

ON THE STRUCTURE OF ROMANIAN PASSIVE PARTICIPLES

1. Introduction

Participles in general, and passive participles in particular are known to combine verbal and adjectival properties in various proportions, which results in the existence of different types coexisting in a single grammatical system as well as in considerable crosslinguistic variation. In this paper, we propose a typology and a general analysis of Romanian passive participles. The coexistence of different types of participles for one and the same verb is restricted to change-of-state verbs, where resultative participles are known to exhibit more adjectival properties (e.g. *Ușa este chiar acum **vopsită** de către meseriași* – eventive – vs. *Ușa este recent **vopsită*** – resultative). Moreover, for many verbs the non-eventive form can have two readings: the resultative reading, where a causing event is implied, and the simple state reading, with no causing event implication (e.g. *Sarcinile sunt deja **împărțite*** – resultative – vs. *Inima este **împărțită** în patru camere* – simple state); see Embick 2004, and, for Romanian, Nicolae & Dragomirescu 2009). Besides this three-way distinction, participles can be classified according to productivity, which leads us to the following typology:

- (i) fully systematic participles (which represent a grammatical category of the verb, analyzed as involving a functional head in the verbal extended projection): (i.1) eventive participles of transitive change-of-state verbs; (i.2) resultative participles of transitive and unaccusative change-of-state verbs; (i.3) participles of transitive verbs that are not +change-of-state (e.g. *iubit* ‘loved’, *văzut* ‘seen’)
- (ii) less systematic participles (which we treat as involving lexical derivation, analyzable as involving a categorizing head directly attached to the root): (ii.1) resultative participles of unergative verbs (*băut* ‘drunk’, *mâncat* ‘who has eaten’ etc.); (ii.2) simple state participles (*întins* ‘wide’, lit. ‘stretched, spread’); (ii.3) participles of stative object experiencer verbs (which involve argument alternation: *mulțumit de..* ‘happy with’).

In this paper, we will concentrate on type (i). An important conclusion is that those types that have more adjectival properties are not confined to type (ii), which shows that the resultative

vs. eventive contrast cannot be equated with a difference between derivational (adjectival) and inflectional (verbal) participles, as in Wasow (1977). We will show that, in Romanian, (a) eventive participles have certain adjectival properties which support the existence of a functional head that introduces an adjectival feature (section 2); (b) certain participles with fully passive argument structure (stative passive participles based on generic/habitual eventives and lexical states) share some of the more adjectival properties of resultatives (section 3); (c) resultative participles sometimes allow agent-PPs as well as other modifiers of the causing event, which is indicative of an embedded verbal structure (section 4). Moreover, we will argue that resultatives in Romanian always correspond to target states in Kratzer's (2000) typology. The type (ii) above will be briefly addressed in section 5.

2. The general adjectival properties of participles

In Romanian, all types of participles, including the eventive, fully passive ones, have by and large an adjectival distribution and morphology: (i) they lack Tense/Aspect/Mood morphology (and person agreement) and therefore they need copula support in order to form the main predicate of a sentence:

(1) În acest moment, mostrele sunt [**analizate** de către experți] / [disponibile].

(ii) They may occur as selected and unselected secondary predicates (currently analyzed as small clauses), either argument (2a) or adjunct (2b-c):

(2) a. L-am văzut [**atacat** de câini] / [fericit].

b. [**Analizată** îndelung de toți colegii într-o ședință] / [Prea dificilă pentru noi],
chestiunea a fost până la urmă lăsată deoparte în articol.

c. Turiștii înaintau [**ajutați** de un ghid] / [atenți].

(iii) They may occur as adnominal modifiers:

(3) [Mostrele [**analizate** pe atunci de către experți] / [recente]] nu indicau nimic clar.

(iv) In all these environments, they show agreement with the subject/head noun.

