

Romanian nominalizations: case and aspectual structure¹

ALEXANDRA CORNILESCU

University of Bucharest

(Received 2 July 1996; revised 15 September 2000)

Two Romanian nominalizations, the infinitive and the supine, are compared in Noun + Object (NO) and Noun + Subject (NS) structures, regarding their ability to yield e-(vent)/r-(esult) readings. The NO structures behave alike and yield e-readings. The two NS structures contrast sharply: the infinitive NS is always an r-nominal, the supine NS may be an e-nominal. This contrast between the infinitive and the supine follows from their aspectual properties. While the supine is [–Telic], and may project either an Object or a Subject in e-nominals, the infinitive is [+Telic], and REQUIRES the projection of the Object. This constraint may follow from the fact that in nominals Aspect and Case are checked in the same projection.

I. PRELIMINARIES

The starting point of the present analysis of Romanian nominalizations is the work of Grimshaw 1990, who has established an essential difference between verb-based nouns designating complex events (e-nominals) and verb-based nouns designating results of events, usually through metonymic shift (r-nominals). Only the former have argument structure (a-structure) and, therefore, only for them is it legitimate to ask whether their a-structure is completely or partly inherited from the corresponding verbs. R-nominals, as well as underived nominals, lack a-structure, and project on the basis of their lexical conceptual structure. Grimshaw makes two important claims regarding the theory of nominalization:

1. Nominalization is an operation on a-structures which suppresses the external argument of the corresponding verb. Suppressed positions are not satisfied by arguments, but may license argument-adjuncts, i.e. a *by*-phrase or a Possessor (Gen(itive)) phrase. The Gen subject of an event or result nominal is always a modifier, and this explains why it is always optional, unlike the subject of a finite clause.

[1] I would like to express my profound gratitude to Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin for patiently reading several earlier drafts of this paper and making many substantive, detailed comments, most helpful in clarifying my ideas. Gabriela Pana-Dindelegan and Ileana Baciu also deserve my warm thanks for their suggestions and their invaluable help with the data. Thanks are also due to the two anonymous *JL* referees who offered relevant criticism that helped to rewrite the paper and to Bob Borsley for extensive help with the final version of the manuscript. The usual disclaimers apply.

2. Like verbs and unlike r-nominals, e-nominals have obligatory arguments. But since the Agent is a modifier in nominalizations, the obligatoriness of arguments concerns only the (Direct) Object of transitive nominalizations.

As an illustration, given 1. and 2. above, the status of the two Gens in an English e-nominal like *their deliberate destruction of the city* is different. The Object is an obligatory ARGUMENT in the nominal's a-structure, while the Agent is merely a MODIFIER, which can be omitted (*the deliberate destruction of the city*).

The aim of this paper is to suggest certain revisions and refinements of Grimshaw's theory on the basis of Romanian data. While fully endorsing her insight that only e-nominals have a-structure, we take exception to the view that nominalizations are operations on a-structure which suppress the external argument. We will, instead, argue in favour of the following generalizations:

1. The status of the subject in e-nominals is not that of a modifier, but of an argument. Event nominals and corresponding verbs share their a-structure, having analogous l-syntax in the sense of Hale & Keyser 1991.
2. For both nouns and verbs the projection of a-structure is related to the aspectual type. Which arguments must be projected, lexicalized and assigned structural Case crucially depends on the aspectual type of the nominalization.
3. The analysis confirms the hypothesis that the projection of the Object of transitive verbs is obligatory, adding one qualification, namely, the projection of the Object is required only in [+Telic], that is perfective, nominalizations.

Our results are also congruent with Szabolcsi's (1994) and Siloni's (1997) conclusions that the Subject is an argument, rather than a modifier in e-nominals. In addition, Romanian data highlight the importance of the aspect parameter in the syntax of nominalization.

1.1 *Outline of the paper*

In the following sections, we examine two types of verb-based nouns in Romanian, infinitive nouns and supine nouns, which present an interesting contrast.

The infinitive is the most productive Romanian nominalization, regularly formed by attaching the suffix *-re* to the basic form of the verb, e.g. *citi* 'read', *citi+re* 'read+inf, reading'. The second nominalization investigated here is the supine, which is productively formed with the suffixes *-Vt* and *-(V)s*, where V is a stem vowel, for example, *citi* 'read', *citit+ul* 'read-sup+the,

the reading', as in *Cititul este o bucurie* 'Reading is a joy'. Both nominals are traditionally described as expressing the 'name of the action', therefore, both are action nominals.

The case of Romanian is particularly instructive because Romanian nominals, unlike Romance DPs in general, may contain AT MOST one (nominal) Gen phrase, so that only the argument which is obligatory for some particular interpretation will be lexicalized. Since only one argument may be overtly expressed in transitive nominalizations, either the Object or the Subject will be lexicalized, producing the Noun+Object (NO) and Noun+Subject (NS) structures, respectively.

In sections 2 and 3, we examine in turn the properties of the NO and NS structures, with respect to the contrast between event readings and result readings. The behaviour of the infinitive nominalization fully confirms Grimshaw's theory of event/result nominals while the supine does so only in part.

