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SUMMARY

In Chapter 1 entitled Introduction we give details about the inspiration for the theme of the dissertation, the major aims and the scope of the paper, the appropriateness of the theme under investigation, the structure of the thesis and we set the theoretical framework.

Chapter 2 entitled On Resultative Constructions is devoted to the question of what a resultative construction is.

Section 2.1, as usually the first section of all chapters is the introductory part which sets the main aims of the chapter and gives a brief summary of the sections to follow.

Section 2.2 reviews the notion of resultative construction by introducing different definitions and accounts of this predicate structure. The definition that we adopt is the following: in a resultative construction of the surface form DP₁-VP-(DP₂)-XP the XP predicate (where XP = AP, PP, Prt, DP or NP) describes the literal or metaphorical state or location achieved by the (surface) subject (DP₁) or the postverbal DP (DP₂) it is predicated of as a direct consequence of the action denoted by the verb. This definition makes it obvious that in the thesis we do not regard state (resultative) and location (goal of motion, caused-motion or directed motion) constructions as two separate structures, but we rather say that resultative constructions denote either change in state or change in location. As there is no principled reason to say that result states are resultative predicates, but result locations are not; the present definition allows us to give a unified account of these two subtypes of the resultative construction.

Although there seems to be a more or less universally accepted definition of the resultative construction and the analyses proposed in the vast literature are fairly uniform with
respect to their implicit assumptions about the basic character of this predicate structure, the straightforwardness of the definition covers a wide array of constructions and the proposals for their typology vary according to several criteria related to the phrases that make up the construction.

Going beyond the simple definition of this predicate structure, in Section 2.3 we discuss (i) English ‘fake/false’ (Tortora 1998, Rapoport 1999), ‘weak’ (Washio 1997) or ‘direct’ (Ramchand 2006) resultatives, like freeze solid or break into pieces, where the predicate (further) specifies the state entailed in the meaning of the verb and (ii) Romanian metaphorical resultatives, like a bate măr ‘beat flat/beat as red/soft as an apple’ or a freca lună/oglinză ‘scrub clean/shiny//scrub as clean/shiny as the moon/mirror’, where the predicate denotes the metaphorical end state of the Patient argument. With our syntactic, l-syntactic, semantic, aspectual, contextual and cross-linguistic arguments we change the view largely adopted in the literature that false/weak resultatives and such metaphorical ‘expressions’ are not resultatives. Therefore, we further propose that the notion of resultative construction should be reconsidered. Hence, as our general conclusion is that there are resultatives in Romanian, the basic question to which we try to find the answer is the following: what kind of resultatives there are in this language and why.

Furthermore, we mention a few interesting differences among some Germanic and some Romance resultatives. Without diminishing or abolishing the systematic difference that exists between the resultative constructions of the two languages or the two language families, or without discrediting the generalization that English is much more productive and liberal in the expression of resultatives than Romanian, we claim that language-specific considerations should be taken into account and conclusions should not be drawn on the basis of Germanic or Romance languages more generally, but need to be related to the analysis of resultatives in a specific language/in specific languages.

Section 2.4 offers a comparative typology of English and Romanian resultative constructions based on the following five dimensions proposed by Goldberg & Jackendoff (2004): (i) the type of the governing verb, (ii) the status of the postverbal DP, (iii) the syntactic category of the result predicate, (iv) the type of change entailed in the predicate and (v) the host of the predicate.

The following table summarizes the typology of English and Romanian resultative constructions.
Table 1: The Typology of English and Romanian Resultative Constructions (‘?’ = restriction)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS OF THE TYPOLOGY</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Romanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VERB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transitive/control resultative</td>
<td>transitive verb</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unaccusative verb</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intransitive/ECM resultative</td>
<td>intransitively used transitive verb</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unergative verb</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POSTV.</strong></td>
<td>subcategorized postverbal DP</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-subcategorized postverbal DP: not pronoun</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-subcategorized postverbal DP: inalienable body part</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-subcategorized postverbal DP: ‘extended’ body part</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>non-subcategorized postverbal DP: fake reflexive</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREDICATE</strong></td>
<td>AP predicate</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP predicate</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prt predicate</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DP predicate</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP predicate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHANGE</strong></td>
<td>change in state (PP predicate)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change in state (AP predicate)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change in location (PP predicate)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change in location (AP predicate)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOST</strong></td>
<td>subject-predicated resultative</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>object-predicated resultative</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In **Section 2.5** we are faced with the difficulty of drawing a (clear) borderline between resultative and non-resultative constructions. We do not believe that a linguistic construction such as the resultative can be confined within very clear bounds. Rather, there are extensions in all directions, which determine some to adopt Goldberg’s (1995), Jackendoff’s (1997) or Goldberg & Jackendoff’s (2004) Construction Grammar approach which posits additional special subconstructions that are minimally different from the other structures. However, keeping the discussion within limits, we manage to exclude some structures which inherit the surface word-order of resultatives, but which - in our opinion - should not be taken as members of the larger class of these predicate constructions. These are some verb-particle constructions, adverbial constructions and pseudo resultatives; as well as other predicate structures, like depictives, causatives and the Romanian EPS (*element predicativ suplimentar*) construction.

