

“BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF LETTERS

RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
IN ENGLISH AND ROMANIAN

- summary -

SCIENTIFIC COORDINATOR

Prof. Ștefan OLTEAN PhD

PhD CANDIDATE

Imola-Ágnes FARKAS

CLUJ-NAPOCA

2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | 6 |
| ABSTRACT | 7 |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | 8 |
| | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 9 |
| 1.1 Preliminary Considerations | 9 |
| 1.2 Chapter Summaries | 13 |
| | |
| 2 ON RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS | 14 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 14 |
| 2.2 Definitions and Accounts of Resultative Constructions | 15 |
| 2.3 Resultative Constructions in a Broader Sense | 22 |
| 2.3.1 False/Weak Resultatives | 22 |
| 2.3.2 Metaphorical Resultatives | 26 |
| 2.3.3 Resultatives in Germanic and Romance Languages | 30 |
| 2.3.4 Summary | 34 |
| 2.4 The Typology of Resultative Constructions | 35 |
| 2.4.1 The Typology of English Resultative Constructions | 36 |
| 2.4.2 The Typology of Romanian Resultative Constructions | 38 |
| 2.4.3 Summary | 43 |
| 2.5 Beyond Resultative Constructions | 45 |
| 2.5.1 Verb-Particle Constructions | 45 |
| 2.5.2 Adverbial Constructions and Pseudo-Resultatives | 49 |
| 2.5.3 Other Predicate Constructions | 51 |
| 2.5.3.1 Depictive Constructions | 51 |
| 2.5.3.2 Causative Constructions | 53 |
| 2.5.3.3 EPS Constructions | 55 |
| 2.5.4 Summary | 56 |
| 2.6 Conclusions | 57 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 3 SYNTAX OF RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS | 58 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 58 |
| 3.2 Small Clause Analysis | 60 |
| 3.2.1 The Small Clause Theory | 61 |
| 3.2.2 Resultatives as Complement Small Clauses: Hoekstra (1988) | 65 |
| 3.2.3 A Binary Branching Analysis of Resultatives: Bowers (1997) | 67 |
| 3.2.4 An L-Syntactic Analysis of Resultatives: Ramchand (2008) | 69 |
| 3.2.5 Arguments in Favour of the Small Clause Analysis | 78 |
| 3.2.5.1 The Insertion of Adverbials | 79 |
| 3.2.5.2 Nominalization | 82 |
| 3.2.5.3 Floating Quantifiers | 84 |
| 3.2.5.4 Conjoined Structures | 88 |
| 3.2.5.5 AP Resultatives | 91 |
| 3.2.5.6 Non-Canonical Resultative Constructions | 92 |
| 3.2.5.7 Subject-Predicated Resultatives | 95 |
| 3.2.6 Summary | 96 |
| 3.3 Complex Predicate Analysis | 97 |
| 3.3.1 The Complex Predicate Theory | 97 |
| 3.3.2 Complex Predicates in Dutch and English: Neeleman & van de Koot (2002) | 101 |
| 3.3.3 Deadjectival Verbs and Resultative Constructions: Embick (2004) | 104 |
| 3.3.4 Arguments against the Complex Predicate Analysis | 107 |
| 3.3.4.1 Fronting and Topicalization | 108 |
| 3.3.4.2 L- and S-Selection of the Result Predicate | 110 |
| 3.3.4.3 The Status of the Postverbal DP | 113 |
| 3.3.4.4 Subject-Predicated Resultatives | 114 |
| 3.3.5 Summary | 115 |
| 3.4 Ternary Analysis | 116 |
| 3.4.1 The Predication Theory | 116 |
| 3.4.2 The VP-internal Subject Hypothesis: Roberts (1988) | 119 |
| 3.4.3 A Ternary Branching Analysis of Resultatives: Carrier & Randall (1992) | 121 |
| 3.4.4 Arguments against the Ternary Analysis | 123 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 3.4.4.1 The Binary Branching Hypothesis | 123 |
| 3.4.4.2 Predication | 124 |
| 3.4.4.3 Distribution of Constituents | 125 |
| 3.4.4.4 The Postverbal DP | 126 |
| 3.4.4.5 Subject-Predicated Resultatives | 127 |
| 3.4.5 Summary | 128 |
| 3.5 Hybrid Analysis | 129 |
| 3.5.1 Transitive and Intransitive Resultatives: Yamada (1987) | 129 |
| 3.5.2 Hybrid Small Clause Analysis: Sato (1987) | 131 |
| 3.5.3 Restructuring: Stowell (1991) | 133 |
| 3.5.4 Resultatives in English and Italian: Folli (2002) | 135 |
| 3.5.5 Arguments against the Hybrid Analysis | 136 |
| 3.5.6 Summary | 136 |
| 3.6 Conclusions | 137 |
| | |
| 4 RESULTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN ENGLISH AND ROMANIAN. A | |
| COMPARATIVE VIEW | 138 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 138 |
| 4.2 The Path Argument of Resultative Constructions | 140 |
| 4.2.1 Path in the Lexicalization Pattern: Talmy (1985, 1991, 2000) | 140 |
| 4.2.2 Path in Change of Location and State: Goldberg (1995) | 144 |
| 4.2.3 Path in the L-Syntactic Structure: Ramchand (2008) | 146 |
| 4.2.4 Summary | 147 |
| 4.3 Resultative Constructions in English | 148 |
| 4.3.1 Resultative Constructions of Change of Location | 148 |
| 4.3.2 Resultative Constructions of Change of State | 160 |
| 4.3.3 Summary | 172 |
| 4.4 Resultative Constructions in Romanian | 173 |
| 4.4.1 Resultative Constructions of Change of Location | 173 |
| 4.4.2 Resultative Constructions of Change of State | 187 |
| 4.4.3 Summary | 209 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.5 The Comparative View | 210 |
| 4.5.1 The Lexicalization Pattern | 213 |
| 4.5.2 The Matrix Verb | 214 |
| 4.5.3 The <i>res</i> Head | 216 |
| 4.5.4 Result Augmentation | 217 |
| 4.5.5 Underassociation | 219 |
| 4.6 Conclusions | 220 |
| | |
| 5 FINAL CONCLUSIONS | 221 |
| 5.1 Summary | 221 |
| 5.2 Future Research | 226 |
| | |
| REFERENCES | 228 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1: The Typology of English and Romanian Resultative Constructions | 44 |
| Table 2: Mapping of the Caused-Motion Construction to the Resultative | 145 |
| Table 3: Configurations of the Verbs <i>jump</i> in English and <i>a sări</i> in Romanian | 183 |
| Table 4: Location Resultatives in English and Romanian | 211 |
| Table 5: State Resultatives in English and Romanian | 212 |