In sections 4–6, we deal with the contrast between infinitive and supine e-nominals, deriving this contrast from the different aspectual properties of the two nominalizations.

2. THE NOUN + OBJECT STRUCTURE

2.1 *Properties of e-nominals*

Expectedly, both infinitive and supine nominalizations may have an eventive meaning in the NO structure. The presence of the Object is as obligatory as it is for the corresponding verb. The absence of the Object leads to ungrammaticality, as (1) and (2) illustrate.

- (1) Cumpărarea *(casei) a fost inutilă.
 buy.INF + the house + the.GEN was useless
 'The buying (of the house) was useless.'
- (2) Cumpăratul *(casei) a fost inutil.
 buy.SUP + the house + the.GEN was useless
 'The buying (of the house) was useless.'

The Agent can only be identified by an argument-adjunct, a *de către* 'by'-phrase, never by a Gen, since the Romanian DP has only one structural (nominal) Gen case position. Moreover, the agentive *de către* 'by'-phrase is licensed only if the Object is also present, as shown by the impossibility of leaving out the Gen in the infinitive or the supine examples in (3) and (4), respectively. The Object is, thus, an obligatory constituent of the e-nominal for the infinitive as well as for the supine.

- (3) Cumpărarea *(acestei case) de către Ion a fost inutilă.
 buy.INF + the this.GEN house by Ion was useless
 'The buying (of this house) by Ion was useless.'

- (4) Dărîmatul *(acestei biserici) de către stat a fost o eroare.
 demolish.SUP + the this.GEN church by the state was a mistake
 ‘The demolition (of this church) by the state was a mistake.’

The Subject (Agent) cannot occur alone, in the Gen case, without causing severe ungrammaticality (see (5a) and (6a) below). Since there is only one Gen case position, the Subject and the Object cannot both be lexicalized in either the infinitive or the supine nominals (see (5b) and (6b) below). Before going any further a note is necessary on the Genitive in Romanian. The morphological Genitive is always assigned by the definite article in Romanian, on condition that the Gen DP is adjacent to the Gen assigning noun. If there is any constituent between the Gen assigning noun and the Gen DP, the presence of the genitival article *al* is necessary. *Al* is an expletive definite article which simply assigns Genitive case. Morphologically *al* agrees with the Gen assigning noun, acting like a copy of it. In the glosses below we will always give the masculine singular form *al* (for details regarding the syntax of *al* see Cornilescu 1995).

- (5) (a) *Cumpărarea lui Ion a fost inutilă.
 buy.INF + the the.GEN Ion was useless
 ‘Ion’s buying was useless.’
 (b) *Cumpărarea lui Ion a casei a fost inutilă
 buy.INF + the the.GEN Ion AL house + the.GEN was useless
 ‘Ion’s buying of the house was useless.’
 (6) (a) *Dărîmatul statului a fost o eroare.
 demolish.SUP + the state + the.GEN was a mistake.
 (b) *Dărîmatul statului al bisericii
 demolish.SUP + the state + the.GEN AL church + the.GEN
 a fost o eroare.
 was a mistake
 ‘The state’s demolishing (of the church) was a mistake.’

Aspectual modifiers like *constant* ‘constant’ and *frecvent* ‘frequent’, which are characteristic of e-nominals, are duly licensed in both nominalizations:

- (7) Studiarea **constantă** a documentelor este o necesitate.
 study.INF + the constant AL documents + the.GEN is a necessity
 ‘The constant study of the documents is a necessity.’
 (8) Fumatul **constant** al trabucurilor l-a ruinat.
 Smoke.SUP + the constant AL cigars + the.GEN him-has ruined
 ‘The constant smoking of cigars has ruined him.’

The tests surveyed so far were first proposed by Grimshaw for English. In every case, the Supine NO structures are fully parallel with their infinitive counterparts. Additionally, in Romanian, e-nominals and r-nominals also differ regarding the form of the adjuncts they allow. When they modify

underived nouns, Romanian place/time adjuncts (PPs or AdvPs) acquire an extra preposition *de*; for example; *Cartea este aici* ‘The book is here’, but *cartea de aici* ‘the book here’. The preposition *de* could be interpreted as a mark of adjectivization, so that *de aici* in the example just given means ‘the class of objects which are here’ (see Rubin 1994 for a proposal along these lines).

In Romanian, only r-nominals share with underived nouns the ability to license these adjectival space/time adjuncts. Complex e-nominals exclude them. Thus, (9a) and (10a) are e-nominals, as indicated by the aspectual modifiers *frecvent* ‘frequent’/*repetat* ‘repeated’. *De*-modifiers are excluded, as shown in (9b) and (10b).

