Focus of the study
The structural source of Romanian stative nominalizations that:

- are derived from object-experiencer OE psych verbs that undergo the 'causative alternation' (i.e. have subject-experiencer SE counterparts)
- realize (at least) the Experiencer argument
- ambiguity between a stative and an eventive reading.

Data
- In Romanian, there are three possible nominalizations derived from these predicates: i) supine, ii) infinitival, and iii) zero derived. (i) is never stative; in (1a) only the infinitive can have a stative reading;
  the supine has an iterative eventive reading (see IS 2008 where the supine is shown to contain a pluractional operator). (ii) is in principle ambiguous between an eventive and a stative reading and (iii) is always stative (1b).

(1)  a. Supara-re-a/supara-t-ul parintilor  
    upset-Inf-the/upset-Sup-the parents-Gen  
    'The parents' state of being upset/upsetting the parents'
  b. teama/frica/groaza lui Ion de caini  
    fear/fear/dread John-Gen of dogs

- In Romanian (and Romance), the relevant predicates also have a BE+participle construction (a fi supărat, enervat, être énervé) and which is unambiguously stative (involves a resultative participle). This might be an indication for an intermediate resultative projection shared by the participle and the stative eventuality (Embick 2004).

(2)   a. supărărea/enervarea lui Ion  
    upset-Inf-the/irritate-Inf-the of Ion  
  b. Ion s-a supărat (SE)  
  c. Ion e supărat (BE+Prt)

The c. construction is known to be ambiguous between the eventive, the resultative and the (basic) stative structure (Embick 2004, and Sleeman 2011 for further development)

- Romanian fericit ‘happy’ and many other (psych-) adjectives look like participles:

(3)   a. (a fi) fericit, mulţumit, liniştit, îngrozit, înfuriat, înfricoşat

---

1 Ce travail a été mené partiellement en collaboration avec Gianina Iordachioaia et Artemis Alexiadou (Université de Stuttgart). Il a bénéficié du soutien du programme Structure Argumentale et Structure Aspectuelle de la Fédération TUL.
(be) happy-ed satisfied quiet-ed en-frightened, en-raged, en-scared
‘(be) happy, satisfied, quiet/calm, frightened, enraged, scared’
b. desperate-ed mad-ed disappointed
c. infuriated vs. furious ‘irritated’, enervate vs. nervous

Note the existence of affixed – nonaffixed pairs in participles (reminding the affixed vs. zero-derived nominalizations (cf. 3c)
• They are indeed derived from O(bject)E(xperiencer) or S(ubject)-E(xperiencer) psych-verbs; some of them alternate and some are more ambiguous than others, e.g. fericit ‘happy’ is a pure (adjectival) state:

(4) răspunsul lui m-a mulțumit / ?fericit / supărat / liniștit
answer his me-has satisfied / happy-ed / mad-ed / quiet-ed
‘his answer satisfied me/ made me happy / angry / released

• The psych-verb base can alternate between a O(bject)E(xperiencer) and a S(ubject)-E(xperiencer) structure. They also usually have related stative nominals which in Romanian can be simple/zero-derived or based on the infinitive.

(5) a. a (se) fericiti, a (se) mulţumiti (cu puţin), a (se) supăra, a (se) linişti
to (get) happy, satisfy oneself (with few), (get) mad, (get) quiet
b. fericire ‘happiness’, mulţumire ‘satisfaction’, supărar ‘anger’
liniște ‘quietness’ – liniștire; iubire vs. amour ‘love’

We will
• test the alternating object experiencer verb to see their readings
• sort the possible source for the derived (affixed and non-affixed) stative nominalizations in Romanian
• figure out the relation between the nominals and the stative participles.

1. Alternating object experiencer verbs


Romanian (Ro):

(6) a. Ion a enervat-o pe Maria dinadins/cu bătul/cu obrâznicie.
John has annoyed-her Acc Mary intentionally/with stick.the/with impudence
‘John annoyed Mary intentionally/with a stick/impudently.’

b. Maria s-a enervat (pe Ion) de la fleacuri (*intentionat).
Mary Rf-has annoyed (at John) from trifles (*intentionally)
‘Mary got annoyed at John from trifles.’

Oglinda de pe masa/freza lui Ion o enervează pe Maria.
mirror-the of on table/haircut the.Gen John her annoys Acc Mary
‘The mirror on the table/John’s haircut annoys Mary.’
The agentive OE reading in (6a) is always (bi-)eventive: a change of state is triggered in the experiencer. It has been argued that the subject is interpreted as agentive and the object experiencer verb loses its psych properties.