This distribution shows that the passive argument structure is not contingent on the presence

of the copula. As this structure is also found with *se*-verbs, we propose that it relies on a variety of *v*, called *v_{pass}*. The difference between participial and *se*-passives comes from a higher head Voice, which comes in two varieties – Voice_{part} and Voice_{SE} (for the distinction between Voice and *v*, see Alexiadou et al. 2015; this distinction corresponds to Bruening’s 2012 distinction between Pass and Voice). We propose that Voice_{part} comes with a +A feature which makes it incompatible with T/Asp/Mood but compatible with Pred, the head characteristic for non-verbal predications (see Bowers 1993). The Pred head can also be used for adnominal participles, creating the reduced relative structure, as proposed by Giurgea & Soare (2010):

- (4) [BE [PredP (DP_i) [Pred⁰ [VoiceP Voice_{part} [_{vP} *v_{pass}* [_{VP} V (DP_i)] (*by*-P)]]]]]]

There is however one environment that allows passive participles but not adjectives – the complement of certain modal verbs:

- (5) Cartea {trebuie/merită /merge/ se cuvine/se cere} {citită / *disponibilă}.

We propose that such verbs select directly for Voice_{part}, without the mediation of Pred. This may explain why *trebui* ‘must’ and *merita* ‘be worth’ also allow intransitive participles (e.g. *Trebuie mers* ‘must gone’ = ‘One/We must go’), which is excluded in finite environments, where impersonal passives can only be realized as *se*-forms (e.g. *se merge* ‘people are going’, not **este mers*): the requirement of the presence of a theme probably comes from the Pred head, which is absent with modal verbs. Participial forms can also be used as impersonal passives when selected by the non-finite low complementizer *de*, in the so-called supine (e.g. *este de mers acolo*). This is another environment where no Pred head is present. Note however that the supine differs from the participle by never showing agreement, which suggests that the relevant passive head is not Voice_{part} (recall that the distinctive feature of Voice_{part} is a +A feature, which naturally comes with agreement features).

3. Properties correlated with stativity

It is well-known that resultative participles differ from eventive participles by a number of properties that make them more similar to adjectives: (i) reduced argument structure (strong limitations on *by*-phrases and other agent-oriented modifiers, lack of an obligatory implicit

agent); (ii) combination with degree words; (iii) negative prefixation (Ro. *ne-*, Engl. *un-*); (iv) occurrence in the complement position of certain verbs (*părea* ‘seem’, *ajunge* ‘get, come to be’, *rămâne* ‘remain’, *considera* ‘consider’, *lăsa* ‘leave’, *găsi* ‘find’) – see (6) for properties (i) and (iv), (7) for property (ii) and (8) for property (iii) (see, for Romanian, Niculescu 2013, Nicolae & Dragomirescu 2009):

- (6) Ușa pare reparată (?? chiar în acest moment, de muncitori).
 = ‘The door seems to have been repaired.’ (resultative)
 ≠ ‘The door seems to be under repairing (at this very moment, by workers)’ (eventive)
- (7) Băiatul e foarte bătut / e mai bătut ca ieri.
 = ‘The boy has a lot of injuries/ more injuries than yesterday.’ (resultative)
 ≠ ‘The boy is being badly beaten / is being beaten worse than yesterday.’ (eventive)
- (8) Ușa este nereparată.
 = ‘The door has not been repaired’ (resultative)
 ≠ ‘The door is not being repaired’ (eventive)

However, the properties in (ii) and (iv) are also found with participles with fully passive, not reduced argument structure, provided that they are stative. This concerns above all lexical statives:

- (9) a. Șefa e foarte iubită de (către) angajați.
 b. Muzeul e mai cunoscut de străini decât de localnici.
- (10) a. Șefa pare iubită de (către) angajați.
 b. Președintele a ajuns urât de toată lumea / reușește să rămână iubit de alegători.
 c. Acest concept nu-l putem considera cunoscut de toți.
 d. Clădirea din poză pare înconjurată de copaci.

With the negative prefix (see (iii)) – which must be tested in the postcopular position, because otherwise *ne-* also functions as sentential negation (e.g. *nevăzut de nimeni*) – the data are mixed (which suggests that *ne-* prefixation relies on lexicalization):

- (11) a. * Șefa e neurătă / neadmirată (de angajați).
 b. Bucureștiul este neiubit de mulți dintre locuitorii săi. (www.contributors.ro)
 c. Acest autor este necunoscut de (către) tinerii de azi.

d. Copilul era neînsoțit de (%cătore) părinți.