- (9) (a) *semnarea* *frecventă* *a unor* *importante* *documente*
 sign.IMF + the frequent AL some.GEN important documents
la București
 at București
 ‘the frequent signing of some important documents in Bucharest’
- (b) **semnarea* *frecventă* *a unor* *importante*
 sign.INF-the frequent AL some.GEN important
documente **de la** *București*
 documents DE at Bucharest
- (10) (a) *cîntatul* *repetat* *al unor* *cîntece* *interzise*
 sing.SUP + the repeated AL some.GEN forbidden songs
la petreceri
 at parties
 ‘the repeated singing of forbidden songs at parties’
- (b) **cîntatul* *repetat* *al unor* *cîntece* *interzise*
 sing.SUP + the repeated AL some.GEN forbidden songs
de la *petreceri*
 DE at parties

The facts given above summarize the typical syntactic behaviour of infinitive and supine NO e-nominals in Romanian.

2.2 *The representation of the Agent*

The Agent cannot be lexicalized in e-nominals, for lack of a second Case position. In this section we provide evidence that the implicit Agent is semantically active in e-nominals, although the evidence is not sufficient to warrant its projection as a full-blown syntactic argument, presumably as PRO. Several well-known tests show the active role of the implicit Agent (IA).

First, the IA in infinitive and supine e-nominals may be qualified by typical Agent-oriented adjectives, like *intenționat* ‘intended’, *deliberat* ‘deliberate’, *premeditat* ‘intended, planned’, etc.

- (11) distrugerea deliberată a culturii (infinitive)
 ‘the deliberate destruction of culture’
- (12) recitatul premeditat al unor versuri subversive (supine)
 ‘the intended reciting of subversive poems’

Secondly, the IA may act as the antecedent of a DP internal anaphor. The strong reflexive generic pronoun *sine* ‘self’ in (13a) or the emphatic reflexive pronoun *el însuși* in (13b) is interpreted as bound by the IA in the examples below.

- (13) (a) Apărarea **de sine/sinelui** pornește din
 defend.INF + the DE self/self + the.GEN springs from
 instinctul de conservare.
 the instinct of self-preservation
 ‘Self-defence springs from the instinct of self-preservation.’
- (b) Apărarea **lui însuși** înaintea judecătorilor
 defend.INF + the he.GEN himself before the judges
 este singura preocupare a lui Ion.
 is only concern Ion’s
 ‘His own defence before the judges is Ion’s only concern.’

Thirdly, IAs may license an adjectival predicative adjunct (see Safir 1987). The predicative adjective agrees with the IA which, therefore, has ϕ -features. This is illustrated in (14). In this example, and in many of the following ones, the preposition *pe* is used as a mark of the Accusative case for personal nouns and pronouns.

- (14) Pe Maria o exasperează corectarea/corectatul
 PE Maria.ACC.F.SG. her-exasperates grade.INF/grade.SUP + the
 tezelor la examenul de admitere, așa **încordată**
 papers + the.GEN at the exam of entrance so tensed.F.SG.
 ‘Grading the papers at the entrance exam, being as tensed as she is, exasperates Maria.’

Fourthly, as often remarked, the IA has control properties. For instance, it may control the subject of a purpose clause. Here are relevant examples: infinitive, (15), and supine, (16).

- (15) înfrîngerea rapidă a Germaniei
 defeat.INF + the rapid AL Germany + the.GEN
 pentru a pune capăt războiului
 to put an end to the war
 ‘the rapid defeat of Germany to put an end to the war’

- (16) cititul poeziei cu glas tare
 read.SUP + the poem-the.GEN in a loud voice
 pentru a reține mai repede
 to retain faster
 ‘reading the lesson in a loud voice to memorize it faster’

Strategies used for the identification of the IA are clearly reminiscent of PRO. Like PRO, the IA may be controlled, when there is a DP in an appropriate syntactic configuration, as in (17a), or arbitrary, as in (18). The generic emphatic reflexive pronoun *sine* ‘self’ in (18a) implies an arbitrary PRO. The parallelism with PRO can be strengthened by noticing that when the IA is arbitrary, it allows either a generic, quasi-universal reading, as in (18a), or an existential reading, as in (18b), roughly under the circumstances described by Cinque (1988).

- (17) Pe Ion îl interesează numai cumpărarea unei noi case.
 PE Ion.ACC him-interests only buy.INF + the a.GEN new house
 ‘Ion is interested only in buying a new house.’
- (18) (a) Cunoașterea de sine ramîne o problemă importantă.
 ‘Knowledge of oneself remains an important problem.’
 (b) Ion a sugerat mărirea salariilor.
 ‘Ion suggested raising the salaries.’

Taking into account what has been said so far, it could be supposed that the IA is represented as a PRO since it is projected in a non-case-marked position, and it is subject to Control Theory. For such a proposal, see Bottari 1989, Giorgi & Longobardi 1991 and Valois 1991, among many.

However, the hypothesis of a PRO projected in the syntax of e-nominals encounters serious difficulties. The syntactic projection of PRO would be desirable if its interpretation fell under Control Theory, and if its presence were required by other modules, such as Binding Theory. Yet, a syntactic PRO in e-nominals is problematic for Control and apparently not required for Binding Theory.