KEYWORDS:

resultative construction, English, Romanian, *resP*, small clause, complex predicate, binary branching analysis, ternary branching analysis, Path argument, change of state, change of location, satellite-framed language, verb-framed language, telic, atelic

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 DP_1 -VP-(DP_2)-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 (DP_1) or the postverbal DP (DP_2) 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/oglinďă* ‘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, 1-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)

| DIMENSIONS OF THE TYPOLOGY | | | English | Romanian |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|---------|-------------|
| V E R B | transitive/ control resultative | transitive verb | + | + |
| | | unaccusative verb | + | + |
| | intransitive/ ECM resultative | intransitively used transitive verb | + | - |
| | | unergative verb | + | ? |
| P O S T V. D P | subcategorized postverbal DP | | + | + |
| | non-subcategorized postverbal DP: not pronoun | | + | - |
| | non-subcategorized postverbal DP: inalienable body part | | + | - |
| | non-subcategorized postverbal DP: ‘extended’ body part | | + | - |
| | non-subcategorized postverbal DP: fake reflexive | | + | - |
| P R E D I C A T E | AP predicate | | + | ? |
| | PP predicate | | + | + |
| | Prt predicate | | + | - |
| | DP predicate | | ? | - |
| | NP predicate | | - | + |
| C H A N G E | change in state (PP predicate) | | + | + |
| | change in state (AP predicate) | | + | ? |
| | change in location (PP predicate) | | + | + |
| | change in location (AP predicate) | | + | - |
| H O S T | subject-predicated resultative | | + | - (adjunct) |
| | object-predicated resultative | | + | + |

