PÂNĂ-PPs AND COMPLEX EVENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN ROMANIAN

IMOLA-ÁGNES FARKAS[1]

ABSTRACT. Până-*PPs and Complex Event Constructions in Romanian*. This paper examines the syntactic and semantic status of Romanian PPs headed by the morphologically complex prepositions *până în/la* 'until/as far as/up to in/at' in VPs of change of location (*a pluti până în peşteră* 'float up to the cave') and change of state (*a munci până la epuizare* 'work to the point of exhaustion'). Contrary to the claims made in the literature (Barbu 2015), the approach taken here argues that these – and other similar – VPs cannot be considered complex event constructions such as goal-of-motion structures and strong resultative constructions, respectively. The discussion revolves around the interpretation of the entire VP, the lack of any type of restriction on the syntactic and semantic classification of the verb, the violation of the Direct Object Restriction, as well as the borderline between these PPs and temporal adjuncts. These properties highlight the fact that the availability of such VPs does not turn Romanian into a satellite-framed language as they are not real counterexamples to the Talmian generalization according to which verb-framed Romanian disallows these two complex event constructions.

Keywords: goal-of-motion structure, resultative construction, VP, până-*PP, Romanian*

REZUMAT. *Grupuri prepoziţionale cu* până *şi construcţii eventive complexe în limba română*. Această lucrare analizează statutul sintactic şi semantic al grupurilor prepoziţionale din limba română construite cu prepoziţia compusă *până în/la* în grupuri verbale de schimbare de locaţie (*a pluti până în peşteră*) şi schimbare de stare (*a munci până la epuizare*). Contrar afirmaţiilor făcute în literatura de specialitate (Barbu 2015), abordarea propusă aici susţine că aceste – şi astfel de – grupuri verbale nu pot fi considerate construcţii eventive complexe

_____

[1] **Imola-Ágnes FARKAS** is lecturer at the Department of English Language and Literature of the Faculty of Letters, Babeş-Bolyai University. Her research interests include argument structure, event structure and the syntax-semantics interface. Email: imola.farkas@ubbcluj.ro.

cum ar fi structuri de schimbare de locație, respectiv construcții rezultative tari. Discuția se concentrează pe interpretarea întregului grup verbal, lipsa oricărei restricții asupra clasificării sintactice și semantice a verbului, încălcarea restricției asupra complementului direct, precum și frontiera dintre aceste grupuri prepoziționale și adjuncții temporali. Aceste proprietăți accentuează faptul că datorită prezenței acestor grupuri verbale în limbă, româna nu devine o limbă satelitară deoarece ele nu sunt adevărate excepții la generalizarea talmiană potrivit căreia limba română, ca limbă verbală, nu permite aceste două construcții eventive complexe.

Cuvinte-cheie: *structură de schimbare de locație, construcție rezultativă, grup verbal, grup prepozițional cu* până, *limba română*

1. Introduction

It is a well-established fact that Romanian, together with Romance languages more generally, blocks – or at least severely restricts – complex event constructions such as goal-of-motion structures and so-called strong resultative constructions (Washio 1997); cf. Snyder (2001), Drăgan (2012), Irimia (2013) or Farkas (2013, 2021). As such, an atelic manner-of-motion verb fails to derive a telic, directed-motion structure with a morphologically simple preposition (see (1a), which has only a locative interpretation); and an atelic activity verb fails to derive a telic, resultative construction with an AP secondary predicate (see (1b), which has only a descriptive reading):

(1) a. *Flaconul   a   plutit   în   peșteră.
       the bottle   has   floated   in   cave
       'The bottle floated into the cave.'
    b. *Medicul   a   muncit   epuizat.
       the doctor   has   worked   exhausted
       'The doctor worked himself exhausted/into exhaustion.'

However, when such an atelic manner-of-motion or activity verb combines not with a PP headed by a morphologically simple preposition or an AP result predicate, respectively, but with a PP headed by a morphologically complex preposition introduced by the PathP *până* 'until/as far as/up to', there seems to be a marked change in the interpretation of the entire VP, as illustrated below:

(2) a. Flaconul   a   plutit   ***până   în   peșteră***.
       the bottle   has   floated   up to   in   cave
       'The bottle floated up to the cave/until it ended up in the cave.'

b. Medicul   a   muncit **_până la epuizare_**.
   the doctor has   worked until at exhaustion
   'The doctor worked himself to the point of exhaustion.'