As regards Control Theory, for English, Williams 1985 shows that, if projected, PRO in nominal environments would not obey the same control principles as in the verbal counterparts. Control in Romanian DPs also differs in several ways from control in infinitives or in Romanian subjunctive clauses, the latter introduced by the invariable subjunctive particle *să*. The main, though not the only, problem is that with e-nominals it is difficult to find examples of anaphoric PRO, that is, instances of obligatory control. Thus, even with verbs that show obligatory control in subjunctives or infinitives (such as *a începe* ‘begin’, *a cere* ‘ask’), control is not always obligatory in e-nominals. Therefore, even in these environments, the assumed PRO does not behave like an anaphor:

- (19) (a) ?*Muncitorii au cerut să mărească salariile.
workers-the have demanded să raise.SUBJ wages-the
‘The workers demanded to raise the wages.’
- (b) Muncitorii au cerut mărirea salariilor.
workers-the have demanded raising-the wages-the.GEN
‘The workers demanded the raising of the wages.’
- (c) Muncitorii au cerut să înceteze lucrul.
workers-the have demanded să stop work-the
‘The workers decided to stop working.’
- (d) Muncitorii au cerut încetarea lucrului.
workers-the have demanded stopping-the work-the.GEN
‘The workers decided the ceasing of work.’

The subjunctive clause allows only the controlled reading; so, if control is factually unlikely, as in (19a), the sentence is awkward. In contrast, the nominalization allows both controlled and uncontrolled readings, as seen in (19b) and (19d). This is a serious problem for the hypothesis of PRO projection, as recently stressed by Ackema & Schoorlemmer (1995: 181) and as also noted by Koster (1987). Koster argued for a distinction between ‘anaphoric control’ (obligatory control) and ‘non-anaphoric control’. Anaphoric control can be completely subsumed under Binding Theory. The control relation is obligatory, there is a unique c-commanding controller. This is not the case above.

The different behaviour of the Agent in verbal/nominal complements better accords with the hypothesis that the Agent is not syntactically projected in nominals.

At the same time, an IA suffices as controller of the embedded PRO in adjunct clauses (small clauses or purpose clauses) since these represent instances of thematic control (cf. Jaeggli 1986), rather than syntactic, argument (obligatory) control, so the syntactic presence of a controller in a given configuration is not required. It may be concluded that control facts allow the Agent to remain implicit.

As for the binding facts noted above in connection with (13), at closer inspection, the presence of reflexive forms like *sine* or *el însuși* does not force the projection of PRO either, because these expressions are not true syntactic anaphors, but endophors in the sense of Zribi-Hertz (1995). This means that, although they are not referentially free and cannot be used deictically, they admit of non-local binding, in addition to local binding.

It can be argued that neither *sine* nor *el însuși* is an anaphor. For instance, in example (20) below, *sine* does not behave like an anaphor subject to Condition A, which, as is well known, requires a unique, c-commanding local antecedent.

- (20) Petru a vorbit cu Maria despre necesitatea încrederii
 Petru has talked with Maria about necessity-the confidence-the.GEN
 în **sine**.
 in self
 ‘Petru talked with Maria about the necessity of confidence in oneself.’
- (21) Maria este sigură că Petru urăște pe toată lumea în
 Maria is sure that Petru hates PE all people-the
 afară de fiul lor și de **ea însăși**.
 except son-the theirs and her herself
 ‘Maria is sure that Petru hates everybody except for their son and for herself.’

Here, the understood antecedent of *sine* is either *Petru* or *Maria*, or both, or Arb, though true anaphors require unique, non-split antecedents. The compound emphatic reflexive *ea însăși* in (21) also exhibits non-anaphoric behaviour: the reflexive is embedded in an argument (*fiul lor și de ea însăși* ‘their son and herself’) and the antecedent, *Maria*, is one clause away. This is a case of non-local binding.

Actually, given the absence of true anaphors in DPs, Reinhart & Reuland (1993) conclude that NPs never have syntactic subjects, a conclusion that we provisionally adopt too. Given the evidence, the hypothesis of a full-blown projected PRO should be abandoned (see Williams 1985 and Szabolcsi 1994 for similar conclusions). We will accept that the Subject position of e-nominals is saturated in lexical structure. The lexical structure of nouns is assumed to have the same kind of X-bar articulation as syntax (see Hale & Keyser 1991). Moreover, we will assume, with Szabolcsi (1994), contra Hale & Keyser (1991), that the noun’s lexical syntax also represents the subject. It is conceivable, then, that a PRO-like element saturates this subject position in the lexical structure of e-nominals. The Agent role is ‘activated’ when an e-nominal is syntactically projected, possibly acquiring a referential index through control. An arbitrary default reading obtains otherwise.

We may conclude the following on the infinitive and supine NO structure.

1. For both nominalizations the NO structure allows the event interpretation. Since there is only one Case position, and the overt presence of the Object signals the event reading, the unique structural Case position is allotted to the Object.
2. The a-structure of the infinitive e-nominal is complete. The Agent is not projected syntactically, but it is semantically active, and interpreted like a PRO subject.

3. THE NOUN + SUBJECT STRUCTURE

3.1 *Syntactic properties of the NS structure*

While the infinitive and supine show a close parallelism in the NO structure,

they contrast sharply in the NS structure. This is unexpected under the current theory of nominalization.