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-predicated 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 Ettliger (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 *to/into/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 I-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) I-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 4: Location Resultatives in English and Romanian

| | English | Romanian |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
| S A T | [proc] verb + <i>to, into, onto</i> (PathP identified by <i>to</i> which carries a <i>res</i> feature) The bottle floated into the cave. | - a. [proc, res] verb + PlaceP (<i>res</i> identified by the verb) Flaconul a ajuns în peșteră (plutind). b. [proc] verb + <i>până în/la</i> (adjunct) (PathP identified by <i>până</i>) Flaconul a plutit până în peșteră. |
| | [init, proc] verb + <i>to, into, onto</i> (<i>res</i> identified by <i>to</i>) The officer marched the soldiers into the town. | [init, proc] verb + <i>până în/la</i> (adjunct) (PathP identified by <i>până</i>) Asistenta a plimbat pacientul până în parc. |
| L L I | [init, proc] verb + PP predicate (<i>out of, off</i> + DP) (null <i>res</i> head) Alex sneezed the napkin off the table. | [init, proc, res] verb + PP predicate (<i>de pe</i> NP) (<i>res</i> identified by the verb) Ion a șters praful de pe masă. |
| T | [(init), proc] verb + particle (<i>res</i> identified by the particle) The police chased the demonstrators off. | - |
| E | [proc] verb + AP predicate (<i>free/clear of</i> DP) (null <i>res</i> head) Judy danced/swam/skated free of her captors. | - |
| V E | [proc, res] verb + PlaceP <i>in</i> (<i>res</i> identified by the verb) The boys jumped in the water. | [proc, res] verb + PlaceP <i>în</i> (<i>res</i> identified by the verb) Copiii au sărit în apă. |
| | [init, proc, res] verb + <i>into/onto</i> /particle (<i>res</i> identified by <i>-to</i> /particle, Underassociation) Sam (carefully) broke the eggs into the bowl. | [init, proc, res] verb + PlaceP <i>în</i> (<i>res</i> identified by the verb, no Underassociation) Mama a spart ouăle în tigaie. |

Table 5: State Resultatives in English and Romanian ('?' = restriction)

| | English | Romanian |
|----------|---|---|
| S | [init, proc] verb + subcategorized postverbal DP + AP predicate | - |
| A | (null <i>res</i> head/no <i>res</i> head) John hammered the metal flat. | exc. <i>a bate</i> 'beat' (null <i>res</i> head) |
| T | | a. [init, proc] verb + <i>până în/la</i> (adjunct) (PathP identified by <i>până</i>) Cutremurul a scuturat oraşul până la trezire. |
| E | | b. [init, proc, res] verb + adjunct (<i>res</i> identified by the verb) Cutremurul a trezit oraşul (scuturându-l). |
| L | [(init), proc] verb + non-subcategorized postverbal DP + AP predicate | |
| L | (null <i>res</i> head) The teacher talked his throat dry. | - |
| I | [init, proc] verb + <i>to/into</i> (<i>res</i> identified by <i>to</i>) | [init, proc] verb + <i>până în/la</i> (adjunct) |
| T | The guard starved the prisoners to death/ into submission. | (PathP identified by <i>până</i>) Paznicul a înfometat prizonierii până la moarte. |
| E | [init, proc] verb + particle (<i>res</i> identified by the particle) The child blew the candle out. | - |
| V | [(init), proc, res] verb + AP predicate (<i>res</i> identified by the verb) Raid kills bugs dead. | ? [(init), proc, res] verb + AP predicate (<i>res</i> identified by the verb) Copiii au crescut mari. |
| E | [(init), proc, res] verb + <i>Prt/to/into</i> (<i>res</i> identified by the particle/ <i>-to</i> , Underassociation) | [(init), proc, res] verb + PP/NP predicate (<i>res</i> identified by the verb, no Underassociation) |
| R | My friend broke the china into pieces. | Maria a spart vaza în bucăţi. |
| B | [init, proc, (res)] verb + AP predicate (null <i>res</i> head/no <i>res</i> head) Mary wiped the table clean. | [init, proc, (res)] verb + NP predicate (<i>res</i> identified by the verb) Ea a frecat podeaua lună. |

REFERENCES

CRITICAL REFERENCES

- 1) Aarts, Bas (1989). "Verb-Preposition Constructions and Small Clauses in English". *Journal of Linguistics* 25: 277-290.
- 2) Aarts, Bas (1992). *Small Clauses in English. The Nonverbal Types*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 3) Adger, David (2003). *Core Syntax. A Minimalist Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 4) Aske, Jon (1989). "Path Predicates in English and Spanish: A Closer Look". In K. Hall, M. Meacham and R. Shapiro (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 1-14. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- 5) Baciú, Ileana (2007). "Aspect și construcții rezultative". In G. Pană-Dindelegan (ed.), *Limba română. Stadiul actual al cercetării. Actele celui de al 6-lea colocviu al catedrei de limba română*, 51-58. București: Editura Universității din București.
- 6) Baciú, Ileana (2010). "Romanian Resultatives Revisited". Paper presented at the University of Bucharest, June 4.
- 7) Baciú, Ileana and Sorin Baciú (2007). "Goal of Motion in English and Romanian". In G. Alboiu, A. Avram, L. Avram and D. Isac (eds.), *Pitar Mos: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 315-327. București: Editura Universității din București.
- 8) Baker, Mark C. (1988). *Incorporation. A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 9) Beck, Sigrid and William Snyder (2001). "Complex Predicates and Goal PP's: Evidence for a Semantic Parameter". In A. H.-J. Do, L. Domínguez and A. Johansen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 114-122. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. Vol. I.
- 10) Boas, Hans C. (2003). *A Constructional Approach to Resultatives*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