With eventives, degree words are allowed, for some verbs, in generic and habitual contexts, with an interpretation in which the degree word quantifies over the number of occasions (and not on a scale associated with the resulting state as in resultatives, e.g. *foarte bătut* ‘very badly beaten’). The lexical limitations of this construction are not fully understood and are subject to speaker variation:

- (12) a. Genul ăsta de rochii e mai vândut în România decât în Franța.
b. % Cartea e mai cumpărată de tineri decât de bătrâni.
c. Subiectul e foarte discutat în ședințele din Parlament.
d. Filmul acesta e foarte {% vizionat / ??văzut} în Europa.
e. Este o mașină populară, ieftină, drept urmare **foarte văzută** pe străzile noastre.
(<https://dailydriven.ro/...>)
f. Doctorul Bălan e mai {solicitat/ ??consultat} decât doctorul Voicu.
g. % Armstrong e mai ascultat de cei de vârsta a doua decât de tineri.
h. % Acest politician e foarte pomenit la televizor.
i. Fiind din România, țară în care avusese loc o revoluție sângeroasă (...), **am fost foarte căutat de jurnaliștii norvegieni**. (<https://www.incorectpolitic.com/..>)

Pluractionality is crucial for allowing degree modifications with eventives. Otherwise, for a single event (with a single participant), degree modifiers cannot be used to indicate the degree to which the theme is affected, as we have seen in (7) above. But pluractionality is not sufficient. First, the +A feature of the participle is crucial, because otherwise generic and iterative environments do not suffice for licensing Deg words:

- (13) * Românii foarte cumpără acest gen de mașini.

Second, there is evidence that the operator creating pluractionality, in these examples, is very low, attached already in the lexicon or immediately above V (of the type discussed in Ferreira 2005), because Deg cannot occur above pluractionals that take temporally defined events (on the layering of temporal modification above and below Q-Adv, indicating 2 event layers in the scope of Asp, see Giurgea & Stoicescu 2022) – thus, we cannot paraphrase (14a) by (14b):

- (14) a. Anul trecut prăjiturile astea erau (adesea) vândute în 5 minute.

[Asp_{impf} [HAB [_{VP} sold _ in 5 minutes]]]

- b. * Anul trecut, prăjiturile astea erau foarte vândute în 5 minute.

These pluractional eventive participles also occur after verbs such as *părea* ‘seem’, *ajunge* ‘become’, especially when modified by degree words, but not necessarily:

- (15) a. Subiectul a ajuns discutat chiar și de către deputați.

- b. Rochia pare mai cumpărată de tineri (judecând după aprecierile de pe site).

We conclude that degree words and verbs of the type *părea* and *ajunge* are sensitive to a stative feature (which resultatives, habituais and lexical statives share) rather than to the absence of fully passive argument structure.

4. On the structure of resultatives

An important difference between eventives and resultatives concerns the availability of PPs introducing the demoted external argument (the so-called *by*-phrases or ‘agent PPs’). Such PPs are often excluded with resultatives, as opposed to eventives:

- (16) a. [Context: pointing at a scratch on the car; no passerby on the spot]

* Mașina e zgâriată de un trecător. (resultative)

- b. [Context : a passerby is scratching the car]

Mașina (tocmai) e zgâriată de un trecător. (eventive)

There is also evidence that an implicit external argument is always present with eventives but not with resultatives: as noticed by Baker, Johnson, and Roberts 1989 (see also Kratzer 1996), in the eventive reading the Theme/Undergoer cannot corefer with the Agent/Initiator, whereas in the resultative reading, such coreference is possible (the agent of the event that caused the result state can be understood as being the same as the entity that has undergone the change):

- (17) Copiii sunt spălați.