The discussion on the status of these morphologically complex PPs in such and similar change-of-location (2a) and change-of-state VPs (2b) is theoretically relevant as, depending on how they are viewed, they may challenge the verb-framed behaviour of Romanian with respect to Talmy's typology (1972, 1975, 1985, 1991, 2000), which predicts that in such complex event constructions the language cannot lexicalize Path (in goal-of-motion structures) and result (in resultative constructions) in the satellite/PP but, instead, they must be incorporated in the verb. Consequently, the question arises as to whether the VPs in (2) can be considered genuine counterexamples to the Talmian typology and descriptive generalization concerning Romanian or they are only apparent exceptions and, although they are fully available and very productive in the language, they do not make Romanian exhibit satellite-framed behaviour.

This paper aims to contribute to the long-standing debate on the syntactic and semantic status of Romanian PPs headed by the morphologically complex prepositions *până în/la* 'until/as far as/up to in/at' in change-of-location and change-of-state VPs such as the ones in (2) above. Section 2 presents the Talmian descriptive generalization and illustrates the event constructions that are expected in a verb-framed language such as Romanian. Section 3 turns to Romanian *până*-PPs in complex event constructions and claims, contra Barbu (2015), that although the above VPs do have a change-of-location (2a) and change-of-state interpretation (2b), they cannot be considered goal-of-motion structures and strong resultative constructions, respectively. The discussion revolves around the interpretation of the entire construction, the lack of any type of restriction on the syntactic and semantic classification of the verb, the violation of the Direct Object Restriction, as well as the borderline between these PPs and temporal adjuncts. These properties highlight that these and similar VPs do not turn Romanian into a satellite-framed language as they are not real counterexamples to the generalization according to which Romanian disallows these two complex event constructions. Moreover, from a cross-linguistic perspective, it is essential that building them is not problematic in any of the Romance languages. Section 4 concludes.

2. The Talmian descriptive generalization

Talmy (1972, 1975, 1985, 1991, 2000) was the first to propose a typological classification of complex event constructions such as goal-of-motion structures (which express literal motion from one location to another as in *float into the cave*) and resulting event constructions (which express metaphorical

motion from one state to another as in *hammer the metal flat*). His analysis of – literal and metaphorical – motion is based on the following four semantic components: Figure (the entity that moves or undergoes change of state), Ground (the spatial reference point for the motion or change), Path/result (the element encoding the transition, i.e. the path of motion or the result of change) and Manner (the manner of motion by which the Figure moves along the path or the manner in which the result is brought about). Taking a close look at the grammatical encoding of Manner and Path/result, Talmy developed a typology of how they are expressed depending on what incorporates them: the satellite (e.g. the particle, the prefix or the preposition) or the verb. More precisely, the two above-mentioned event constructions are classified according to whether they lexicalize the Path/result in the satellite or in the verb, and, consequently, incorporate Manner in the verb or in the satellite/adjunct. As such, in sharp contrast to so-called satellite-framed languages including English and Germanic languages more generally, in so-called verb-framed languages including Romanian and Romance languages more generally, Path/result is incorporated in the verb (and Manner is or can be lexicalized outside the verb, for instance, in an adjunct). To put it differently, the impossibility of lexicalizing Path/result in the satellite explains the unavailability of goal-of-motion structures and strong resultative constructions in verb-framed languages. As Romance languages including Romanian are canonical examples of verb-framed languages, they are predicted to lack both complex event constructions, as already shown in (1) above; cf. also Snyder (2001), Drăgan (2012), Irimia (2013) or Farkas (2013, 2021).

On the one hand, in the case of motion constructions the language allows the lexicalization pattern where Path is independently incorporated in the verb (also called Path-verb or verb of inherently directed motion). This, in its turn, is followed by a PP headed by a morphologically simple preposition, and, optionally, Manner is (or can be) lexicalized by a sentence-final adjunct (see (3a)). In addition, Romanian may also allow a small set of so-called directional manner-of-motion verbs to occur with a PP headed by a morphologically simple preposition, which give rise to a telic directional interpretation (see (3b), which may have both a telic goal-of-motion reading and an atelic manner-of-motion interpretation; cf. also Baciu 2006). However, the language disallows the lexicalization pattern where Manner is incorporated in the non-directional manner-of-motion verb, which is followed by a PP headed by a morphologically simple preposition. In other words, these VPs are unavailable under a directed-motion reading as such a verb fails to derive a telic structure with such a preposition (see (3c)):