- 11) Bolinger, Dwight (1971). *The Phrasal Verb in English*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 12) Borer, Hagit (2005). *Structuring Sense*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Vol. II
- 13) Bowers, John (1993). "The Syntax of Predication". *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 591-656.
- 14) Bowers, John (1997). "A Binary Analysis of Resultatives". In R. C. Blight and M. J. Moosally (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1997 Texas Linguistics Society Conference*, 43-58. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin.
- 15) Brăescu, Raluca (ed.) (2005). *Gramatica limbii române (GALR)*. București: Editura Academiei Române. Vol. II.
- 16) Broccias, Cristiano (2003). *The English Change Network. Forcing Changes into Schemas*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 17) Broccias, Cristiano (2008). "Towards a History of English Resultative Constructions: The Case of Adjectival Resultative Constructions". *English Language and Linguistics* 12: 27-54.
- 18) Burzio, Luigi (1986). *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- 19) Carrier, Jill and Janet Randall (1992). "The Argument Structure and the Syntactic Structure of Resultatives". *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 173-234.
- 20) Chomsky, Noam (1957/1969). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- 21) Chomsky, Noam (1965/1967). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 22) Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- 23) Chomsky, Noam (1986). *Barriers*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 24) Chomsky, Noam (1995a). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 25) Chomsky, Noam (1995b). "Bare Phrase Structure". In Gert Webelhuth (ed.), *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*, 383-439. Cambridge/Mass.: Blackwell Publishers.
- 26) Constantinescu-Dobridor, Gheorghe (1998). *Dicționar de termeni lingvistici*. București: Editura Teora.

- 27) Constantinescu-Dobridor, Gheorghe (2001). *Gramatica limbii române*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- 28) Contreras, Heles (1995). "Small Clauses and Complex Predicates". In A. Cardinaletti and M. T. Guasti (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 28. Small Clauses*, 135-152. New York: Academic Press.
- 29) Cormack, Annabel and Neil Smith (1999). "Why are depictives different from resultatives?" *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 11: 251-284.
- 30) Cornilescu, Alexandra (2003). *Complementation in English. A Minimalist Approach*. București: Editura Universității din București.
- 31) Dikken, Marcel den (1995). *Particles. On the Syntax of Verb-Particle, Triadic, and Causative Constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 32) Dikken, Marcel den (2006). "On the functional structure of locative and directional PPs". Ms. CUNY Graduate Center.
Available at <http://web.gc.cuny.edu/dept/lingu/dendikken/papers.html>
- 33) Dikken, Marcel den and Erik Hoekstra (1994). "No Cause for a Small Clause? (Non-) Arguments for the Structure of Resultatives". *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik* 37: 89-105.
- 34) Dowty, David (1979). *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- 35) Drașoveanu, Dumitru D. (1967). "Despre elementul predicativ suplimentar". *Cercetări de lingvistică* XII/2: 235-242.
- 36) Drașoveanu, Dumitru D. (1997). *Teze și antiteze în sintaxa limbii române*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Clusium.
- 37) Drăgan, Ruxandra (2005). "On Resultative Constructions and ÎN/IN (-EN) Prepositions/Prefixed in Romanian and English". In M. Burada (ed.), *Conference on British and American Studies*, 99-104. Brașov: Editura Universității Brașov.
- 38) Drăgan, Ruxandra (2007). "The Syntax of Lexical Items. Denominal and Deadjectival Verbs in English". In G. Alboiu, A. Avram, L. Avram and D. Isac (eds.), *Pitar Mos: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 375-388. București: Editura Universității din București.
- 39) Embick, David (2004). "On the Structure of Resultative Participles in English". *Linguistic Inquiry* 35: 355-392.