(a) Resultative: the children have been washed by somebody else or they have washed themselves

(b) Eventive: only: the children are being washed by somebody else

The possibility of Agent–Undergoer coreference with resultatives is not limited to ‘naturally reflexive’ verbs such as ‘wash’ in (17) (contra Bruening 2014):

- (18) a. Aici mi se pare foarte criticat. Și, culmea, chiar el e autorul!
 b. The protestor chained himself to the building and remained attached for a day
 (McIntyre 2013:30)
 b’. (Ro.) Protestatarul s-a legat de stâlp și a rămas legat pentru o zi întreagă

This contrast indicates that the head that introduces the external argument, for which we use the label *v*, is not the same in the two configurations: eventive passive participles rely on a *v* that always introduces the external argument, which we label *v_{pass}* (see (4) above); when the external argument is not saturated by a *by*-phrase, it gets existentially bound (‘there is somebody who does P/something that causes P, etc.’), possibly at the level of VoiceP (as proposed by Bruening, who calls this head ‘Pass’)¹. Resultatives lack *v_{pass}*: the head that introduces the result state either combines directly with VP or with a variety of *v* that does not obligatorily project an external argument.

However, *by*-phrases as well as other modifiers of the causing event are not always excluded with resultatives. By and large, they seem to be possible when they are reflected in features of the result state (cf. Rapp (1996), Meltzer-Asscher (2011), McIntyre (2013), Alexiadou et al. (2015)) – see (19a), where the agent can be identified or characterized based on the writing, (19b), where the agent remains associated with the product of its creativity, as an author; in (19c), the speed of the causing event is manifested in the form of the letters; in (19d), the time of the causing event is manifested in the writing style; (19e) is fine because the age (indicated via the time of the building event) is a relevant property of a building:

- (19) a. Scrisoarea pare scrisă de soră-mea / de către un om bolnav.
 b. Tavanul este pictat de Tintoretto.
 c. Scrisoarea pare/este scrisă în grabă.
 d. Textul acesta este/pare scris {în secolul doi / în Italia}.
 e. Casa e construită în 1940.

¹ Under the analysis in which Voice_{pass} binds the external argument, for cases where a *by*-phrase is present, we could either posit a variant of Voice that does not bind any variable (Bruening 2012) or we may assume that the *by*-P characterizes the external argument but does not saturate it (Giurgea 2019).

In (20a), the agent PP indicates the person responsible for the presence of an item in the situation under discussion (the context being one where the participants' contributions to a meal are relevant); (20b) can be explained in the same way, but can also be associated to an 'author' interpretation (the agent may be reflected in a certain way of cooking):

- (20) a. [Context : pointing to a bottle of wine on the table]
 Vinul ăsta e adus de Ion.
 b. [Context: pointing to the fish dish just served at the table]
 Peștele e gătit de Andreea.

When these conditions are not fulfilled, *by*-phrases and event-oriented modifiers are not allowed:

- (21) a. [Context: the speaker notices an empty pool]
 Bazinul { *e / a fost } golit de autorități.
 b. [Context: the house is no longer standing, the demolition is completed]
 Casa e demolată (*în grabă).
 c. ?? Mașina e reparată/avariată ieri.
 d. [Context: describing a book, no undergoing event of scribbling]
 ?? Cartea e mângălită/scrișă în pat.

In order to account for the presence of a limited range of causing-event modifiers, we propose the following: (i) resultatives are built on top of eventive VPs and involve an operator RES that introduces the result state and binds the causing event (cf. McIntyre 2013: 36); (ii) modifiers of the causing event, including agents, are attached below RES; (iii) the resultative operator comes with the further requirement that *the property of having a P-event as a cause be manifested in the state* – see the denotation in (22), where P (the denotation of the complement of RES) is a complex property which includes the modifiers of the causing event:

$$(22) \llbracket \text{RES} \rrbracket = \lambda P_{\langle v, t \rangle} \lambda s \exists e (P(e) \wedge \text{res-state}(s, e) \wedge \text{manifest}(s, \lambda s'. \exists e (P(e) \wedge \text{res-state}(e, s'))))$$

's is a result state of an event of type P and it manifests the property of being a result state of an event characterized by P'