(6b) have been claimed to be inchoative in e.g. Spanish (Marin & McNally 2011) and Italian (Belletti & Rizzi 1988).²,³

(6c) have been claimed to be ambiguous between an eventive and a stative causative reading (cf. Pylkkänen 2000), the former involves a change of state in the experiencer, while the latter does not (Arad 1998, 2002).

The tests to distinguish between the eventive and the stative reading of verbs like in (6) focus on the difference between the agentive and the stative causative reading (see e.g. Arad 1998), not much evidence exists for the contrast between the eventive causative and the stative causative reading of these verbs, except for an explanation about the duration span of the psychological state of the experiencer in relation to the presence of the cause/stimulus:⁴

(7) a. |----------------------- ----- eventive causative reading
   causing event        psych state
b. perception of stimulus/cause
   |---------------------------|   stative (causative) reading
   |---------------------------|
   psych state

**Question**

- Where does the stative nominalization of these verbs come from? Does it come from the stative accusative-governing form (6c), the stative SE form (6b) or some morphologically more basic form, like a possibly semantically underspecified bound root (as argued in Pesetsky 1995) or verbal stem?

**Conclusion**

- Romanian clearly has some stative infinitive Ns that are derived from eventive-only verbs which seems to suggest that the stative N is not necessarily derived from a stative eventuality

---

² There is a long debate about the precise aspectual value of OE psych verbs (see Grimshaw 1990, Van Voorst 1992, Tenny 1987, 1994). In the following, we try to stick to simple facts that are relevant for our discussion on stative nominalizations.

³ Concerning (6b), Pesetsky (1995) claims that reflexive (SE) forms have non-causative semantics: for instance, in French, the object of the preposition bears either the target or the subject matter role:

(i) Marie s’étonne *de Paul/*de cette table/du bruit qu’on fait sur cette histoire.
   Marie refl-amazes of Paul/of this table/of the fuss made about this story.
   This is not the case in Romanian; (i) de la ‘of at/from’ introduces the causer, de ‘of’ the subject matter, and pe ‘on’ the target.

(ii) Maria s-a suparat {pe Ion de la jocul de carti/de problemele lui Ion}
   Mary Rf-has upset on John of at game of cards/of problems John-Gen
   ‘Mary got upset with John because of the card game/with John’s problems’

⁴ We use stimulus and subject matter (Pesetsky 1995) as the thematic role that appears in the context of (5b) and causer for (5a); so the causer is part of an event that triggers a change of state in the experiencer.
2. Romanian psych verbs
2.1 A note on stativity and eventivity tests

Romanian lacks the progressive, so this test cannot be used to check the stativity of (6b) and (6c). One test that we can use to distinguish between the two readings is modification by 'in'/for' PPs. We consider 'for'-PPs here.

Typically, these are OK with atelic/durative eventualities: but depending on whether it modifies inner or outer aspect (see e.g. Verkuyl 1993), it measures out the extension of one eventuality or of several iterated eventualities together (iterative reading):

(8) Ion a alergat/cântat/dansat/bătut la ușa lor timp de 3 ore/3 ani.
    John has run/sung/danced/knocked at door their time of 3 hours/3 years
    'John ran/sang/danced/knocked at their door for 3 hours/3 years.'

**Achievements** allow only the iterative reading (with the shorter/longer time span):

(9) Ion a găsit soluția/intrat pe ușă??(iar și iar) timp de 3 ani/3 ore.
    John has found solution/entered on door again and again time of 3 years/3 hours
    'John found the solution/entered the door again and again for 3 years/#3hours.'

**States** allow only the eventuality-span reading and prefer the longer time-span:

(10) Ion a iubit-o/disprețuit-o pe Maria(??iar și iar) timp de 3 ore/ani
    John has loved-her/despised-her Acc M. again & again time of 3 hours/years
    'John loved/despised Mary (*again and again) for 3 #3hours/years.'

**Alternating psych verbs:**

Arad (2002) points out that the (6c) pattern behaves either like the agentive reading in some languages or like the stative reading in some other languages. In languages like Romanian and Greek, a stative reading is favored in the presence of clitic-doubling, while an agentive/eventive reading is forced in the absence of clitic doubling.

Note that Anagnostopoulou (1999) claimed that clitic-doubling of the experiencer is obligatory (but see Verhoeven 2009). It seems, however, that clitic doubling is obligatory with stative-only verbs:

    Mary/Soccer interests/preoccupy boy-the
    b. Maria/Fotbalul îl interesează/preocupă pe băiat
    Mary/Soccer him interests/preoccupy Acc boy
    'Mary/Soccer interests/preoccupies the boy.'

