(init), proc, res]}$ bugs dead.

(10)



Such constructions have been called "false" (Mateu 2000) or "weak" (Washio 1997) resultatives, because an [(init), proc]-type of verb with an incremental theme or PATH complement or an [(init), proc, res]-type of verb (corresponding to an accomplishment-, respectively an achievement-type of verb

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

from the Vendlerian classification) encodes the *res*P in its representation. The template associated with these verbs, which already independently identify a result, cannot be augmented further; hence, all the added result phrase does is to specify the change lexicalized by the verb or to confirm what is otherwise implicated in its meaning.

It is also possible to express change of state by the addition to an [(init), proc]-type of verb of a PP predicate, usually headed by *to* or *into*, mediating the predication relation between the postverbal DP and the predicate. Like in the case of location resultatives, these prepositions are denoted as PathPs. One example is illustrated in the following where *to* measures out the path of change and the PP *in* denotes the endpoint of change:

(11) They starved $_{[init,\ proc]}$ the rebels in-to $_{PathP}$ submission/to $_{PathP}$ death. (Carrier and Randall 1992: 203)

(12)



Both Folli (2002) and Ramchand (2008) claim that the reason why English has canonical AP state resultatives is because the *res* functional head can be null. Although *res*P is present, it is not identified by the verb root itself or by an overt PP predicate, but by a null head which takes the predicate of the small clause as its complement. This is shown in the following:

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

(13) John hammered $_{[init, proc]}$ the metal flat.

(14)



Such constructions have been called "true" (Mateu 2000) or "strong" (Washio 1997) resultatives, because an [(init), proc]-type of verb (corresponding to an activity-type of verb from the Vendlerian classification) is augmented by the addition of a result predicate which describes the final state arrived at by the thematic argument; a phenomenon known as Template Augmentation (Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1998) or Result Augmentation (Ramchand 2006, 2008).

3.2.2 Location resultatives

The generalization about English resultatives denoting change in location is that in case the verb contains *res*P in its representation, it can only combine with a location-denoting PP complement (denoted PlaceP), in which case the semantics of the *res* head in the verb gives rise to the telic interpretation of the construction, as in (15):

(15) The boys jumped $_{[(init), proc, res]}$ in $_{PlaceP}$ the water (in one second).

If the verb contains only (*init*P and) *proc*P in its representation as in (16a) or (16b), in order to get a directed motion interpretation it must combine with a bounded goal PP (denoted PathP), usually *to* or *into*/*onto*, where *to* measures out the distance involved in the event of motion and *in* denotes the final location; but it cannot combine with unbounded PPs, like *towards*:

(16) a. The boys jumped $_{[(init), proc]}$ in-to $_{PathP}$ the water (in one second).

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

b. The couples danced/walked $_{[(init), proc]}$ in-to $_{PathP}$/*towards the hall (in two minutes).

These [init, proc]-type of verbs, in combination with a location PP give rise to a non-resultative interpretation, as in (17). In (18) we illustrate the possibilities of deriving bounded and unbounded location resultatives with *jump*:

(17) a. The boys jumped $_{[(init), proc]}$ in $_{PlaceP}$ the water (all afternoon).
b. The couples danced/walked $_{[init, proc]}$ in $_{PlaceP}$ the hall (for half an hour).

(18)



To sum up, in English state resultatives the *res* head can be incorporated in the l-syntactic representation of the verb (generating "weak" resultatives), overtly expressed by a bounded PP predicate headed by *to* or *into* or it can be null (generating "strong" resultatives). Location resultatives do not license null *res* projections in their l-syntactic structure.

3.3 Resultatives in Romanian

3.3.1 State resultatives

Searching for an explicit account of what factor is responsible for the cross-linguistic variation in the distribution of English and Italian resultative constructions, both Folli (2002) and Ramchand (2008) mention that the reason why Italian lacks canonical AP state resultatives of the type *hammer the metal flat* is because in this language the *res* functional head cannot be null. Independently,

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

Luigi Rizzi (p.c.) has suggested that in English there is a silent *up to* element, which is not possible in Romance languages, hence the impossibility to build canonical AP resultatives. In what follows we restrict ourselves to analyzing these constructions in Romanian.