In this analysis, the constraints on agent PPs and causing-event modifiers follow from the *manifest*-relation in the formula in (22). For cases where *by*-phrases are allowed, we may assume a RES that attaches above $v_{\text{pass}}P$ (as proposed by Bruening 2014, who uses ‘VoiceP’ for our ‘ $v_{\text{pass}}P$ ’). However, the fact that coreference between Agent and Undergoer is allowed with resultatives (see (17) above) indicates that RES can also take a projection lacking the external theta-role, i.e. a VP. A RES that directly combines with a VP must in any case be assumed for unaccusatives (e.g. *intrat la liceu, căzut din copac*). It is well-known that resultative participles are fully productive with unaccusatives that denote a change-of-state (see Dragomirescu 2010, a.o.), therefore we assume that they rely on a verbal functional category, rather than on lexical formation:

- (23) a. [Part_{res} [vP v_{pass} [VP V ...] (*by*-phrases)]] (resultatives with *by*-phrases)
 b. [Part_{res} [VP V ...]] (resultatives with EA-IA coreference and unaccusatives)

The issue whether resultatives have a VP-internally generated Theme is disputed: Bruening (2014) supports such an analysis, whereas McIntyre (2013) argues against it, proposing that the theme theta-role is externalized. At least for the richer structure in (23)a, a VP-internal Theme is expected. Supporting evidence comes from ECM-constructions (*acest medicament* in (24) cannot be an external argument of *demonstrat*):

- (24) [Acest medicament]_i este demonstrat [__i a fi eficient]

Alexiadou et al. (2015) also propose that the head creating resultative participles (which they label Adj) may attach above or below VoiceP (as we suggested in (23)), but they propose that this distinction corresponds to Kratzer’s distinction between resultant state and target-state participles, the higher resultatives introducing ‘resultant states’ and the lower resultatives – ‘target states’. However, there is evidence that Romanian resultative participles always denote ‘target states’ in Kratzer’s terms.

Kratzer (2000) proposed that resultative participles (in German and English) can have two types of denotation: (i) *resultant states*, which are states that hold forever after the culmination of an event, representing properties of times (rather than properties of entities), as proposed by Parsons (1990) for the perfect aspect; (ii) *target state*, which represent the concrete result that is specified in the lexicon for change-of-state verbs. Given the Parsons–

Kratzer definition of resultant states, any type of event should allow for a resultant state. The restrictions on the resultant states should only be pragmatic – whether it is relevant for an entity that it participated to a certain event at some moment in the past (see the experiential perfect: *I've been to Rome, I've met love*, etc.). But, in Romanian, resultative participles appear to be restricted to change-of-state verbs, qualifying as target state participles. Here are some contexts where the occurrence of a previous event has current relevance (and would allow the English perfect) and yet resultative participles are out:

- (25) a. [Context: pointing to a painting in somebody's apartment]
 # Tabloul ăsta e expus la Luvru.
 vs. the perfect aspect in English: 'This painting has been exhibited at the Louvre.'
- b. [Context: the owner of a villa boasting of his house]
 # Vila asta e vizitată de un rege.
- c. [Context: A wonders whether they should ask X about something; X has been previously asked that; B replies to A:]
 # Nu mai e nevoie, e deja întrebat.

Kratzer's main test for distinguishing 'resultant state' from 'target state' participles is the irreversibility of the state. But certain change-of-state verbs have permanent associated target-states by virtue of their meaning: states such as being proven, written or dead are irreversible. Therefore, the irreversibility test can only apply to verbs whose target state is in principle reversible. Kratzer uses as tests for irreversibility the combinations with *still* and *remain* (cf. *#He's still dead, #He remained dead*). Based on this test, Alexiadou et al. (2015) argue that only resultant state participles have *by*-phrases, proposing a richer structure for resultant-state participles (Adj selecting VoiceP) than for target-state participles:

- (26) a. Ta lasticha ine akoma fuskomena. (Greek, Alexiadou et al. 2015:157)
 the tires are still pumped.up
- b. Ta lasticha ine (*akoma) fuskomena apo tin Maria. (ibid.:158)
 the tires are still pumped.up by the Maria

This contrast can be replicated in Romanian:

- (27) a. Capela e pictată de Mantegna.