**Romanian:** both SE and OE forms may allow both readings: iterative and eventuality-span; the former indicates an eventive reading (favored by the presence of a causer PP and
modification by *iar si iar* 'again and again' (12a, 13a)), the latter a stative one (favored by the presence of a stative subject matter/stimulus whose perception triggers the state):

(12) a. Ion s-a *supărat/ingrijorat iar și iar de la* știrile TV timp de 5 zile. 
      John Rf-has upset/worried (again and again) from news TV time of 5 days 
      'John got upset/worried (again and again) because of the TV news for 5 days.'

b. Ion s-a *supărat/ingrijorat (??iar și iar) de starea Mariei timp de 5 zile.*
      John Rf-has upset/worried (again & again) of state M.-Gen time of 5 days 
      'John was upset/worried about Mary's state for 5 days.'

(13) a. Știrile TV (l-)au *supărat/ingrijorat (pe) băiat(ul) (iar și iar)* timp de 5 zile.
      News TV (him-)has upset/worried Acc boy(the) again and again time of 5 days 
      'The TV news upset/worried the boy (again and again) for 5 days.'

b. Starea Mariei *(l-)a supărat/ingrijorat pe băiat (??iar și iar)* timp de 5 zile.
      state M.-Gen him-has upset/worried Acc John again & again time of 5 days 
      'Mary's state upset/worried the boy for 5 days.'

- **eventive-only verbs** only allow the iterative reading: they require an adverb that suggests repetition => they cannot be stative:

(14) a. Ion s-a *înviorat/inflăcărat/insufletit/infiorat ??(iar și iar) timp de 3 zile.*
      John Rf-has cheered-up/inflamed/enlivened/thrilled again and again time of 3 days

b. Veștile l-au *inviorat/inflăcărat/insufletit/infiorat ??(iar și iar) timp de 3 zile.*
      News him-have cheered-up/inflamed/enlivened/thrilled again & again time of 3 days

2.2. Summary

SE forms: ambiguous between stative and eventive readings in a considerable set of verbs.

EO forms: most are ambiguous between stative and eventive 
no clitic doubling => eventive reading (change of state)

3. Nominalizations from alternating psych verbs

3.1. Morphology of nominalizations derived from alternating psych verbs

- infinitive nominalizations with the suffix -re: most productive
- "0-derived nominals": some Vs are derived from psych Ns which sometimes block the infinitive nominalization
- other suffixes (not of interest here)

---

5 Without an adverb of repetition, (12) may get a reading in which the *for-PP* measures the result state of the event, but the most natural way to express this would be with the preposition *pentru* 'for':

i. Vestea l-a înviorat/inflacarat/insufletit/infiorat/revigorat pe Ion pentru 3 zile.'
   News him-has cheered-up/inflamed/enlivened/thrilled/invigorated Acc John time of 3 days 
   'The news made John be cheered up/inflamed/enlivened/thrilled/invigorated for 3 days.'
Infinitive and zero-derived Ns:
There is a competition between stative zero-derived and infinitival Ns for verbs that are clearly derived from Ns => two groups of verbs with stative Ns:

- **Group I:** only zero-derived stative Ns; infinitives are only eventive:

  (15) infuria 'enrage' = in- + furie 'fury'; infurierare is eventive, furia is stative
  ingrozii 'terrify' = in + groaza 'dread'; ingrozirea is eventive, groaza is stative
  teroriza 'terrorize' = tereoare + -iza; terorizarea is eventive, tereoarea is stative
  necaji 'bother' = necaz + -i; nec[amera] is eventive, necaz is stative
  încuraja 'encourage' = in + curaj + -a; încurajarea is eventive, curaj is stative
  alerta 'alert' = aler[a] + -a; alerare is eventive, aler[a] is stative
  interesă 'interest' = interes + -a; only interes 'interest' (the verb is stative-only)

- **Group II:** productively derive stative infinitival Ns; no zero-derived forms:

  (16) enerva 'annoy' - enervare; supăra 'upset' - supărare; irita 'irritate' - irritare;
  demoraliza 'demoralize' - demoralizare; descuraja 'discourage' - descurajarea
  deprima 'depress' - deprimare; induioșă 'touch' - induioșire; dispera 'despair' - disperare;
  tulbura 'confuse' - tulburare; dezamăgi 'disappoint' - dezamăgire;
  mahni 'grieve' - mâhnire, exaspera 'exasperate' - exasperare;
  însufleți 'enliven' - însuflețire, înviora 'refresh' - înviorare, înfiora 'thrill' - înfiorare.