What we note first is that most Romanian resultatives are built on verbs which incorporate the *res* functional head in their l-syntactic structure. These [(init), proc, res]-type of verbs give rise to a bounded interpretation and all the added sentence-final predicate does is either to highlight the degree of the outcome of the event or to render the vague endpoint of the event more precise. Some of these verbs, denoting external changes of state are *a creşte* 'grow', *a (se) zdrobi* 'smash', *a sfărâma* 'shatter', *a (se) rupe* 'tear', *a (se) sparge* 'break', *a tăia* 'cut', *a măcina* 'grind', *a vopsi* 'paint'.

The following pair of examples is illustrative. Because the verb *a creşte* 'grow' lexically includes the notion of 'upward', the perfect English resultative *she grew tall* is perceived as redundant in Italian (Napoli 1992: 82). Example (19a) also sheds light on the fact that it is possible to have AP resultatives in Romanian, provided the verb contains the *res*P in its representation:

(19) a. Copi-i-i au crescut$_{[(init), proc, res]}$ mari.
child-PL-ART have grow-PERF big-PL M
'The children have grown big.'

b. Suporter-i-i au spart$_{[init, proc, res]}$ geam-uri-le ţăndăr-i.
fan-PL-ART have break-PERF window-PL-ART splinter-PL
'The fans have broken the windows into splinters.'

(20)



A note is in order here: not all [init, proc, res]-based resultatives from English are possible in Romanian (under a result interpretation); see (9), repeated here for convenience:

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

(21) a. Raid kills $_{[(init), proc, res]}$ bugs dead.
b. *Raid omoară $_{[(init), proc, res]}$ gândac-i- i morţ-i.
Raid kill-PRES bug- PL-ART dead-PL M
'Raid kills bugs dead.'

Building Romanian resultatives with [init, proc]-type of verbs not containing the *res*P in their representation, as in (22a), would only be possible if the verb combined with a bounded PP predicate headed by prepositions, like *într-un/într-o* 'into' or (*până*) *în/la* '(until/up to) in/at' with *până* 'until/up to' measuring out the Path of change and the prepositions *în/la* 'in/at' denoting the final state:

(22) a. The earthquake shook $_{[init, proc]}$ the town awake.
b. *Cutremur(u)-l a scuturat $_{[init, proc]}$ oraş(u)-l treaz.
earthquake-ART has shake-PERF town- ART awake.SG M
'The earthquake has shaken the town awake.'
c. Cutremur(u)-l a scuturat $_{[init, proc]}$ oraş(u)-l până $_{PathP}$ la trezire.
earthquake- ART has shake-PERF town- ART up to at a wakening
'The earthquake has shaken the town until waking (it) up.'

(23)



With these process verbs, the predicate must be a bounded PP for a resultative interpretation; otherwise, a depictive or an attributive reading arises. Other similar examples, like *a biciui* $_{[init, proc]}$ *până* $_{PathP}$ *la sânge/*sângeros* 'whip

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

until bloody/*bloody' or *a întinde*$_{[init, proc]}$ *până* $_{PathP}$ *la ruptură/*rupt* 'stretch until broken/*broken' are easy to build in Romanian.

There are some less studied Romanian constructions which are semantically and lexically frozen items, but which follow the pattern and the syntax of resultatives. Their puzzling character is given by the fact that their metaphorical resultative semantics is constructed by the addition of a strictly predicative NP in its default form, characterized by the absence of any type of inflection:

(24) L- au bătut măr.
CL3 SG M have beat-PERF apple
'They have beaten him flat/senseless/to a pulp.'

(25) a bate măr/*măr(u)-l/ *un măr/*mer-e/ *mer-e- le
to beat apple/apple-ART/ART apple/apple-PL/apple-PL-ART

A closer attention to these constructions reveals that they are mostly structures in which the verb incorporates *res*P in its structure. They allow a large variety of [init, proc, res]-type of verbs denoting exterior, as well as interior changes of state; with the result predicate intensifying the action of the verb, as in the following with our literal translations: *a freca lună* 'wipe moon', *a îngheța bocnă* 'freeze bone', *a lega cobză* 'tie cobs/violin'; respectively *a se îndrăgosti lulea* 'fall in love pipe', *a se îmbăta criță* 'get drunk steel' and *a se supăra foc* 'get angry fire'.