- b. Când am vizitat prima oară Padova, capela încă era pictată.
- c. ??Când am vizitat prima oară Padova, capela încă era pictată de Mantegna.

However, we should not conclude from (27)c that (27)a is a resultant state perfect. We propose that the reason why (27)c is not felicitous is pragmatic: if we use *încă* ‘still’, a modifier which highlights the possibility of interruption, with a modified event, the interruption possibility tends to be interpreted as applying to the property introduced by the modifier: e.g. *she still writes well* is associated to the possibility that she starts to write badly. But, for target states, modifiers that introduce a feature of the causing event will be true as long as the state itself is true: if Mantegna made a painting, then, as long as the painting resists as such, its author will be Mantegna. But, as we have argued, the use of a modifier with *still* tends to highlight the possibility that the state changes only with respect to that modifier; since this is impossible in the case of the agent of the causing event, (27)c is bad.

Now, if we imagine that after the destruction caused by the war a different painter repainted the chapel, (27)c becomes fully acceptable:

- (28) Pe atunci, capela era încă pictată de Mantegna. Ce frumusețe! Nici o comparație cu pictura modernă de acum.

To conclude, the irreversibility test does not provide evidence, in Romanian, for a resultant state interpretation of resultative participles modified by *by*-phrases ((28) shows that such participles denote target-states). Therefore, based on the data in (25), we maintain the conclusion that Romanian resultative participles always denote target states in the sense of Parsons (1990) and Kratzer (2000).²

5. Lexicalized participles

The types of participles discussed so far are all fully productive, systematic, which is the reason why we analyzed them as being built in syntax, by combining a verbal lexeme with certain functional categories. The other types listed in §1 (under (ii)) are less systematic:

- (i) Resultative participles of unergative verbs are restricted to a few bases (*mâncat/nemâncat* ‘who has/hasn’t eaten’, *nevorbit* ‘who hasn’t spoken’ – but not **vorbit*

² Note that the participle can occur in a construction with a perfect/anterior interpretation, see (i), but the contrast between (i) and (25)c shows that the perfect meaning does not come from the participle, but from *odată*:

(i) Odată întrebat și Popescu, s-a terminat cu consultările.

‘who has spoken’) and often have idiomatic meanings (*băut/nebăut* ‘who has/hasn’t drunk alcohol’, *umblat* ‘who has travelled a lot’).

(ii) For change-of-state verbs, the property which obtains in the result state of the verb is often denoted by an adjective that is not derived from the verb: e.g. *gol* ‘empty’ – *goli* ‘to empty’, *plin* ‘full’ – *umple* ‘to fill’, *roșu* ‘red’ – *înroși* ‘reddened’ etc. In such cases, the participle – unless eventive – can only be resultative, i.e. it implies the occurrence of a causing event: *golit* ‘emptied’, *umplut* ‘filled’, *înroșit* ‘reddened’ all imply a previous event of emptying, filling or reddening, respectively. It is only for the properties that do not have an associated underived adjective that the participle may have a ‘simple state’ use, in which it just denotes the property that holds in the result state of the verb, without implying an actual causing event: see *uscat* ‘dry, dried’ – *usca* ‘to dry’, *împărțit* ‘divided’ – *împărți* ‘to divide’; (29) is an example where *împărțit* does not imply a causing event:

(29) Inima este împărțită în patru camere.

Besides the fact that the simple state use of participles is restricted to some of the verbs, the proposal that these participles rely on lexical derivation is also supported by the existence of idiomatic meanings, see *deschis* ‘open, opened, (about colors) light, (about spaces) open, (about persons) frank, sincere’, *ascuțit* (< *ascuți* ‘to sharpen’) ‘sharp, (about sounds) high-pitched, (about unpleasant feelings) bitter, painful, intense, (about angles) acute’, etc.