(3) a. Flaconul a intrat/ ajuns în peșteră (plutind).
    the bottle has entered/ arrived in cave floating
    'The bottle got into the cave (floating).'

b. Flaconul   s   -a   rostogolit   în   peşteră.
   the bottle   REFL   has   rolled   in   cave
   'The bottle rolled in/into the cave.'
c. *Flaconul   a   plutit   în   peşteră.
    the bottle   has   floated   in   cave
   'The bottle floated into the cave.'

These examples show that in Romanian it is only with Path-incorporating – but not Manner-incorporating – verbs that a directed-motion reading is derived in the company of a morphologically simple preposition. As these verbs describe telic events, the telic interpretation of the entire VP is due to the verb and not to the satellite/PP.

On the other hand, Romanian resultatives only allow the combination of a verb that independently encodes result (also called result-verb) and a satellite (i.e. result predicate) that only lexicalizes or specifies the end result state, renders the vague endpoint of the event more precise or highlights the degree of the outcome of the event (see (4a)). In other words, the result predicate does not independently delimit or measure out the action of the verb; cf. also Farkas (2013). In addition, the language may also allow the combination of a result verb with an AP predicate that gives rise to an ambiguous resultative/depictive interpretation (see (4b)). These so-called weak resultatives (Washio 1997) built on the verb-framed pattern stand in total contrast to so-called strong resultatives (Washio 1997) built on the satellite-framed pattern, where an atelic Manner-incorporating verb combines with an AP result predicate and generates a delimited construction. As expected, this lexicalization pattern is unavailable in the language, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (4c), at least under a result interpretation:

(4) a. Copiii   au   crescut   mari/   înalţi.
     the children   have   grown   big   tall
     'The children grew big/tall.'
   b. ?Ion   a   vopsit   gardul   verde.
      John   has   painted   the fence   green
     'John painted the fence green/the green fence.'
   c. *Medicul   a   muncit   epuizat.[2]
      the doctor   has   worked   exhausted
     'The doctor worked himself exhausted/into exhaustion.'

---

[2] The canonical strong resultative given in the literature on these constructions is the English example *John hammered the metal flat.* As expected, its direct counterpart is ungrammatical under a result reading in Romanian and more generally in Romance languages; cf. *Ion a bătut/ciocănit metalul plat* (Romanian), *Gianni ha martellato il metall piatto* (Italian), *Juan golpeó/martilló el metal plano* (Spanish), *Jean a martellé le métal plat* (French) and *Jean va martellejar el metall pla* (Catalan). One could build the *până*-PP counterpart of this AP resultative (e.g. *Ion a bătut/ciocănit metalul până la aplatizare/turtire*) but according to most native speakers of Romanian, this VP might sound rather odd.

These two sets of examples shed light on the fact that Romanian blocks – or at least severely restricts – complex event constructions such as goal-of-motion structures (of the English type *float into the cave*) and strong resultative constructions (of the English type *work oneself exhausted/into exhaustion*).

3. *Până*-PPs and complex event constructions in Romanian

3.1. Preliminaries

In view of the above data, one could propose that when such an atelic manner-of-motion (3c) or activity verb (4c) combines with a PP headed by a morphologically complex preposition introduced by the PathP *până* 'as far as/up to/until', the language exhibits satellite-framed behaviour as there seems to be a striking surface similarity between this morphologically complex preposition and the English PP introduced by *to/into/onto*, and the entire structure seems to present satellite-framed behaviour (cf. Beavers *et alii* 2010 and others):

(5) a. Flaconul a plutit ***până în peșteră***.
　　 the bottle has floated up to in cave
　　 'The bottle floated up to the cave/until it ended up in the cave.'
　 b. Medicul a muncit ***până la epuizare***.
　　 the doctor has worked until at exhaustion
　　 'The doctor worked himself to the point of exhaustion.'