**Section 2.6** presents our summary on the definition and typology of English and Romanian resultative constructions, as well as on the delimitations of this predicate structure from other, superficially similar (predicate) structures.

**Contribution**: one of the fundamental contributions that this part of the paper brings is the inclusion in the discussion of English and Romanian false/weak resultatives and - more importantly - Romanian metaphorical ‘expressions’ of the type *a bate măr* ‘beat flat//beat as soft/red as an apple’.

**Chapter 3** entitled *Syntax of Resultative Constructions* surveys various syntactic models of resultatives and their theoretical devices. The syntax of resultatives extends to uniform and non-uniform, binary branching and ternary branching, biclausal and monoclausal models proposed in the vast literature. Considering both the arguments in favour of and against these syntactic analyses, in the thesis we reject the non-uniform (hybrid) account of resultative constructions. Moreover, based on common arguments in support of the binary branching analysis, we argue that the uniform, biclausal small clause analysis is conceptually superior over the other syntactic accounts proposed in the literature. As we demonstrate, there are a number of arguments both from English and from Romanian which show that the small clause analysis is likely to be correct over the complex predicate approach or the ternary analysis.
Section 3.1 introduces the syntactic structure of resultatives and gives a short presentation of the way the chapter is structured.

Section 3.2 begins with a discussion of the Small Clause Theory which proposes that resultatives are a subtype of secondary predicate constructions that should be analyzed as sentential constituents on the syntactic level. We present in more details Hoekstra’s (1988), Bowers’ (1997) and Ramchand’s (2008) small clause analyses of resultative constructions, with special focus on the advantages of the latter l-syntactic approach.

There are some pieces of extremely compelling syntactic and semantic evidence that support the claim that English and Romanian resultative constructions are best analyzed as small clauses made up of a subject and a nonverbal predicate. Our most important arguments in favour of this syntactic model are the following: (i) the impossibility of inserting sentential adverbials in the [postverbal DP - XP predicate] constituent, (ii) the impossibility of nominalizing the verb governing the small clause, (iii) the distribution and syntactic behaviour of floating quantifiers, (iv) the existence of conjoined structures, (v) the existence of AP resultatives projecting AgrP (especially in Romanian), (vi) the status of the postverbal DP in non-canonical (English) constructions, as well as (vii) the existence of subject-predicated resultatives.

In Section 3.3 we take a look at an alternative analysis of resultative constructions in terms of the Complex Predicate Theory, according to which the governing verb and the secondary predicate form a syntactic unit. We present the complex predicate analysis in general, after which we turn to a more detailed description of the proposals put forward by Neeleman & van de Koot (2002) and Embick (2004). Our discussion shows that the Complex Predicate Theory – in spite of some of its advantages – exhibits a number of deficiencies when it comes to accounting for the syntactic relations holding between the constituents of English and Romanian resultative constructions and when it comes to accounting for their full distribution. Although the complex predicate analysis might be properly equipped to handle the syntactic and semantic behaviour of Dutch resultatives, (at least) for English it presents little immediate evidence. We present specific arguments against this syntactic model in the following order: (i) the impossibility of the English complex predicate unit to undergo topicalization and fronting; (ii) the l- and s-selection of the result predicate by the verb, which is not a sufficiently strong argument for a syntactic complex predicate analysis of resultatives;
(iii) the status of the postverbal DP and (iv) the existence of subject-predicted resultatives in English for which this syntactic model cannot account.

In Section 3.4 we turn to a number of proposals which take Predication Theory to be crucial for the syntactic analysis of these predicate constructions. On this view, resultatives should not be analyzed in terms of a sentential constituent, but rather as ‘flat’ structures in which the predication relationship between the individual constituents is represented in terms of coindexation. After introducing the Predication Theory, we examine in detail the ways in which Roberts (1988) and Carrier & Randall (1992) have contributed to the syntax of resultatives in terms of a flat structure. The most important deficiencies of this model are syntactic and distributional and they are the following: (i) the violation of Kayne’s (1984) Binary Branching hypothesis, (ii) the denial that the semantic predication relation between the two postverbal elements is encoded syntactically in terms of a pair of sister constituents, (iii) the distribution of constituents in the construction, (iv) the status of the postverbal DP, as well as (v) the impossibility of this model to account for subject-predicated resultatives.