(iii) With stative object-experiencer verbs, the participle is associated to a change in argument structure that cannot be described as passivization. First, notice that Romanian can only use the general preposition *de* ‘by, from, of’ and not the complex preposition *de către* which is dedicated to external arguments of passives (‘by-phrases’):

(30) a. Pe George îl nemulțumește fiul său. / b. George e nemulțumit de (*către} fiul său.

Moreover, this PP can be an anaphor bound by the experiencer subject (see (31)a), which is impossible with canonical passives (see (31)b):

(31) a. George e nemulțumit de sine. / b. * George a fost desenat de (către) sine.

The fact that (stative) object-experiencer verbs constitute a special type with respect to argument structure is also manifest in the active version: the experiencer, although marked as

a direct object, appears to be generated higher in the argument structure than the nominative DP, as shown, inter alia, by the impossibility of binding of the accusative experiencer by the nominative DP:

(32) * Vlad se nemulțumește/interesează/plictisește pe sine.

We conclude that, although quite systematic, participles of (stative) object experiencer verbs do not involve v_{pass} . As they are not resultative either, they do not belong to any of the types described in sections 2-4. Given the limitation of these participles to a rather confined lexical class (object-experiencer verbs), we may treat them as relying on lexical derivation.

6. Conclusions

We argued that participles in general have a +A feature, associated to the participial functional head. This head can have a purely argument-structural function, marking passive voice, in which case we labeled it $\text{Voice}_{\text{part}}$, or it can introduce a result-state (a target-state in Kratzer's terminology), in which case we used the label Part_{res} . $\text{Voice}_{\text{part}}$ takes a $v\text{P}$ with an external argument present in the theta-grid but 'demoted' – a $v_{\text{pass}}\text{P}$, which is also found in *se*-passives. Part_{res} may take transitive as well as unaccusative verbs. With transitives, it can combine with $v_{\text{pass}}\text{P}$ (for cases where *by*-phrases are projected) or VP . The latter situation also obtains with unaccusatives. By virtue of their +A feature, participles ($\text{Voice}_{\text{part}}\text{Ps}$ and $\text{Part}_{\text{res}}\text{Ps}$) may further combine with a Pred head, which underlies their various 'adjectival' contexts (postcopular, small clause predicate, adnominal modifier). Eventive participles ($\text{Voice}_{\text{part}}\text{Ps}$) have one non-adjectival context, the complement of certain modal verbs (*trebuie* 'must', *merita* 'be worth', *se cuveni* 'ought' etc.). In this case, the modal selects for the VoiceP , with no PredP mediation. Certain adjectival properties – allowance of degree words and the complement position of a number of verbs (*părea* 'seem', *ajunge* 'get, come to be', *rămâne* 'remain', *considera* 'consider', *lăsa* 'leave', *găsi* 'find') require, in addition, that the participle should be stative. Therefore, these contexts allow passive participles of lexically stative verbs and resultative participles, but in principle disallow eventive passives. They do allow habituais derived from eventives via a very low operator, to various degrees (there is some lexical variation and speaker variation). This is expected because habituais are stative. For lexicalized participles (discussed in section 5), the participial morphology does not correspond to a verbal functional head ($\text{Voice}_{\text{part}}$ or Part_{res}), but is a derivational morpheme.