If these and similar constructions were accepted as genuine complex event constructions of change of location and change of state, respectively, they would challenge the Talmian classification of Romanian as a verb-framed language. In what follows, I analyse the syntactic and semantic behaviour of change-of-location (Subsection 3.2.) and change-of-state VPs (Subsection 3.3.) built with the Romanian PathP *până* 'until/as far as/up to'. I show that these VPs do not call into question Talmy's descriptive generalization since they are merely apparent counterexamples to it.[3]

---

[3] The corresponding structures and PPs in Romance languages have also received special attention in the literature; see the discussion on the Italian *fino a* 'until/as far as/up to', the French *jusqu'à* 'until/as far as/up to' or the Spanish *hasta* 'until/as far as/up to' in Centineo (1986), Aske (1989), Folli and Ramchand (2005), Zubizarreta and Oh (2007), Beavers *et alii* (2010), Croft *et alii* (2010), Mateu (2012), Martínez-Vázquez (2013), Bigolin and Ausensi (2021), and the references cited therein. In a nutshell, in these languages the PP headed by one of the above prepositions is considered to be irrelevant to the discussion on complex event constructions as it is an adjunct and not a complement, which is reflected in the fact that it does not trigger change in the selected perfect auxiliary.

3.2. Până-*PPs in change-of-location VPs*

The first and most salient property that one notices is that this PP is compatible with almost any atelic non-directional manner-of-motion verb such as *a pluti* 'to float', *a valsa* 'to waltz', *a se plimba* 'to walk', *a înota* 'to swim' or *a mărșălui* 'to march', precisely the verbs that are only allowed in the goal-of-motion structures of a satellite-framed language. Some relevant examples follow:

(6) a. Copiii   s   -au   plimbat ***până în parc***.
     the children REFL have   walked until   in   park
     'The children walked up to the park/until they were in the park.'
  b. Și   apoi ai   valsat   ***până aici***.
     and   then have   waltzed   up to here
     'And then you waltzed up to here.'
  c. Petru a înotat ***până la țărm***.
     Peter has swum   until   at   shore
     'Peter swam to the shore/until he was at the shore.'

The specificity of this PP is that *până* 'as far as/up to/until' measures out the path involved in the event of – literal or metaphorical – motion, and *în* 'in' or *la* 'at' indicates the endpoint of motion. However, the entire PP in such Romanian examples acts as an adjunct and not a complement. But crucially, the syntactic notion of Path that is relevant to Talmy's typology does not refer to phrases occupying an adjunct position but to phrases in a syntactic sisterhood relationship with the verb (see also Mateu 2012). Consequently, these examples do not turn Romanian into a satellite-framed language as they are only apparent exceptions to the Talmian typological classification of this language, contra the claims made in the literature. In other words, such and similar examples are not genuine counterexamples to the Talmian generalization, which predicts that in Romanian goal-of-motion structures the verb cannot conflate Manner and Motion, and Path cannot be lexicalized by the satellite (cf. also Farkas 2013, 2021). The fact that they are adjuncts and not complements explains why they can accompany any atelic non-directional manner-of-motion verb in the language.

In addition, although the PP functions as a delimiter as it denotes the end location of the motion event, it does not lexicalize Talmy's Path and it is only a paraphrase of the end location.

3.3. Până-*PPs in change-of-state VPs*

Resultative constructions such as the one given in (7) below are generally associated with a temporal interpretation (e.g. *Maria a bătut albușurile până când albușurile au devenit spumă* 'Mary beat the egg whites until they became foamy') or a causal reading (e.g. *Maria a bătut albușurile, și, ca rezultat*

direct al acestei acțiuni, albușurile au devenit spumă 'Mary beat the egg whites and, as a direct result of this action, the egg whites became foamy'). In addition, such a construction is also amenable to a consecutive interpretation (e.g. *Maria a bătut albușurile atât de mult/tare încât albușurile au devenit spumă* 'Mary beat the egg whites so much that they became foamy').

(7) Maria a bătut albușurile spumă.
    Mary has beaten the egg whites foam
   'Mary beat the egg whites foamy.'

However, Romanian resultative VPs with the PathP *până* 'until/as far as/up to' have, first and foremost, a temporal – but not so much or not necessarily a causal or consecutive – interpretation. Compare the following examples:

(8) a. Medicul a muncit **până la epuizare**.
      the doctor has worked until at exhaustion
     'The doctor worked himself to the point of exhaustion.'
    b. Au imobilizat plămânul bolnav **până la însănătoşire**.
      have immobilised the lung sick until at recovery
     'They immobilised the sick lung until its recovery.'