- 40) Emonds, Joseph (1976). *A Transformational Approach to English Syntax. Root, Structure-Preserving, and Local Transformations*. New York: Academic Press.
- 41) Ettliger, Marc (2008). "The Syntactic Behaviour of the Resultative Phrase: Evidence for a Constructional Approach". In P. J. Midtlyng, R. Edwards, K. Stensrud and C. Sprague (eds.), *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 145-160. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- 42) Farrell, Patrick (2005). "English Verb-Preposition Constructions: Constituency and Order". *Language* 81: 96-137.
- 43) Folli, Raffaella (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*, 153-170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- 44) Folli, Raffaella and Heidi Harley (2004). "Waltzing Matilda around and around: On the licensing of directed-motion resultatives". Ms. University of Cambridge and University of Arizona.
- 45) Folli, Raffaella and Heidi Harley (2005). "Flavors of *v*. Consuming results in Italian & English". In P. Kempchinsky and R. Slabakova (eds.), *Aspectual Inquiries*, 95-120. Dordrecht: Springer.
- 46) Folli, Raffaella and Gillian Ramchand (2005). "Prepositions and Results in Italian and English. An Analysis from Event Decomposition". Ms. University of Cambridge and University of Oxford.
- 47) Fong, Vivienne (2003). "Resultatives and Depictives in Finnish". In D. Nelson and S. Manninen (eds.), *Generative Approaches to Finnic and Saami Linguistics*, 201-233. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- 48) Goldberg, Adele (1991). "It Can't Go Down the Chimney Up: Paths and the English Resultative". In L. A. Sutton, C. Johnson and R. Shields (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 368-378. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- 49) Goldberg, Adele (1995). *Constructions. A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 50) Goldberg, Adele and Ray Jackendoff (2004). "The English Resultative as a Family of Constructions". *Language* 80: 532-568.

- 51) Graur, Alexandru (ed.) (1966). *Gramatica limbii române (GALR)*. București: Editura Academiei R. S. R. Vol. II.
- 52) Guéron, Jacqueline and Teun Hoekstra (1995). "The Temporal Interpretation of Predication". In A. Cardinaletti and M. T. Guasti (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 28. Small Clauses*, 77-107. New York: Academic Press.
- 53) Gumiel, Silvia, Isabel Nieto and Isabel Pérez (1999). "Some Remarks on De-adjectival Verbs and Resultative Secondary Predicates." *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics 7*: 107-124.
- 54) Guțu-Romalo, Valeria (1973). *Sintaxa limbii române. Probleme și interpretări*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- 55) Haegeman, Liliane and Jacqueline Guéron (1999). *English Grammar. A Generative Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- 56) Hale, Kenneth and Samuel Jay Keyser (1993). "On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations". In K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20. Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 53-109. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 57) Halliday, Michael Alexander Kirkwood (1967). "Notes on Transitivity and Theme in English". *Journal of Linguistics 3*: 37-81.
- 58) Harley, Heidi (1999). "Denominal Verbs and Aktionsart". In L. Pylkkänen, A. van Hout and H. Harley (eds.), *Papers from the Second Penn/MIT Roundtable on Argument Structure and the Lexicon*, 73-85. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 59) Hasegawa, Nobuko (2000). "Resultatives and Language Variations: Result Phrases and VV Compounds". *Japanese/Korean Linguistics 9*: 269-282.
- 60) Haugen, Jason D. (2009). "Hyponymous objects and Late Insertion". *Lingua 119*: 242-262.
- 61) Háyzy, Ștefan (1964). "O parte de propoziție în discuție". *Cercetări de lingvistică IX/2*: 233-238.
- 62) Higginbotham, James (2000). "Accomplishments". Ms. University of Oxford.
- 63) Hodiș, Viorel (1967). "Elementul predicativ suplimentar. Contribuții I". *Limba română XVI/6*: 485-489.
- 64) Hodiș, Viorel (1969). "Elementul predicativ suplimentar. Contribuții II". *Limba română XVIII/2*: 139-145.