The verb *a freca* 'wipe', ambiguous between a bounded and an unbounded reading (26a) is "converted" to an unambiguous bounded one by the addition of the result phrase, in (26b):

(26) a. Mama a frecat $_{[init, proc, (res)]}$ podea(u)-a timp de / în zece minute.
mother has wipe-PERF floor- RT time of / in ten minutes
'Mother has wiped the floor for/in ten minutes.'

b. Mama a frecat $_{[init, proc, res]}$ podea(u)-a lună *timp de / în zece minute.
mother has wipe-PERF floor- ART moon time of / in ten minutes
'Mother has wiped the floor shiny *for/in ten minutes.'

(27)


BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)



Interestingly, some of these "metaphorical" resultatives are built on [init, proc]-type of verbs, like in *a dormi tun* 'sleep cannon', *a tăcea chitic* 'keep silent fish' or *a curge gârlă* 'flow stream'. At first sight, they seem to support the existence of Result Augmentation in Romanian, because neither the verb incorporates the *res* functional head in its l-syntactic structure, nor the predicate is of a bounded PathP type to give rise to telicity. But at a closer inspection we notice that these constructions are not bounded. Compare (28a) with (28b):

(28) a. Am dormit [init, proc] tun toată ziua/*în cinci minute.
have sleep-PERF cannon all day/ in five minutes
'I have slept very deeply (like a cannon) all day/*in five minutes.'
b. Am adormit [init, proc, res] bocnă *toată ziua/în cinci minute.
have fall asleep-PERF bone all day/in five minutes
'I have fallen into a (very) deep sleep *all day/in five minutes.'

The behaviour of the sentence-final predicate in (28a) is rather adverbial, as it cannot give rise to a bounded reading for a construction built on an [init, proc]-type of verb. The only real counterexamples where Result Augmentation does seem to hold in Romanian are the constructions based on the verbs *a bate* 'beat' in *a bate* [init, proc] *spumă/măr* 'beat (until) foamy/apple' and *a fierbe* 'boil' in *a fierbe* [init, proc] *(ouăle) tari* 'boil (the eggs) hard'.

3.3.2 Location resultatives

As far as location resultatives are concerned, the generalization is roughly the same as for their English correspondents. In case the verb contains the *res*P in its representation, it can combine with a PlaceP type of complement denoting the end location of the action:

(29) Noi am fugit [(init), proc, res] la PlaceP gară. (Baciu and Baciu 2007: 315)
we have run-PERF at station
'We have run to the station.'

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

If the verb contains only (*init*P and) *proc*P in its representation as in (30); then, in order to get a directed motion interpretation it must combine with a bounded PathP headed by morphologically 'complex' prepositions, like *până în/la* 'until/up to in/at' where *până* 'until/up to' measures out the distance involved in the event of motion and the PPs *în/la* 'in/at' denote the final location:

(30) Noi am alergat $_{[init, proc]}$ / ne -am plimbat $_{[init, proc]}$ până $_{PathP}$ la gară.
we have run-PERF / REFL have walk-PERF up to at station
'We have run/walked to the station.'

If the same [init, proc] verb is followed by a PP denoting only place, like *în* or *la*, the result is only an unbounded location construction:

(31) Noi am alergat $_{[init, proc]}$ / ne- am plimbat $_{[init, proc]}$ în $_{PlaceP}$ oraş /la $_{PlaceP}$ gară.
we have run-PERF/REFL have walk-PERF in town/at station
'We have run/walked in the town/at the station.'

In (32) we illustrate the possibilities of building bounded and unbounded location resultatives:

(32)


What is even more striking is that whereas the English example in (33a) is ambiguous between a locative ('floated under the bridge') and a resultative ('floated up to/until under the bridge') interpretation, its Romanian correspondent has only a purely locative interpretation, in (33b). In order to get a resultative

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

interpretation, an overt Path PP headed by *până* 'until/up to' must be added to the [init, proc]-type of verb, as in (33c):

(33) a. The boat floated under the bridge.
b. Barca a plutit [init, proc] sub PlaceP pod. (locative)
boat has float-PERF under bridge
'The boat has floated under the bridge.'
c. Barca a plutit [init, proc] până PathP sub pod. (resultative)
boat has float-PERF up to under bridge
'The boat has floated up to under the bridge.'