Due to the close, cause-result relation between the activity denoted by the verb and the result state expressed by the PP adjunct, (8a) can be treated as having a temporal, causal or consecutive interpretation. But (8b) can only have, first and foremost, a temporal reading (i.e. *Au imobilizat plămânul bolnav până când plămânul a devenit sănătos* 'They immobilised the sick lung until it became healthy') and hence it excludes both the causal reading (i.e. #*Au imobilizat plămânul bolnav şi, ca rezultat, plămânul a devenit sănătos* 'They immobilised the sick lung and, as a result, it became healthy') and the consecutive interpretation (i.e. #*Au imobilizat plămânul bolnav atât de mult/tare încât plămânul a devenit sănătos* 'They immobilised the sick lung so much that it became healthy').

In addition, there are no restrictions between verb and the PP, which is very often built on an eventive *-re* nominal. Put differently, it is possible to find a wide variety of both transitive/transitively used (9) and intransitive/intransitively used (10) verbs with this PP. The following examples, culled from the Internet, also illustrate the lack of any type of restriction on the semantic classification of the verb.[4]

---

[4] Although the *până*-PP can also be compatible with stative verbs (see *Ion se crede bolnav până la depresie* 'John considers himself sick to the point of depression'; cf. Barbu 2015, 99), there are other restrictions that it imposes on the semantic classification of the verb. As *până*-PPs such as *până la moarte* denote a path, which can be long or short, they can accompany, first and foremost, a durative activity verb but not an instantaneous achievement verb, as illustrated in *L-au bătut/biciuit/ torturat/*ucis/*împuşcat până la moarte* 'They beat/whipped/tortured/*killed/*shot him to death'; see also Wechsler (2005) for the treatment of the English PathP *to death*, and Bigolin and Ausensi (2021) for arguments against considering the Spanish counterpart of the English PP *to death* as a genuine result PP in this Romance language.

(9) a. Amestecă   toate   ingredientele   **până   la   omogenizare**.
    mix   all   ingredients   until   at   homogenisation
    'Mix all the ingredients until they become homogeneous.'
  b. Au   răcit   crema   de   fructe   **până   la   solidificare**.
    have   cooled   cream   of   fruit   until   at   solidification
    'They cooled the fruit cream until it became solid.'
  c. Au   încălzit   materialul   solid **până   la   înmuiere**.
    have   heated   the material   solid   until   at   softness
    'They heated the solid material until it became soft.'
  d. Au   încălzit   conductorul   **până la   incandescență**.
    have   heated   the conductor   until   at   incandescence
    'They heated the conductor until it became incandescent.'
  e. întinderea   mușchilor   **până   la   rupturi parțiale**
    the stretching   of muscles   until   at   tears   partial
    'the streching of muscles until they are partially torn'
  f. L   -au   necăjit/chinuit   **până la   exasperare/   disperare**.
    him   have teased/tormented   until   at   exasperation   despair
    'They teased/tormented him to the point of exasperation/despair.'
  g. Maria   a   curățat   geamurile   **până   la   strălucire**.
    Mary   has   cleaned   the windows   until   at   shine
    'Mary cleaned the windows until they became shiny.'
  h. Au   violat/   bătut/   lovit   -o   **până la   leșin**.
    have   violated   beaten   hit   her until   at   faint
    'They violated/beat/hit her to the point of faint.'
(10) a. Jucătorii   au   alergat   **până   la   epuizare**.
    the players   have   run   until   at   exhaustion
    'The players ran to the point of exhaustion.'
  b. Mama   s   -a   impresionat/ emoționat **până   la   lacrimi**.
    mother   REFL has   impressed   excited   until   at   tears
    'Mother was impressed/excited to tears.'
  c. Oaspeții   au   mâncat **până la saturație** înainte de   a merge la somn.
    the guests have eaten   until   at   saturation before of   to go   at sleep
    'The guests ate until they felt full before going to sleep.'
  d. Ion   a   băut   **până   la   inconștiență**.
    John   has   drunk   until   at   unconsciousness
    'John drank until he became unconscious.'
  e. Băiatul   a   înghețat   **până   la   moarte**.
    the boy   has   frozen   until   at   death
    'The boy froze to death.'