According to Grimshaw, the Agent is UNIFORMLY suppressed in nominalizations and may be specified by a Possessor MODIFIER phrase. Moreover, research on Romance languages (e.g. Zubizarreta 1987, Valois 1991, Piccolo 1991) has indicated that, although in these languages apparently there is more than one Gen position with underived nouns and derived r-nominals, in e-nominals only one Gen phrase is allowed.² The unique nominal Gen of e-nominals necessarily goes to the (obligatory) Object. A Subject Gen thus becomes a mark of a non-eventive, result reading in Romance (as discussed in Kupferman 1991: 145).

The Romanian data below present a problem for such accounts. The infinitive NS structure behaves as predicted – it always expresses result, showing no event properties. Unexpectedly, however, THE SUPINE NS STRUCTURE SHOWS ALL THE PROPERTIES OF E-NOMINALS AND NO RESULT PROPERTIES. Let us examine the facts.

1. With the infinitive NS, nominal control properties are lost even though the Agent is overtly present (example (22)). In contrast, control is fully allowed in supine NS nominals (example (23)).

(22) *descrierea minunată a lui Bălcescu
 describe.INF + the wonderful AL the.GEN Bălcescu
 pentru a stîrni sentimente patriotice
 to stir patriotic feelings
 ‘Bălcescu’s wonderful description to stir patriotic feelings’

(23) cititul lui Ion la micul dejun
 read.SUP + the the.GEN Ion at breakfast
 pentru a-și enerva soacra
 to his mother-in-law irritate
 ‘Ion’s reading at breakfast to irritate his mother-in-law’

2. Aspectual modifiers like *constant* ‘constant’ and *frecvent* ‘frequent’ are not acceptable in the infinitive NS structure (24b), but are licensed in the supine one, (25).

[2] R-nominals of certain verbs which exhibit the NO/NS alternation may marginally even allow a NSO structure, that is, a DP with two post-head Gens. Most informants find such examples less than perfect at best:

(i) descrierile minunate
 describe.INF + the.PL wonderful
 ale lui Sadoveanu ale
 AL Sadoveanu’s AL
 frumusetilor tării
 beauty + the.GEN + PL country + the.GEN
 ‘Sadoveanu’s wonderful descriptions of the beauties of the country’

This possibility is not, however, open to e-nominals (infinitive or supine) in Romanian, irrespective of the order or the length of the two nominals. In such nominals, only one Gen per DP is allowed.

- (24) (a) Introducerea acestui critic cuprinde date interesante.
 introduction-the this.GEN critic contains data interesting
 ‘The introduction (written) by this critic contains interesting data.’
- (b) *Introducerea **frecventă** a criticului
 introduction-the frequent AL this.GEN critic
 la roman a plăcut mult.
 to novel pleased much
 ‘The frequent introduction to this novel by this critic was well liked
 (by everybody).’
- (25) Cititul lui cu glas tare **zilnic**
 read.SUP + the his in a loud voice daily
 i-a corectat rostirea.
 him.DAT-has corrected pronunciation + the
 ‘His constant reading in a loud voice has improved his pronunciation.’

3. Infinitive NS structures allow adjectival place/time adjuncts introduced by *de*, which are excluded in e-nominals and allowed in r-nominals. The infinitive NS structure proves to be an r-nominal with respect to this test (see example (26)). As expected, these types of modifiers are completely impossible in the supine NS structures (27b), which clearly indicates that the supine NS structure is an e-nominal.

- (26) Interpretarea **de la** Paris a operei Oedip
 perform.INF + the DE in Paris AL opera + the.GEN Oedip
 a dezamagit.
 has disappointed
 ‘The Paris performance of the opera Oedipus was disappointing.’
- (27) (a) cântatul lui Ion **la** baie
 sing.SUP + the the.GEN Ion at bathroom
 ‘Ion’s singing in the bathroom’
- (b) *cântatul lui Ion **de la** baie
 sing.SUP + the the.GEN Ion DE at bathroom
 ‘Ion’s singing in the bathroom’

A comparison of the two nominals conclusively shows that the infinitive NS structure has no event properties, the Agent behaves like a modifier, and the structure is entirely nominal. As generally in Romance, a subjective Gen in a deverbal nominal is the mark of a non-eventive reading.

In contrast, the supine NS structures have no result properties. The contrasts between the two nominals are clear-cut and can be understood only if it is accepted that the supine NS structure is an e-nominal. The supine NS structure clearly disproves the generalization that the subjective Genitive of a transitive deverbal noun always marks a non-event reading in Romance.

Even more generally, the contrast between the infinitive and the supine NS structure disproves the claim that nominalization by definition suppresses the

external argument in the verb's a-structure since, if this were true, the Subject should show the same (non-argumental) behaviour in any nominalization. We are thus led to the view that nominalization is not an operation on a-structure, rather the complete a-structure of the verb is inherited in the e-nominal.

Moreover, since we have so far considered nominalizations of basically transitive verbs, the supine NS structure apparently presents the case of a transitive-verb e-nominal which, nevertheless does not (overtly) express the Object, contradicting Grimshaw's second claim above. A closer look at the supine NS data will show, however, that they are not real counterexamples to Grimshaw's important insight that the Object is always present in transitive e-nominals.