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Florian Schäfer, 2015, *External arguments in transitivity alternations: a layering approach*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, Mark, Kyle Johnson, Ian Roberts, 1989, “Passive arguments raised”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 20 (2), 219–251.
- Bowers, John S., 1993, “The syntax of predication”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 591–656.
- Bruening, Benjamin, 2012, “By-Phrases in Passives and Nominals”, *Syntax* 16, 1–41.
- Bruening, Benjamin, 2014, “Word Formation is Syntactic: Adjectival Passives in English”, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 32, 363–422.
- Dragomirescu, Adina, 2010, *Ergativitatea. Tipologie, sintaxă, semantică*, București: Editura Universității din București.
- Embick, David, 2004, “On the structure of resultative participles in English”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 35 (3), 355–392.
- Giurgea, Ion, 2019, „On the Person Constraint on Romanian *se*-passives”, in Ludovico Franco, Mihaela Marchis Moreno, Matthew Reeve (eds.), *Agreement, case and locality in the nominal and verbal domains*, Berlin: Language Science Press, 95–129.
- Giurgea, Ion, Elena Soare, 2010, “Predication and the Nature of Non-Finite Relatives in Romance”, in Anna Maria Di Sciullo, Virginia Hill (eds.), *Edges, Heads and Projections: Interface Properties*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 313–353.
- Giurgea, Ion, Ioana Stoicescu, 2022, “On temporal adjuncts and the imperfective aspect in Romanian”, in Mihaela Tănase-Dogaru, Alina Tigău, Ioana Stoicescu, Mihaela Zamfirescu (eds.), *New Insights into Linguistic Communicative Behaviour*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 219–251.
- Kratzer, Angelika, 1996, “Severing the External Argument from its Verb”, in J. Rooryck and L. Zaring (eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 109–137.
- Kratzer, Angelika, 2000, “Building statives”, *Proceedings of BLS* 26, 385–399.
- McIntyre, Andrew, 2013, “Adjectival passives and adjectival participles in English”, in Artemis Alexiadou, Florian Schäfer (eds.), *Non-canonical passives*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 21–42.
- Meltzer-Asscher, Aya, 2011, “Adjectival passives in Hebrew: evidence for parallelism between the adjectival and verbal systems” *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29, 815–855.
- Nicolae, Alexandru, Adina Dragomirescu, 2009, “Omonimia sintactică a participiilor românești”, in Blanca Croitor, Ana-Maria Mihail, Rodica Zafiu (eds.), *Studii de gramatică. Omagiu Doamnei Profesoare Valeria Guțu Romalo*, București: Editura Universității din București, 193–207.
- Niculescu, Dana, 2013, “Romanian passive participles as complements of perception verbs”, *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 58 (1), 55–71.
- Parsons, Terence, 1990, *Events in the semantics of English: A study in subatomic semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Rapp, Irene, 1996, “Zustand? Passiv? – Überlegungen zum sogenannten ‘Zustandspassiv’”, *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 15 (2): 231–265.
- Wasow, Tom, 1977, “Transformations and the Lexicon”, in P. W. Culicover, T. Wasow, and J. Bresnan (eds.), *Formal Syntax*, New York: Academic Press, 327–360.

ON THE STRUCTURE OF ROMANIAN PASSIVE PARTICIPLES

(Abstract)

We present a typology of participles in Romanian, providing syntactic analyses for each type. We argue that participles in general have a +A feature. For the productive types of participles, this feature is associated to the participial functional head, which can have a purely argument-structural function, marking passive voice (Voice_{part}) or can introduce a result-state (Part_{res}). By virtue of their +A feature, participles (Voice_{part}Ps and Part_{res}Ps) may further combine with a Pred head, which underlies their various ‘adjectival’ contexts (postcopular, small clause predicate, adnominal modifier). Voice_{part} takes v_{pass}P, which is also found in *se*-passives. Part_{res} may take either v_{pass}P (for cases where *by*-phrases are projected) or VP. The latter property allows it to combine with

unaccusatives. The limitations of causing event modifiers found with resultatives are explained by a requirement introduced by the RES operator, which filters out properties that are not manifest in the result state. We argue that Romanian resultative participles are always 'target states' in the sense of Kratzer (2000). Eventive participles (Voice_{part}Ps) have one non-adjectival context, the complement of certain modal verbs (*trebui* 'must', *merita* 'be worth', *se cuveni* 'ought' etc.), where the modal selects for the VoiceP, with no PredP mediation. Some adjectival properties (degree words, the complement position of certain verbs) require that the participle be stative. Besides resultatives and participles of lexically stative verbs, habituals derived from eventives via a very low operator may pattern with stative participles in this respect. Non-productive types of participles (simple state participles associated to change-of-state verbs, resultative participles of unergatives) as well as participles involving a peculiar change in argument structure (participles of stative object experiencer verbs) are analyzed as relying on lexical derivation.