Crucially, in such cases the *până*-PP can be replaced neither by an AP predicate (cf. **Maria a curățat geamurile strălucitoare* 'Mary cleaned the windows shiny', the counterpart of (9g) above) nor by a participle (cf. **Au încălzit materialul solid înmuiat* 'They heated the solid material soft', the counterpart of (9c) above); see also Lupșa (2004). Whereas the former does not give rise to a result

interpretation in Romanian (and more generally in Romance languages) but can only have a descriptive and/or attributive reading, the latter is systematically barred from both weak and strong resultatives even in English (see Carrier and Randall 1992 or Goldberg and Jackendoff 2004).

Also, despite the result interpretation generated by the combination of the verb and the *până*-PP adjunct, and the telicity in the sentence, these VPs are not resultative constructions *per se*, contra the claims made in Barbu (2015). Therefore, it is wrong to consider that Farkas (2009) limits herself only to those AP resultatives that are extremely frequent in English but very limited in Romanian (e.g. *hammer the metal flat*) and, hence, does not capitalize on and does not take advantage of the ability of *până*-PPs to build resultatives in Romanian (Barbu 2015, 99). Once again, the reason why Farkas (2009) does not exploit or profit from these PPs in such configurations is that they only give rise to VPs which cannot be equalized with strong result constructions (of the English type *hammer the metal flat* or *clean the windows shiny*).[5]

Moreover, in addition to the *până*-PP being predicated of the syntactic direct object (see (9) above), it can also be predicated of the syntactic subject of a transitive verb; cf. (11) below:

(11) a. Mama   a   tăiat/ cojit   ceapa   ***până la lacrimi***.
      mother has cut   peeled the onion until   at   tears
      'Mother cut/peeled the onions to the point of tears.'
  b. Ridicați greutăți   ***până   la epuizare***.
      lift   weights   until   at exhaustion
      'You lift weights to the point of exhaustion.'

The example in (11b) is very similar to the oft-cited English subject-predicated resultative *swim laps to exhaustion*, which is still under debate in the vast literature (cf. Verspoor 1997; Rappaport Hovav and Levin 2001) because it seems to contain an adjunct directional PP of the type *to the point of exhaustion* (see also Mateu 2005). In addition, it is not uncommon that such and similar VPs are analysed as involving complex verbs such as *swim laps* or, in my case, *a ridica greutăți* 'to lift weights'; cf. Shim and den Dikken (2007).

Furthermore, as illustrated in Barbu (2015) as well, the PP can be predicated of a nominal which is neither the subject nor the direct object argument of the verb. This not only violates Levin and Rappaport Hovav's

---

[5] In sharp contrast to the VP *a curăța geamurile până la strălucire* 'clean the windows until they become shiny' (cf. (9g) above), the VP *a curăța geamurile lună/oglindă* 'clean the windows as clean/shiny as the moon/mirror' is indeed considered a resultative construction, where the result phrase is expressed by a predicative bare noun. For more details on such and similar result expressions, see Farkas (2013).

(1995) Direct Object Restriction, which states that a result phrase may only be predicated of a direct object but not a subject or an oblique complement (see also the intransitive examples in (10)), but also sheds light on the lack of any type of syntactic and semantic restriction on the verb in such VPs. The following example serves as illustration:

(12) Au   încălzit   amestecul   **până**   **la**   **dizolvarea** completă a mierii.
       have heated   the mixture   until   at   dissolution complete of honey
    'They heated the mixture until the complete dissolution of the honey.'

However, a closer look at the above sentence readily shows that the non-eventive nominal within the adjunct *până*-PP (i.e. *mierea* 'honey'), the referent of which undergoes change of state and becomes completely dissolved in the above-illustrated example, is somehow included or is a 'part' of the referent of the nominal in the postverbal direct object position (i.e. *amestecul* 'mixture'), which is indeed directly affected by the event of the verb.

Another problem posed by such PPs, provided they are taken to be resultative secondary predicates, is that they can very easily be confused with classic examples of temporal adjuncts and the exact delimitation between them is not (always) very clear:

(13) Au   amânat   vaccinarea   **până**   **la însănătoşire**.
       have   postponed vaccination   until   at recovery
    'They postponed the vaccination until the recovery.'