4. VERBS THAT YIELD THE NS SUPINE NOMINAL

Since the NS structure is NOT very frequent, one should first examine the range of verbs that allow it. They fall into two classes: a) transitive verbs which accept prototypical objects and have unergative pairs, and b) reflexive verbs (with reflexive or reciprocal interpretation). The essential question to be answered before advancing any further is whether or not the Object is actually projected in these nominalizations, in other words, whether the examples above represent nominalizations of transitive or intransitive verbs.

4.1 *Prototypical Object verbs*

The first group of verbs allowing NS e-nominals includes verbs like the following:

- (28) *cînta* 'sing', *scrie* 'write', *picta* 'paint', *decora* 'decorate', *pescui* 'fish', *ara* 'plough', *culege* 'pick', *traversa* 'cross', *semăna* 'sow', *fotografia* 'photograph', *cheltui* 'spend', *mătura* 'sweep', *deretica* 'clean, tidy up', *împleti* 'knit', *visa* 'dream', *fura* 'steal', *minji* 'lie', *învăța* 'learn', *mînca* 'eat', *bea* 'drink', *recita* 'recite', *fuma* 'smoke', *suge* 'suck', *tricota* 'knit', *murmura* 'murmur', *asculta* 'listen', *traduce* 'translate', etc.

The examples below show that the verbs that yield the NS supine structure have both transitive and intransitive uses. In other words, they are transitive verbs that allow null prototypical objects.

- (29) (a) Ion cîntă (cîntece).
 'Ion sings (songs).'
 cîntatul lui Ion în baie
 'Ion's singing in (the) bathroom'

- (b) Ion fotografiază (monumentele Parisului)
‘Ion photographs (the monuments of Paris).’
Fotografiatul lui Ion la Paris costă o avere.
‘Ion’s photographing in Paris costs a fortune.’
- (c) Mama toarce/tricotează/gătește minunat.
‘Mother spins/knits/cooks (something) wonderfully.’
- (d) torsul/ tricotatul/gătitul minunat al mamei
‘mother’s wonderful spinning/knitting/cooking’

Since these verbs have intransitive pairs, the supine nominal might be constructed on the intransitive form. Therefore, whatever solution is adopted for the analysis of the intransitive use of the verb should also be adopted for the supine NS e-nominals.

Two analyses have been proposed for such situations. The first claims that the Object is saturated in the lexicon, so that these verbs are projected as unergative, rather than transitive. If this analysis is adopted, the NS supine structure can be regarded as the nominalization of an unergative, rather than transitive, verb; the Direct Object is not projected and the generalization that the Object is always (lexically) present in e-nominals of transitive verbs proves to be correct.

The alternative analysis claims that the Direct Object may be viewed as a null argument, syntactically projected as an empty category, most likely *pro*. In that case, the supine NS structure would offer an example of a transitive verb event nominalization which nevertheless does not lexicalize the Object, contrary to Grimshaw’s claim (1990: 47). The choice between these hypotheses is an empirical matter.

4.2 Rizzi’s tests

The theory of *pro* developed by Rizzi (1986), who discusses *pro* in Object position, proposes several tests enabling the distinction between saturation of an argument in the lexicon (an operation on a-structure) and the projection of a null argument in syntax. A projected null argument *pro* is syntactically ACTIVE, differing in this from a lexically saturated implicit argument. Null object *pro* is licensed through being governed and Case-marked by the verb. Rizzi (1986: 524) assumes that the crucial licensing relation for *pro* is Case assignment by a designated head.

- (30) *pro* is Case-marked by X_v^0 .

Rizzi contrasts English and Italian with respect to their (in)ability to license a syntactically active Object *pro*. Italian verbs have the ability to license an active null Object, unlike English verbs. As shown by the data in (31), Romanian does not pattern like Italian, apparently disallowing a null *pro* in Accusative position. In each pair of Romanian examples in (31), the first

sentence, where the Direct Object is *pro*, is ungrammatical while the second sentence, where the Direct Object is overtly expressed, is grammatical.

(31) (a) *Control*

Questo conduce *pro* [a PRO concludere che ...]. (Italian)

*This leads *pro* [PRO to conclude that ...]. (English)

(i) *Aceste fapte fac *pro*

these facts make *pro*

[a trage *pro* concluzia ...]. (Romanian)

to draw *pro* conclusion-the ...

(ii) Aceste fapte fac pe unii

these facts make PE some

[a trage *pro* concluzia că ...]

draw *pro* conclusion-the that ...

(b) *Adjunct Small Clauses*

Di solito, Giovanni fotografa *pro* seduti. (Italian)

*Usually, Giovanni photographs *pro* seated. (English)

(i) *De obicei, Ion fotografiază *pro* așezate. (Romanian)

usually Ion photographs *pro* seated.F.PL.