The small clause part of this construction built on an [init, proc]-type of verb is the following:

(34)



To sum up, state resultatives in Romanian are mostly built on [init, proc, res]-type of verbs where the added secondary predicate renders the vague endpoint of the event more precise or intensifies the action of the verb. In case *res*P is not included in the l-syntactic representation of the verb, it must be overtly expressed by a bounded PP denoting the end state of the action of the verb. Romanian does not allow the *res* functional head to be null; that is, neither included in the l-syntactic representation of the verb, nor expressed by an overt bounded PP predicate (see the extremely few exceptions above). Similarly to English, in location resultatives the *res* head is either included in the verb or it is overtly expressed by a bounded PP.

If we consider, together with Mateu (in prep.) that *until*-markers, that is, our PP predicates headed by *până* 'until/up to' do not present satellite-framed behaviour in Romanian, as they can be attached to any kind of [init, proc]-type of verb, then the Romanian data confirm Talmy's generalization that Romance languages including Romanian are "verb-framed languages" (Talmy 1985) or fall under the "Path-conflation pattern" (Talmy 2000) which involves incorporation of Path (that is, *res*P in our analysis) into the verb both in state and in location resultatives (see Talmy 1985, 1991 and 2000).

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

4. Conclusions

We have shown that resultative constructions include an abstract Path argument and the state or location denoted by the XP predicate is treated as an endpoint to a path of a change of state/location, rather than a pure state/location. The abstract Path is represented in the l-syntactic structure of resultative constructions in Ramchand's (2008) *res* head which licenses the RESULTEE in [Spec, RP] and mediates the predication relation between the subject RESULTEE and the XP predicate of the small clause.

In the present paper we have proposed a unified account of state and location resultatives. The cross-linguistic difference that arises between English and Romanian can be summarized in the following way: as far as state resultatives are concerned, English allows the *res* functional head to be null; that is, neither included in the l-syntactic representation of the verb, nor expressed by a bounded PP predicate. Romanian does not allow the same functional head to be null; that is, *res* must either be incorporated in the l-syntactic representation of the verb (in which case the sentence-final predicate specifies the end result or intensifies the action of the verb) or it must be overtly expressed by a bounded Path PP predicate, usually headed by *până* 'until/up to'. The possibility of leaving this functional head null is correlated with the availability of canonical state AP resultatives in English and the impossibility of leaving the same syntactic head null is correlated with the unavailability of the correspondent structures in Romanian. We conclude that, with extremely few exceptions, the phenomenon of Result Augmentation does not exist in Romanian. As far as location resultatives are concerned, the pattern seems to be similar in the two languages: the *res* head must either be included in the l-syntactic representation of the verb or expressed by a bounded Path PP predicate; otherwise an unbounded non-resultative reading arises. If PP predicates headed by *până* 'until/up to' do not present satellite-framed behaviour, the Romanian data confirm Talmy's generalization that Romance languages are verb-framed languages.

References

Baciu, I. and Baciu, S. 2007. Goal of motion in English and Romanian. In G. Alboiu, A. Avram, L. Avram and D. Isac (eds.), *Pitar Moş: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 315-327. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

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

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

Folli, R. 2002. Resultatives: Small clauses or complex VPs?. In C. Beyssade, R. Bok-Bennema, F. Drijkoningen and P. Monachesi (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2000. Selected Papers from 'Going Romance'*, 153-170. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fong, V. 2003. Resultatives and depictives in Finnish. In S. Manninen and D. Nelson (eds.), *Generative Approaches to Finnic and Saami Linguistics*, 201-233. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Goldberg, A. 1995. *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

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

Levin, B. and Rapoport, T. R. 1988. Lexical subordination. In L. McLeod, G. Larson and D. Brentari (eds.), *Chicago Linguistic Society 24*: 275-289. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

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

Mateu, J. in prep. Conflation and incorporation processes in resultative constructions.

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

Ramchand, G. 2006. Result augmentation. Paper presented at the University of Geneva, April 2006.

Ramchand, G. 2008. *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon. A First-phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rappaport Hovav, M. and Levin, B. 1998. Building verb meanings. In M. Butt and W. Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments. Lexical and Compositional Factors*, 97-134. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: A Handbook in Generative Syntax*, 281-335. Boston, London: Dordrecht.

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.

Talmy, L. 1991. Path to realization: A typology of event conflation. In L. Sutton, C. Johnson and R. Shields (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 480-519. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Talmy, L. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

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

Washio, R. 1997. Resultatives, compositionality and language variation. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6: 1-49.

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)

BDD-A9859 © 2011 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 18.97.14.83 (2026-09-05 11:26:48 UTC)