In this case the sentence-final PP is predicated neither of the syntactic subject (e.g. #*Au amânat vaccinarea până la însănătoşirea medicului* 'They postponed the vaccination until the doctor's recovery') nor of the syntactic direct object itself (i.e. #*Au amânat vaccinarea până la însănătoşirea vaccinării* 'They postponed the vaccination until its recovery') but rather of the object of this eventive *-re* nominal (i.e. *Au amânat vaccinarea pacientului până la însănătoşirea pacientului* 'They postponed the patient's vaccination until his recovery'). But in this case the sentence-final PP acts as a temporal adjunct and expresses a time limit until the event of the verb (i.e. the postponement) takes place. Consequently, it would be wrong to claim that there is a close, cause-result relationship between the event of the verb and the state of the sentence-final PP, or that the state expressed by the *până*-PP is a direct consequence of the event denoted by the verb. This is the reason why I do not consider examples such as the following:

(14) A   tot   furat bani   de la firma   tatălui   său **până la faliment**.
       has kept stole money from company father's his until at bankruptcy
    'He kept stealing money from his father's company until it went bankrupt.'
    (adapted after Barbu 2015, 100)

151

Again, although there might be a result interpretation in the sentence (i.e. *Firma este falimentată* 'The company went bankrupt'; cf. also Barbu 2015, 100), in this case the sentence-final PP is not a result secondary predicate *per se* but merely a temporal adjunct or delimiter of the event of the verb, or a temporal paraphrase of the result state.

Last but not least, due to the lack of any type of syntactic and semantic restriction on the verb that can occur in such a configuration, a change-of-state verb can easily be followed by a *până*-PP built on a modified (eventive) nominal derived from the root of the verb itself. Consider the following example:

(15) Carnea   o   uscați   timp de   4-7 ore   sau   ***până   la   uscarea*** completă.
     the meat it   dry   for   4-7 hours or   until   at dryness   complete
     'You dry the meat for 4-7 hours or until complete dryness.'
     (adapted   from   https://cdn2.elektronik-star.de/images/category/new_star/ manuals /RO/10033212.pdf)

The atelic verb of change of state *a usca* 'to dry' is compatible with the *for*-time adverbial (see above), and the sentence-final PP acts as the (temporal) delimiter of the event of the verb. The lack of redundancy between the verb *a usca* 'to dry' and the eventive nominal *uscare* 'dryness' is due precisely to the postmodifier *completă* 'complete' of the latter, which expresses the attainment of a final state and the entire sentence is associated with event maximalization.

3.4. Interim summary

One could, paradoxically, claim that Romanian has goal-of-motion structures and strong resultative constructions, and, because of the existence and availability of VPs such as the ones presented in the previous two subsections, it exhibits satellite-framed behaviour. On closer inspection, however, all these VPs turn out to be apparent exceptions to the Talmian typological classification of this language. To put it differently, although these VPs are fully available and very productive in the language, they do not make Romanian exhibit satellite-framed behaviour.

4. Conclusion

This paper demonstrated that Romanian PPs headed by the morphologically complex prepositions *până în/la* 'until/as far as/up to in/at' can appear in change-of-location (*a pluti până în peșteră* 'float up to the cave') and change-of-state VPs (*a munci până la epuizare* 'work to the point of exhaustion') but these phrases cannot be considered goal-of-motion structures and strong resultative constructions, respectively. The discussion revolved around the interpretation of the entire construction, the lack of any type of

restriction on the syntactic and semantic classification of the verb, the violation of the Direct Object Restriction, as well as the borderline between these PPs and temporal adjuncts. The theoretical relevance of the conclusion drawn here is that these and similar VPs do not turn Romanian into a satellite-framed language as they are not real counterexamples to the Talmian generalization according to which Romanian disallows these two complex event constructions.

WORKS CITED

Aske, Jon. 1989. "Path predicates in English and Spanish: A closer look." In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, edited by Kira Hall, Michael Meacham, Richard Shapiro, 1-14. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Baciu, Ileana. 2006. "Goal of motion constructions in English and Romanian. The case of «a alerga» and «a fugi»." *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, vol. 51, no. 1, 43-54.

Barbu, Ana-Maria. 2015. "Diferenţa dintre limită şi ţintă exemplificată prin *până (la)* şi *la*, cu aplicaţie la analiza construcţiilor rezultative." *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice*, vol. 66, no. 1, 91-101.

Beavers, John, Beth Levin, and Shiao Wei Tham. 2010. "The typology of motion expressions revisited." *Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 46, no. 2, 331-377.