- 65) Hoeksema, Jack (1991). "Complex Predicates and Liberation in Dutch and English". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14: 661-710.
- 66) Hoekstra, Teun (1988). "Small Clause Results". *Lingua* 74: 101-139.
- 67) Hornstein, Norbert and David Lightfoot (1987). "Predication and PRO". *Language* 63: 23-52.
- 68) Ionescu, Daniela Corina (1998). *Small Clauses in English and Romanian*. București: Editura Universității din București.
- 69) Irimia, Monica-Alexandrina (2005). "Types of Secondary Predication". *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 25: 20-29.
- 70) Jackendoff, Ray (1977). *X-Bar Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 71) Jackendoff, Ray (1997). "Twistin' the Night Away". *Language* 73: 534-559.
- 72) Jackendoff, Ray (2002). "English Particle Constructions, the Lexicon, and the Autonomy of Syntax". In N. Dehé, R. Jackendoff, A. McIntyre and S. Urban (eds.), *Verb-Particle Explorations*, 67-94. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 73) Jespersen, Otto (1924/1968). *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- 74) Jespersen, Otto (1927/1974). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. London: G. Allen and Unwin; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard. Vol. II.
- 75) Jespersen, Otto (1940/1970). *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. London: G. Allen and Unwin; Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard. Vol. IV.
- 76) Johnson, Kyle (1991). "Object Positions". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9: 577-636.
- 77) Kayne, Richard (1984). *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- 78) Kayne, Richard (1985). "Principles of Particle Constructions". In J. Guéron, H.-G. Obenauer and J.-Y. Pollock (eds.), *Grammatical Representation*, 101-140. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- 79) Kenny, Anthony (1963/2003). *Action, Emotion and Will*. London/New York: Routledge.
- 80) Keyser, Samuel Jay and Thomas Roeper (1992). "Re: The Abstract Clitic Hypothesis". *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 89-125.

- 81) Kim, Soowon and Joan Maling (1997). "A Crosslinguistic Perspective on Resultative Formation". In R. C. Blight and M. J. Moosally (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1997 Texas Linguistics Society Conference*, 189-204. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin.
- 82) Kitagawa, Yoshihisa (1985). "Small but Clausal". In W. H. Eilfort, P. D. Kroeber and K. L. Peterson (eds.), *Papers from the 21st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 210-220. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- 83) Kratzer, Angelika (1996). "Severing the External Argument from its Verb". In J. Rooryck and L. Zaring (eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 109-137. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 84) Kratzer, Angelika (2005). "Building Resultatives". In C. Maienborn, A. Wöllstein and M. N. Verlag (eds.), *Event Arguments: Foundations and Applications*, 177-212. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- 85) Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson (1999). *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and Its Challenge to Western Thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- 86) Larson, Richard (1988). "On the Double Object Construction". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 335-391.
- 87) Legendre, Géraldine (1997). "Secondary Predication and Functional Projections in French". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15: 43-87.
- 88) Levin, Beth (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations. A Preliminary Investigation*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- 89) Levin, Beth and Tova R. Rapoport (1988). "Lexical Subordination". In L. MacLeod, G. Larson and D. Brentari (eds.), *Papers from the 24th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 275-289. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- 90) Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav (1995). *Unaccusativity. At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 91) Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav (2004). "The Semantic Determinants of Argument Expression: A View from the English Resultative Construction". In J. Guéron and J. Lecarme (eds.), *The Syntax of Time*, 477-494. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 92) Levinson, Lisa (2006). "Finding Arguments for Pseudo-Resultative Predicates". *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 13: 155-168.

- 93) Lupşa, Cornelia Daniela (2004). Resultative Phrases as Modifiers. Doctoral Dissertation, Tohoku University.
- 94) Mateu, Jaume (2000). “Why Can’t We Wipe the Slate Clean? A Lexical-Syntactic Approach to Resultative Constructions”. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 8: 71-95.
- 95) Mateu, Jaume (2001). “Preverbs in Complex Denominal Verbs: Lexical Adjuncts or Core Predicates?”. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 9: 37-51.
- 96) Mateu, Jaume (2005). “Arguing our way to the *Direct Object Restriction* on English resultatives”. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 8: 55-82.
- 97) Mateu, Jaume (2010). “On the L-Syntax of Manner and Causation”. Ms. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- 98) Mateu, Jaume (2011, to appear) “Conflation and Incorporation Processes in Resultative Constructions”. In V. Demonte and L. McNally (eds.), *Telicity, Change, and State: A Cross-Categorial View of Event Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 99) Mateu, Jaume and Maria Teresa Espinal (2007). “Argument Structure and Compositionality in Idiomatic Constructions”. *The Linguistic Review* 24: 33-59.
- 100) Merlo, Paola (1988). “Secondary Predicates in Italian and English”. In J. Powers and K. de Jong (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, 338-348. Columbus: The Ohio State University.
- 101) Mezhevich, Ilana (2003). “English resultatives: State versus location”. In S. Burelle and S. Somesfalean (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2003 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 166-177. Université de Québec à Montréal.
- 102) Napoli, Donna Jo (1992). “Secondary resultative predicates in Italian”. *Journal of Linguistics* 28: 53-90.
- 103) Napoli, Donna Jo (1994) “Resultatives”. In R. F. Asher and J. M. Y. Simpson (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* 7, 3562-3566. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- 104) Nedjalkov, Vladimir and Sergei J. Jaxontov (1988). “The Typology of Resultative Constructions”. In V. Nedjalkov (ed.), *Typology of Resultative Constructions*, 3-62. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- 105) Neeleman, Ad (1994). Complex Predicates. Doctoral Dissertation, Utrecht University.