=> The competition between zero-derived and infinitival stative Ns indicates that although the stative infinitive is morphologically derived from the verb, it does not include any eventuality information that the verbalizer adds to the meaning of the stative noun (i.e. the stative infinitive N is not a nominalization of the stative eventuality, but of something below that).

### 3.2. Tests for stativity of Ns (partly adapted from Fabregas, Marin & McNally 2012)

(i) Psych nouns, unlike nominals describing events, cannot be the subject of ‘take place’, a standard diagnostic for eventivity (cf. (17a) with (17c)):

(17) a. demolarea casei/ citirea cărții a avut loc ieri
demolish-Inf house-Gen/read-Inf book- Gen has taken place yesterday

b. enervarea/supărarea/mâhnirea/îngrijorarea Mariei a avut loc ieri
anoy-Inf/upset-Inf/grieve-Inf/worry-Inf  Mary-Gen has taken place yesterday

c. *teama/frica/groaza/furia/interesul Mariei a avut loc ieri
fear/ fear/dread/ fury/interest Mary-Gen has taken place yesterday

In Romanian, infinitival Ns are ambiguous between eventive and stative: they are not out in eventive contexts (17b). The zero derived ones (17c) are unambiguous.

In addition, nominalizations from stative-only Vs are incompatible with 'to happen':

---

6 The Ns in bold font are derived from eventive-only verbs (cf. (12)).
(18) *Preocuparea/iubirea lui Ion s-a petrecut în fața mea. 
preoccupy-Inf/love-Inf John-Gen Rf-has happened in front my 'John's preoccupation/love happened in front of me'

(ii) Psych nouns are unacceptable as subjects of verbs that denote properties of dynamic eventualities, such as ‘finish’ and ‘stop’:

(19) a. *sosirea lui/găsirea soluției s-a încheiat/terminat 
arrive-Inf his/find-Inf solution-Gen Rf-has closed/finished 
b. căutarea soluției /citirea cărții s-a încheiat/terminat 
seek-Inf solution-Gen/read-Inf book-Gen Rf-has closed/finished 
c. *enervarea/supărarea/mâhnirea/îngrijorarea Mariei s-a încheiat/terminat 
annoy-Inf/upset-Inf/grieve-Inf/worry-Inf Mary-Gen Rf-has closed/finished 
d. *teama/groaza/furia/interesul Mariei s-a încheiat/terminat 
fear/dread/fury/interest Mary-Gen Rf-has closed/finished

Note that this test does not disambiguate between achievements and states (cf. (19a), (19c), (19d)), but indicates that the nominalizations in (19c) cannot be activities or accomplishments (by comparison to (19b)). To show that they are not only achievements, note their compatibility with 'to last' (unlike the achievement 'arrival'):

(20) enervarea/supărarea/mâhnirea/îngrijorarea/teama/*sosirea Mariei 
annoy-Inf/upset-Inf/grieve-Inf/fear/ *a rrieve-Inf Mary-Gen 
a durat 3 zile
has lasted 3 days

(iii) Martin (2010): assister à ‘witness’ in French is a predicate that rejects object denoting individuals, states or facts (it is ok with achievements, activities, accomplishments):

(21) a. am fost martor la găsirea/căutarea soluției/ construirea casei 
have been witness at find-Inf/seek-Inf solution-Gen/build-Inf house-Gen 
b. am fost martor la *teama/*furia/*interesul/supărarea/?îngrijorarea Mariei 
have been witness at *fear/*fury/ *interest/upset-Inf/?worry-Inf Mary-Gen

- Incompatibility with plural marking (vs. result Ns):

Many such nominals do not realize plural at all (24); if they do, they receive a result reading:

(24) *enervările/ *îngrijorările/*mirările/ *uimirile/ *deprimările/ 
annoy-Inf-Pl/worry-Inf-Pl/wonder-Inf-Pl/depres-Inf-Pl/ 
*înduioșările/*înflăcărările Mariei 
touch-Inf-Pl/inflame-Inf-Pl Mary

As already mentioned, in Romanian group I, the infinitival is ambiguous between a stative and an eventive reading (see (17b), (21a)). Note here that the Romanian supine (past participle-based) nominalization only has an eventive reading:
(25) supăra-t-ul părinților (de către copii) are loc în timpul vacanțelor
upset-Sup-the parents-Gen (by children) takes place in time-the vacations-Gen

4. The structural source of stative nominalizations

We assume the following structure of psych verbs, building on Arad (2002), and Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer (2006):

• the stative and the (agentive) eventive reading are formed on the basis of the same root
• the difference arises from the functional heads they combine with
• in the agentive/causeative & eventive reading, they combine with a $v_{\text{eventive}}$ head, and a Voice head (Kratzer 1996) that introduces the external argument.
• in the stative reading, they combine with $v_{\text{stative}}$.