As opposed to these uniform syntactic analyses, a fourth direction of study, the so-called hybrid analysis tries to account for the apparent contradictions in the behaviour of different resultatives by resorting to a non-uniform treatment. As such, Section 3.5 is dedicated to some non-uniform/hybrid analyses: (i) a distinction made between transitive/unaccusative-based and unergative-based resultatives, defended by Yamada (1987); (ii) a hybrid small clause analysis advocated by Sato (1987); (iii) a restructuring analysis proposed by Stowell (1991) and (iv) a cross-linguistic analysis put forth by Folli (2002). The common point of all these proposals is that different resultatives have different syntactic structure. In spite of its apparent advantages, we claim that such a syntactic model is not tenable within our comparative analysis.

Section 3.6 summarizes the chapter.

Contribution: the fundamental contributions that this part of the dissertation brings are the assignment of a uniform small clause structure to English and Romanian resultatives, based on syntactic, semantic and distributional evidence from both languages and the discussion of several counterarguments against the complex predicate approach and the ternary analysis.
Chapter 4 entitled Resultative Constructions in English and Romanian. A Comparative View provides a comparative l(exical)-syntactic analysis of English and Romanian change of location and change of state constructions.

As Section 4.1 states, the theoretical background of the chapter is Ramchand’s (2008) First Phase Syntax. However, we mention the lexicalization pattern introduced by Talmy (1985, 1991, 2000) to differentiate, among others, Germanic and Romance languages.

The premise of Section 4.2 is that resultative constructions involve an abstract Path argument by which the secondary predicate is treated not as a pure state/location, but as an endpoint to a path of a change of state/location. We examine this abstract argument as it is illustrated in Talmy’s (1985, 1991, 2000) lexicalization pattern and in Goldberg’s (1995) Construction Grammar approach where resulting states are considered to be abstract locations. We claim that an abstract Path must be represented in the l(exical)-syntax of result constructions. Therefore, we follow Ramchand’s (2008) l-syntactic model where Path is represented by the res functional head. Choosing to express the basic structural difference between English and Romanian in Ramchand’s (2008) more syntactically-driven perspective, we direct our discussion towards the way in which Ramchand’s (2008) resP, a structural position in the syntactic skeleton of resultative constructions, corresponding to the abstract Path argument differs in English and in Romanian.

What we also emphasize in this part of the chapter is that not only location resultatives, but also state resultatives involve an abstract Path argument relating the governing verb with the predicate and that languages are satellite- or verb-framed not only from the point of view of change of location, but also from the perspective of change of state constructions.

Section 4.3 discusses a large variety of English location and state resultatives in the spirit of Ramchand’s (2008) l-syntactic approach. The reason for presenting these two types of constructions in this order is given by some properties of location resultatives which are inherited by state resultatives; cf. Goldberg (1995) and Ettlinger (2008).

The main descriptive generalization of English location and state resultative constructions can be summarized as follows: English is basically a satellite-framed language (without excluding verb-framed resultatives) both from the point of view of change of location and that of change of state constructions.

This language presents a large variety of weak, as well as strong resultatives. As far as the res head is concerned, on the one hand it can be overtly expressed by a particle or a
bounded PP predicate headed by *toli nto/onto* or it can be null (these exhibit satellite-framed behaviour and roughly correspond to strong resultatives). On the other hand, *res* can also be incorporated in the l-syntactic representation of the verb (these exhibit verb-framed behaviour and roughly correspond to weak resultatives).

**Section 4.4** investigates, again in the spirit of Ramchand’s (2008) l-syntactic approach different Romanian resultatives of change of location and state. Knowing that there are resultative constructions in Romanian, this section tries to answer the question what kind of resultatives this language licenses and why. The analysis sheds light on the fact that Romanian integrates into the class of Romance languages by showing an almost exclusive verb-framed behaviour as far as goal of motion and state resultatives are concerned.

Briefly, Romanian - which is restricted to weak resultatives - lacks those location and state constructions where the verb entering the derivation is basically an [(init), proc]-type of verb, i.e. it does not incorporate *resP* in its structure; that is, it does not denote change of location/state or it does not involve directionality towards a certain change. Location and state resultatives in this language are mostly built on [(init), proc, (res)]-type of verbs where the added secondary predicate specifies the end location/state, renders the vague endpoint of the event more precise or highlights the degree of the outcome of the event. Moreover, such resultatives are subject to further severe constraints.