- 106) Neeleman, Ad and Fred Weerman (1993). "The Balance between Syntax and Morphology: Dutch Particles and Resultatives". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11: 433-475.
- 107) Neeleman, Ad and Hans van de Koot (2002). "Bare resultatives". *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 6: 1-52.
- 108) Niță, Silvia (1958). "Predicatul circumstanțial". *Limba română* VII/4: 93-98.
- 109) Oya, Toshiaki (2002). "Reflexives and Resultatives: Some differences between English and German". *Linguistics* 40: 961-986.
- 110) Perlmutter, David (1978). "Impersonal Passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis". In J. J. Jaeger et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 157-189. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- 111) Pustejovsky, James (1991). "The Syntax of Event Structure". *Cognition* 41: 47-81.
- 112) Pykkänen, Liina (2008). *Introducing Arguments*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 113) Rădulescu, Maria (1957). "Numele predicativ circumstanțial". *Studii de gramatică* II: 121-129.
- 114) Rădulescu, Maria (1958). "Tot despre numele predicativ circumstanțial". *Limba română* VII/6: 76-80.
- 115) Ramchand, Gillian (2006). *Result Augmentation*. Paper presented at the University of Geneva, April 10.
- 116) Ramchand, Gillian (2008). *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon. A First-Phase Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 117) Ramchand, Gillian and Peter Svenonius (2002). "The Lexical Syntax and Lexical Semantics of the Verb-Particle Construction". In L. Mikkelsen and C. Potts (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 387-400. Somerville/Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- 118) Rapoport, Tova R. (1993a). "Stage and Adjunct Predicates: Licensing and Structure in Secondary Predication Constructions". In E. Reuland and W. Abraham (eds.), *Knowledge and Language. Lexical and Conceptual Structure*, 157-182. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. Vol. II.
- 119) Rapoport, Tova R. (1993b) "Verbs in Depictives and Resultatives." In J. Pustejovsky (ed.), *Semantics and the Lexicon*, 163-184. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- 120) Rapoport, Tova R. (1999). "Structure, Aspect and the Predicate". *Language* 75: 653-677.
- 121) Rappaport Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin (1998). "Building Verb Meanings". In M. Butt and W. Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments. Lexical and Compositional Factors*, 97-134. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- 122) Rappaport Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin (1999). "Two Types of Compositionally Derived Events". Ms. Bar Ilan University and Northwestern University.
- 123) Rappaport Hovav, Malka and Beth Levin (2001). "An Event Structure Account of English Resultatives". *Language* 77: 766-797.
- 124) Rizzi, Luigi (1997). "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery". In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of English Grammar. Handbook in Generative Syntax*, 281-335. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 125) Roberts, Ian (1988). "Predicative APs". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 703-710.
- 126) Rothstein, Susan (1985). *The Syntactic Forms of Predication*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- 127) Rothstein, Susan (2001). *Predicates and their Subjects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 128) Rothstein, Susan (2004). *Structuring Events. A Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*. Malden/Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- 129) Ryle, Gilbert (1949/2009). *The Concept of Mind*. New York: Routledge.
- 130) Safir, Ken (1983). "On Small Clauses as Constituents". *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 730-735.
- 131) Sato, Hiroaki (1987). "Resultative Attributes and GB Principles". *English Linguistics* 4: 91-106.
- 132) Scriban, August (1939). *Dicționarul limbii românești*. Iași: Institutu de Arte Grafice "Presa Bună".
- 133) Secrieru, Mihaela (2001). *Cumulul de funcții sintactice în limba română: "elementul predicativ suplimentar"*. Iași: Editura Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza.
- 134) Shim, Ji Young and Marcel den Dikken (2007). "The Tense of Resultatives: The Case of Korean". In A. Schardl, M. Walkow and M. Abdurrahman (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 337-350. Massachusetts: GLSA Publications. Vol. II.