Bigolin, Alessandro, and Josep Ausensi. 2021. "A new resultative construction in Spanish? A reply to Rodríguez Arrizabalaga." *Folia Linguistica*, vol. 55, no. 2, 517-546.

Carrier, Jill, and Janet Randall. 1992. "The Argument Structure and the Syntactic Structure of Resultatives." *Linguistic Inquiry*, vol. 23, no. 2, 173-234.

Centineo, Giulia. 1986. "A Lexical Theory of Auxiliary Selection in Italian." *Davis Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 1, 1-35.

Croft, William *et alii* 2010. "Revising Talmy's typological classification of complex event constructions." In *Contrastive studies in construction grammar*, edited by Hans Boas, 201-236. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing House.

Drăgan, Ruxandra. 2012. *Aspects of Lexical Structure: Verbs in Locative Constructions in English and Romanian*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Farkas, Imola-Ágnes. 2009. "Some differences between English and Romanian resultative constructions." *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 11, no. 2, 59-71.

Farkas, Imola-Ágnes. 2013. *Resultative Constructions in English and Romanian. A Comparative Analysis*. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Farkas, Imola-Ágnes. 2021. "Towards a unified analysis of three cross-linguistically correlated telic constructions in Romanian." *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 23, no. 1, 33-60.

Folli, Raffaella, and Gillian Ramchand. 2005. "Prepositions and Results in Italian and English. An Analysis from Event Decomposition." In *Perspectives on Aspect*, edited by Henk Verkuyl, Henriette de Swart, and Angeliek van Hout, 81-105. Dordrecht: Springer.

Goldberg, Adele, and Ray Jackendoff. 2004. "The English Resultative as a Family of Constructions." *Language*, vol. 80, no. 3, 532-568.

Irimia, Monica-Alexandrina. 2013. "How to turn into a resultative." In *Proceedings of NELS 42*, Volume 1, edited by Stefan Keine, Shayne Sloggett, 249-260. University of Toronto.

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

Lupșa, Cornelia Daniela. 2004. "Resultative Phrases as Modifiers." PhD dissertation, Tohoku University.

Martínez-Vázquez, Montserrat. 2013. "Intralinguistic variation in the expression of motion events in English and Spanish." *Lingue e Linguaggi*, no. 9, 143-156.

Mateu, Jaume. 2005. "Arguing our way to the *Direct Object Restriction* on English resultatives." *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, vol. 8, no. 1-2, 55-82.

Mateu, Jaume. 2012. "Conflation and Incorporation Processes in Resultative Constructions." In *Telicity, Change, and State: A Cross-Categorial View of Event Structure*, edited by Violeta Demonte, Louise McNally, 252-278. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka, and Beth Levin. 2001. "An Event Structure Account of English Resultatives." *Language*, vol. 77, no. 4, 766-797.

Shim, Ji Young, and Marcel den Dikken. 2007. "The Tense of Resultatives: The Case of Korean." In *Proceedings of the Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society, Volume II*, edited by Anisa Schardl, Martin Walkow, Muhammad Abdurrahman, 337-350. Massachusetts: GLSA Publications.

Snyder, William. 2001. "On the Nature of Syntactic Variation: Evidence from Complex Predicates and Complex Word-Formation." *Language*, vol. 77, no. 2, 324-342.

Talmy, Leonard. 1972. "Semantic structures in English and Atsugewi." PhD dissertation, University of California.

Talmy, Leonard. 1975. "Semantics and syntax of motion." In *Syntax and Semantics, Volume 4*, edited by John P. Kimball, 181-238. New York: Academic Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. "Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Volume 3,* edited by Timothy Shopen, 57-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talmy, Leonard. 1991. "Path to Realization: A Typology of Event Conflation." In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, edited by Laurel A. Sutton, Christopher Johnson, Ruth Shields, 480-519. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

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

Verspoor, Cornelia Maria. 1997. "Contextually-Dependent Lexical Semantics." PhD. dissertation, The University of Edinburgh.

Washio, Ryuichi. 1997. "Resultatives, compositionality and language variation." *Journal of East Asian Linguistics*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1-49.

Wechsler, Stephen. 2005. "Resultatives Under the 'Event-Argument Homomorphism' Model of Telicity." In *The Syntax of Aspect: Deriving Thematic and Aspectual Interpretation,* edited by Nomi Erteschik-Shir, Tova Rapoport, 255-273. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa, and Eunjeong Oh. 2007. *On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.