(26) a. Agentive/causeative & eventive:

```
       VoiceP
             \\
       Agent/causer Voice' \\

            Voice v_{\text{eventive}P} \\
                     \\
                 v' \\

                       v_{\text{eventive}} √P \\
                                \\
               √fear       NP (experiencer)
```

b. Stative:

```
       v_{\text{stative}P} \\
             \\
     stimulus v' \\

       v_{\text{stative}} √P \\
                          \\
   √disgust       NP (experiencer)
```

Eventive Ns nominalize some segment of the structure in (26a) (see AAS 2008, AIS 2011).

Zero-derived stative nominals are derived on the basis of $√P$:

(27) 

```
       N \\
             \\
       √P \\

                      \\
     √disgust       NP (experiencer)
```
Affix-derived stative nominals in principle nominalize the structure in (26b), as follows:

(28)

```
N
  \----------------------\ 
v_{static} P
  |                      |
  \----------------------\ 
  \                  \    |
  \                  v'    |
  \----------------------\ 
v_{static} √P
              \       |       
              \       NP (experiencer)
              \       √disgust
```

- It is yet not clear whether (28) is available: while Romanian stative infinitives can also be derived from eventive-only psych verbs, which suggests that the infinitive may also derive from √P, the component that is shared by all verb forms:

(29) însufleţirea/inflăcararea/infiiorarea Mariei a durat 3 ore/*s-a încheiat/ *s-a terminat
enliven-Inf/inflame-Inf/thrill-Inf  M-Gen has lasted 3 h/Rf-has closed/Rf-has finished

=> We need further tests to distinguish between a nominal derived from a stative eventuality and one derived from the basic state that is embedded by eventive psych verbs in (26a). At least the stative infinitives in (29) are clearly derived from the lowest component of (26a);

=> one might need to assume that the verbalizer (including the thematic vowel in Romanian which appears in the infinitive N) does not necessarily involve (dynamic or stative) eventuality; it might be an additional projection between √P and v_{static} or v_{eventive} in (26).

- In general, the infinitival affix in Romanian is unspecified as to the height of attachment (it is the default nominalizer): it can attach to (26a) or (26b).

5. Connecting with participles

Back to participles derived from alternating psych verbs – they correspond to different structures (optical illusions), like other adjectival participles.


Like in the case of other COS verbs, these participles can instantiate a dynamic-verbal structure, or a more reduced one (cf. adjectival vs. verbal participles).

English: (Embick, 2004); open – opened ; #close – closed ; empty – emptied...

(30) This door has been built open / *opened / closed (ambiguous).
    a. [Asp[Root]]
    b. [Asp [vP[Root]] ]
    c. [Asp [VoiceP [vP [Root]] ] ]
(and see Sleeman 2011 for indications that an intermediate structure can be proposed for resultative participles)

As such, the BE-participial constructions give positive results with stative diagnostics:

\[
(31) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Maria e supărată} \text{ intenţionat/dinadins pe Ion} \\
& \text{Maria is angered intentionally on Ion} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Maria e supărată pe Ion de la fleacuri} \\
& \text{Maria is angered on Ion from trifles} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Maria a fost supărată pe Ion ?? iar şi iar timp de trei zile} \text{ (eventuality-span)} \\
& \text{Maria has been angered on Ion again and again time of three days}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(32) \begin{align*}
\text{Maria e foarte supărată pe Ion} \\
& \text{Maria is very angry at Ion}
\end{align*}
\]

Fericit – fericire and supărat – supărare might simply share the ‘resultative’ RP part of the structure. However, more work has to be done on the size of the relevant structure.

6. Conclusions and further questions

- Romanian stative Ns derived from eventive psych verbs support the idea that stative Ns do not derive from the stative eventuality of the verb. One further needs to investigate whether there is evidence for $v_{\text{stative}}$ in stative Ns (or they are all derived from a smaller structure).
- Nominalizers: Ro infinitival -re seems to be very underspecified w.r.t. what it can nominalize (see also Cornilescu 2001, IS 2008) and despite the thematic vowel (typical of the verb) it may not include the verbal projection (unless we assume that the verbalizer is below the (stative) eventuality level).
- The result reading in the plural gives rise to analyses in terms of “occurential” readings. Is this indeed a further case? Cf also Brito & Sleeman who proposes an eventive class of result nominals – an intermediary form. The existence of this intermediary form might be also suggested by the connection between stative nominalizations from alternating psych-verbs and the adjectival, aka low stative reading of participles.
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