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 peșteră ‘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 Talman generalization according to which verb-framed Romanian disallows these two complex event constructions.
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REZUMAT. Grupuri prepoziționale cu până și construcții eventive complexe în limba română. Această lucrare analizează statutul sintactic și semantic al grupurilor prepoziționale din limba română construite cu prepoziția compusă până în/la în grupuri verbale de schimbare de locație (a pluti până în peșteră) și schimbare de stare (a munci până la epuizare). Contrar afirmațiilor făcute în literatura de specialitate (Barbu 2015), abordarea propusă aici susține că aceste – și astfel de – grupuri verbale nu pot fi considerate construcții eventive complexe
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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 adjunții temporale. Aceste proprietăți accentuează faptul că datorită prezenței acestor grupuri verbale în limbă, română 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.
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### 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.’
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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 \textit{hammer the metal flat}). His analysis of \textit{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 a intrat/ ajuns în peșteră (plutind).
   the bottle has entered/ arrived in cave floating
   'The bottle got into the cave (floating).'

(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 peșteră.
   the bottle REFL has rolled in cave
   'The bottle rolled in/into the cave.'

c. *Flaconul a plutit în peșteră.
   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/înalti.
   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.
   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/ciocănît metalul plat (Romanian), *Gianni ha martellato il metallo piatto (Italian), *Juan
golpeó/martilló el metal plano (Spanish), *Jean a martellé le métal plat (French) and *Jean va
martellejar el metal pla (Catalan). One could build the pănă-PP counterpart of this AP
resultative (e.g. Ion a bătut/ciocănît metalul pănă 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 walked up to the park/until they were in the park.’

b. Și apoi ai valsat până aici.
   ‘And then you waltzed up to here.’

c. Petru a înotat până la țărm.
   ‘Peter swam until at 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 acţiuni, albuşurile 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 albuşurile atât de mult/tare încât albuşurile au devenit spumă ‘Mary beat the egg whites so much that they became foamy’).

(7) Maria a bătut albuşurile 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 immobilizat 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 immobilizat 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 immobilizat 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 immobilizat 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 belong 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.
PÂNĂ-PPs AND COMPLEX EVENT CONSTRUCTIONS IN ROMANIAN

(9) a. Amestecă toate ingredientele până la omogenizare.
Mix all ingredients until homogenisation
‘Mix all the ingredients until they become homogeneous.’
b. Au răcit crema de fructe până la solidificare.
have cooled cream of fruit until solidification
‘They cooled the fruit cream until it became solid.’
c. Au încălzit materialul solid până la înmuiere.
have heated the material solid until softness
‘They heated the solid material until it became soft.’
d. Au încălzit conductorul până la incandescență.
have heated the conductor until incandescence
‘They heated the conductor until it became incandescent.’
e. întinderea mușchilor până la rupturi parțiale
the stretching of muscles until partial tears
‘The stretching of muscles until they are partially torn’
f. L-a necăjit/chinuit până la exasperare/disperare.
him have teased/tormented until despair
‘They teased/tormented him to the point of despair.’
g. Maria a curățat geamurile până la strălucire.
Mary has cleaned the windows until shine
‘Mary cleaned the windows until they became shiny.’
h. Au violat/ bătut/ lovit -o până la leșin.
have violated/beaten hit her until faint
‘They violated/beat/hit her to the point of faint.’

(10) a. Jucătorii au alergat până la epuizare.
the players have run until exhaustion
‘The players ran to the point of exhaustion.’
b. Mama s-a impresionat/ emoționat până la lacrimi.
mother REFL has impressed excited until tears
‘Mother was impressed/excited to tears.’
c. Oaspeții au mâncat până la saturare înainte de a merge la somn.
the guests have eaten until at satiation before of to go at sleep
‘The guests ate until they felt full before going to sleep.’
d. Ion a băut până la inconștință.
John has drunk until 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).

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 curăţa geamurile până la străluclire ‘clean the windows until they become shiny’ (cf. (9g) above), the VP a curăţa 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 însănătoșire.
    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 însănătoșirea medicului ‘They postponed the vaccination until the doctor’s recovery’) nor of the syntactic direct object itself (i.e. #Au amânat vaccinarea până la însănătoșirea 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 însănătoșirea 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)
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.*

‘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 peste ră* ‘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.
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