- 135) Simpson, Jane (1983). "Resultatives". In L. Levin, M. Rappaport and A. Zaenen (eds.), *Papers in Lexical-Functional Grammar*, 143-157. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- 136) Snyder, William (1995). *Language Acquisition and Language Variation: The Role of Morphology*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 137) Snyder, William (1996). "The Acquisitional Role of the Syntax-Morphology Interface: Morphological Compounds and Syntactic Complex Predicates". In A. Stringfellow, D. Cahana-Amitay, E. Hughes and A. Zukowski (eds.), *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 728-735. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.
- 138) Snyder, William (2001). "On the Nature of Syntactic Variation: Evidence from Complex Predicates and Complex Word-Formation". *Language* 77: 324-342.
- 139) Sportiche, Dominique (1988). "A Theory of Floating Quantifiers and its Corollaries for Constituent Structure". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19: 425-449.
- 140) Sportiche, Dominique (1995). "French Predicate Clitics and Clause Structure". In A. Cardinaletti and M. T. Guasti (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 28. Small Clauses*, 271-324. New York: Academic Press.
- 141) Stowell, Tim (1981). *Origins of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 142) Stowell, Tim (1983). "Subjects across Categories". *The Linguistic Review* 2: 285-312.
- 143) Stowell, Tim (1991). "Small Clause Restructuring". In R. Freidin (ed.), *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, 182-218. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 144) Svenonius, Peter (1996). "The Verb-Particle Alternation in the Scandinavian Languages". Unpublished article. University of Tromsø.
Available at <http://www.hum.uit.no/a/svenonius/paperspage.html>
- 145) Talmy, Leonard (1985). "Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms". In T. Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description III. Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, 57-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 146) Talmy, Leonard (1991). "Path to Realization: A Typology of Event Conflation". In L. A. Sutton, C. Johnson and R. Shields (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 480-519. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

- 147) Talmy, Leonard (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press. Vol. II.
- 148) Tenny, Carol (1994). *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- 149) Tomescu, Veronica (2007). “The Romanian Prefix ÎN”. In G. Alboiu, A. Avram, L. Avram and D. Isac (eds.), *Pitar Mos: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 619-629. București: Editura Universității din București.
- 150) Tortora, Cristina (1998). “Verbs of Inherently Directed Motion are Compatible with Resultative Phrases”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29: 338-345.
- 151) Vendler, Zeno (1967/1974). *Linguistics in Philosophy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 152) Verkuyl, Henk (1972). *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- 153) Verkuyl, Henk (1993). *A Theory of Aspectuality. The Interaction between Temporal and Atemporal Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 154) Verspoor, Cornelia Maria (1997). Contextually-Dependent Lexical Semantics. Doctoral Dissertation, the University of Edinburgh.
- 155) Washio, Ryuichi (1997). “Resultatives, compositionality and language variation.” *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 6: 1-49.
- 156) Washio, Ryuichi (1999). “Some Comparative Notes on Resultatives.” In M. Muraki and E. Iwamoto (eds.), *Linguistics: In Search of the Human Mind*, 674-707. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- 157) Wechsler, Stephen (1997). “Resultative Predicates and Control”. In R. C. Blight and M. J. Moosally (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1997 Texas Linguistics Society Conference*, 307-321. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin.
- 158) Wechsler, Stephen (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.
- 159) Williams, Edwin (1975). “Small Clauses in English”. In J. P. Kimball (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics* 4, 249-273. New York: Academic Press.
- 160) Williams, Edwin (1980). “Predication”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11: 203-238.
- 161) Williams, Edwin (1983). “Against Small Clauses”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14: 287-308.

- 162) Williams, Edwin (1994). *Thematic Structure in Syntax*. Cambridge/Mass.: The MIT Press.
- 163) Williams, Edwin (1997). "Lexical and Syntactic Complex Predicates". In A. Alsina, J. Bresnan and P. Sells (eds.), *Complex Predicates*, 13-28. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- 164) Yamada, Yoshihiro (1987). "Two Types of Resultative Constructions". *English Linguistics* 4: 73-90.
- 165) Zoerner, Ed (1996). "English Verb-Particle Constructions: Two Types, Two Structures". *Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics* 21: 123-141.

LITERARY REFERENCES

- 1) Creangă, Ion (1881/1976). *Amintiri din copilărie*. București: Editura Albatros.
- 2) Salinger, Jerome David, (1951/1981). *The Catcher in the Rye*. Toronto/New York: Bantam Books.

INTERNET SOURCES

- 1) <http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/> (British National Corpus)
- 2) www.cerculpoetilor.net
- 3) <http://dexonline.ro/>