(ii) De obicei, Ion fotografiază

usually Ion photographs

clientele așezate.

the customers.F.PL seated.F.PL

(c) *Argument Small Clauses*

Questa musica rende [*pro* allegri]. (Italian)

*This music makes [*pro* happy]. (English)

(i) ?*Aceasta muzică face [*pro* fericit]. (Romanian)

this music makes [*pro* happy]

(ii) Aceasta muzică face [omul fericit].

this music makes man happy

(d) *Binding*

La buona musica riconcilia *pro* con se stessi. (Italian)

*Good music reconciles with oneself. (English)

(i) ?Muzica bună împacă cu sine. (Romanian)

music-the goodreconciles with self

(ii) Muzica bună te împacă cu tine (însuți).

music good you-reconciles with yourself

On this basis, one may well conclude that Romanian null Objects involve saturation of a position in a θ -grid with an arbitrary index at the lexical head. In contrast, Italian allows *pro* as a projected, syntactically active Direct Object.

The same conclusion is arrived at by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), who argues that in both Romanian and French, null prototypical Objects are not

syntactically projected. Dobrovie-Sorin stresses, however, that this does not mean that a Direct Object *pro* is never projected in English or Romanian, since syntax involves more than the projection of lexical structure. Copula passives, like the French *Il a été parlé de vous* ‘It has been spoken about you, You have been spoken about’, for example, always require the Object to be syntactically projected, since these passives rely on a Subject/Object coindexation. She concludes that a prototypical Object *pro* is projected only where there are independent formal reasons that require it.³

Pending further research, we tentatively assume that the intransitive uses of the (transitive) verbs in (28) represent UNERGATIVE configurations because the Direct Object is saturated in the lexicon. Given the correlation between the unergative use of the verb and the supine NS structure shown in (29) above, one may conclude that for the supine NS e-nominals of the verbs in (28), the Object is also saturated in the lexicon, because the supine suffix operates on an unergative verb. Under this analysis, the data presented in this section are not counterexamples to the view that the Object must be projected in e-nominals of transitive verbs.

4.3 Transitive reflexive verbs

Let us turn to the second group of verbs allowing the NS supine construction, some of which are listed in (32) below. They are transitive reflexive verbs and will help in the choice of an appropriate analysis for prototypical Objects.

- (32) *a (se) spăla* ‘wash (oneself)’, *a (se) îmbrăca* ‘dress (oneself)’, *a (se) bărbieri* ‘shave (oneself)’, *a (se) dichisi* ‘spruce oneself’, *a (se) pieptăna* ‘comb (oneself)’, *a (se) încâlța* ‘shoe (oneself), put on shoes’, *a (se) aranja* ‘arrange oneself’, *a (se) pregăti* ‘prepare (oneself)’, *a (se) farda* ‘make (oneself) up’, *a (se) indigna* ‘feel indignant’, *a (se) machia* ‘make (oneself) up’, *a (se) privi* ‘to look at oneself’, *a (se) peria* ‘brush (oneself)’, *a (se) revolta* ‘feel revolted at’, *a (se) ascunde* ‘hide (oneself)’.

[3] It is necessary to mention, in this line of thought, the existence in Romanian of idiomatic constructions, with a possessive Dative clitic, for which there is no overtly expressed ‘possessed object’. Thus, in (ii), the Possessor clitic binds the overtly expressed Direct Object, *tema* ‘the homework’, expressing the possessed object, but in (i), there is no Accusative DP. Such cases could be handled by assuming that the overtly expressed PP in (i) is the modifier of *pro*, in a structure of the type $_{DP}[pro]_{PP}[la\ matematică]$. This allows maintaining the generalization that a Possessive Dative clitic always binds an argument of the verb. The projection of *pro* in this instance is syntactically, rather than lexically, required.

- (i) Ion își face *pro* la matematică.
 Ion to-himself-is doing *pro* at mathematics
 ‘Ion is doing his mathematics (homework).’
- (ii) Ion își face tema la matematică.
 Ion to-himself-is doing homework at mathematics
 ‘Ion is doing his mathematics homework.’

a se apleca ‘bend (oneself)’, *a (se) amuza* ‘amuse (oneself)’, *a (se) ruga* ‘pray’, *a (se) jeli/a (se) boci* ‘lament (oneself)’, *a (se) căsători cu/a (se) mărita cu/a (se) însura cu* ‘marry (oneself) to’, etc.

In the supine NS nominalizations based on these verbs, the reflexive reading is either the only reading or the strongly preferred one; sometimes, as in (33b), there may be an ambiguity between the NO/NS reading.

- (33) (a) Ion se pregătește pentru spectacol.
 Ion himself prepares for show
 ‘Ion is preparing himself for the show.’
 Pregătitul lui Ion pentru spectacol durează
 prepare.SUP + the the.GEN Ion for the show lasts
 ore întregi
 whole hours
 ‘Ion’s preparing himself for the show lasts whole hours.’
 ‘Preparing Ion for the show lasts whole hours.’
- (b) Ion se spală pe mâini în fiecare seară
 Ion himself washes on hands in every evening
 ‘Ion washes his hands every evening.’
 spălatul lui Ion pe mâini în fiecare seară
 wash.SUP + the the.GEN Ion on (the) hands in every evening
 ‘Ion’s washing his hands every evening.’
- (c) Ion se bărbiereste la miezul nopții cîntînd.
 Ion himself shaves at midnight singing
 ‘Ion shaves himself at midnight singing.’
 Bărbieritul lui Ion la miezul nopții cîntînd
 shave.SUP + the the.GEN Ion at midnight singing
 îi deranjează pe vecini.
 them-disturbs the neighbours
 ‘John’s shaving himself at midnight, singing disturbs the neighbours.’