**Section 4.5** summarizes the analysis of English and Romanian location and state resultatives around five dimensions: (i) Talmy’s (1985, 1991, 2000) lexicalization pattern of satellite-framed and verb-framed languages, (ii) the type of the matrix verb, (iii) the way *res* head is identified (or is not identified) in the two languages, (iv) the linguistic phenomenon of Result Augmentation and (v) Underassociation.

**Section 4.6** concludes the chapter.

**Contribution**: the contribution that this part of the thesis brings is the unified and comparative analysis of English and Romanian path and result expressions in the spirit of Ramchand’s (2008) first-phase syntax; most of the data being summarized in Tables 4 and 5 below.

**Chapter 5** entitled *Final Conclusions* evaluates the final conclusions on the resultative constructions of the two languages under study and proposes some issues for future research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Romanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Table 4: Location Resultatives in English and Romanian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>[proc] verb + <em>to, into, onto</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(PathP identified by <em>to</em> which carries a res feature)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The bottle floated into the cave.</td>
<td>Flaconul a ajuns în peșteră (plutind).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>[init, proc] verb + <em>to, into, onto</em></td>
<td>[init, proc] verb + <em>până în-la</em> (adjunct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>res</em> identified by the verb)</td>
<td>(<em>PathP</em> identified by <em>până</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The officer marched the soldiers into the town.</td>
<td>Asistenta a plimbat pacientul până în parc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>[init, proc] verb + PP predicate (<em>out of, off + DP</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(null <em>res</em> head)</td>
<td>[init, proc, res] verb + PP predicate (<em>de pe NP</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex sneezed the napkin off the table.</td>
<td>Ion a șters praful de pe masă.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>[(init), proc] verb + particle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>res</em> identified by the particle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The police chased the demonstrators off.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>[proc] verb + AP predicate (<em>free/clear of DP</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(null <em>res</em> head)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judy danced/swam/skated free of her captors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>[proc, res] verb + PlaceP <em>in</em></td>
<td>[proc, res] verb + PlaceP <em>în</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>res</em> identified by the verb)</td>
<td>(<em>res</em> identified by the verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The boys jumped in the water.</td>
<td>Copii au sărit în apă.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>[init, proc, res] verb + intoto/onto/particle</td>
<td>[init, proc, res] verb + PlaceP <em>în</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(<em>res</em> identified by -to/particle, Underassociation)</td>
<td>(<em>res</em> identified by the verb, no Underassociation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sam (carefully) broke the eggs into the bowl.</td>
<td>Mama a spart ouăle în tigaie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>[init, proc] verb + subcategorized postverbal DP + AP predicate</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(null res head/no res head)</td>
<td>exc. <em>a bate</em> ‘beat’ (null res head)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John hammered the metal flat.</td>
<td>a. [init, proc] verb + <em>până în/la</em> (adjunct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PathP identified by <em>până</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cutremurul a scuturat orașul <em>până la trezire</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>[init, proc] verb + particle</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(res identified by the particle)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The child blew the candle out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>[init, proc] verb + to/into</td>
<td>[init, proc] verb + <em>până în/la</em> (adjunct)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(res identified by to)</em></td>
<td>(PathP identified by <em>până</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The guard starved the prisoners to death/into submission.</td>
<td>Paznicul a înfometat prizonierii <em>până la moarte</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>[init, proc] verb + particle</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(res identified by the particle)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The child blew the candle out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>[(init), proc] verb + non-subcategorized postverbal DP + AP predicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(null res head)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>The teacher talked his throat dry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>[(init), proc] verb + particle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(res identified by the particle)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The child blew the candle out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>[(init), proc, res] verb + AP predicate</td>
<td>![Symbol] [(init), proc, res] verb + AP predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(res identified by the verb)</em></td>
<td><em>(res identified by the verb)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raid kills bugs dead.</td>
<td>Copiii au crescut mari.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(res identified by the particle/to, Underassociation)</em></td>
<td><em>(res identified by the verb, no Underassociation)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My friend broke the china into pieces.</td>
<td>Maria a spart vaza în bucăți.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>[(init, proc, (res)) verb + AP predicate</td>
<td>![Symbol] [(init, proc, (res)) verb + NP predicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(null res head/no res head)</em></td>
<td><em>(res identified by the verb)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary wiped the table clean.</td>
<td>Ea a frecat podeaua lună.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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