For the NS reading, especially in the nominals of (33b, c), the ONLY interpretation is the one where the Object is understood as co-referential with the Subject. A prototypical reading of the missing Object is, in fact, excluded.

Notice that, for reflexive readings, saturation in the lexicon can be hypothesized only for the nominalization, since it is beyond doubt that in the verbal constructions the Object is projected and bound by the reflexive clitic *se*. As amply shown by Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), the clitic *se* is always an Accusative clitic in Romanian, binding a DP in object position, while getting ϕ -features through agreement with the Subject DP; its functioning always presupposes chains like (34).

- (34) $NP_i se_i e_i$

Since the reflexive verb does project its Object, it would be desirable to

project the Object in the nominalization as well, attempting to adhere to the principle of sameness of a-structure between e-nominals and the corresponding verbs.

In this case, the supine NS structure would represent the e-nominal of a transitive verb, offering a genuine counterexample to the generalization that the Object must be overt in transitive nominalizations. The projected Object will be *pro*.

This account is theoretically problematic, however, since *pro* will remain caseless, contrary to Rizzi's theory regarding *pro* identification (see (30) above). One might adopt the proposal that in such cases, *pro* is merely θ -licensed by its head and that it has inherent Case (as proposed in Hoekstra & Roberts 1993). However, an ad hoc enrichment of the inventory of empty categories does not look like a good idea.

Fortunately, a different account of reflexivity, proposed by Reinhart & Reuland (1993), sheds new light on the case. According to these authors, reflexivity is a property of predicates, a reflexive predicate being defined as one that allows the co-indexation of two arguments in its θ -grid. Reflexive predicates are reflexively marked; marking may be inherent, it may be on the verb, or on one of the arguments.

The reflexive marker *se* in Romanian falls in the category of simple pronominal forms which mark a predicate as intrinsically reflexive. The reflexive predicate is formed in the lexicon. The theory proposed by Reinhart & Reuland assumes distinct lexical entries for pairs like *a spăla* 'wash', a transitive predicate, and *a se spăla* 'wash oneself', a reflexive predicate. Reflexivization is viewed as an operation on the verb's θ -grid, absorbing one of its θ -roles, and 'languages vary on whether the absorbed role is nevertheless realized in the syntax' (Reinhart & Reuland 1993: 662). It is an empirical problem to decide whether the object of the reflexive verb is projected in syntax. As already mentioned above, the reflexive clitic *se* does require the projection of an Object, its functioning relying on particular types of chain (see (34) above).

The point to retain for the analysis of nominalizations, however, is that in this analysis of reflexive verbs, the projection of the Direct Object is SYNTACTICALLY driven, following from the syntactic properties of the Accusative clitic *se*, rather than being derived from the θ -theoretic need to project the complete <Agent, Patient> structure of the verb. But since *se* is not present in the syntax of the nominalization, and the lexicon already contains a reflexive verb, nothing would force the projection of the Object in the reflexive supine nominal. The (transitive) reflexive nominalizations of the verbs in (33) are based on the reflexive verbs, inheriting their (thematic) properties.

We conclude that the Object is not projected in the NS supine nominalization. This view eliminates the postulation of an undesirable caseless object *pro*.

The analysis of the verbs that allow the NS supine structure leads to the conclusion that THIS STRUCTURE DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A COUNTEREXAMPLE TO THE GENERALIZATION THAT E-NOMINALS OF TRANSITIVE VERBS LEXICALIZE THE OBJECT. The supine NS structure operates just on unergative verbs.

However, even if this is true, in its current form, Grimshaw's 1990 theory still does not account for the absence of the EVENT NS structure with the infinitive nominalization, apparent in sharply contrasting infinitive/supine pairs like the following:

- (35) Cîntatul/*Cîntarea lui Ion la masă enervează pe toată lumea.
'Ion's singing (supine/*infinitive) at dinner irritates everybody.'

In other words, one must identify the principled reasons which allow the supine to have an implicitly lexically saturated Object, but prevent the infinitive from doing so.

We argue that this contrast between the NS structures of the two nominalizations has to do with the different aspectual properties of the two nominalizations.

5. ASPECT AND NOMINALIZATIONS

5.1 *Aspectual interpretation of the NO and NS structures*

The aspectual properties of the nominalizing affixes are manifest in the aspectual contrasts between the NO structure, available to both nominalizations, and the NS structure, available only to the supine. Let us turn to an examination of the aspectual properties of the NO and NS structures.

5.1.1 *Aspectual interpretation of the NO structure*

The NO structure is obviously based on transitive verbs. Transitive non-stative verbs are mostly accomplishments (or achievements), designating what Pustejovsky (1992) calls 'transitions'. It is reasonable to assume that their nominalizations yield event readings of the same aspectual type, that is, also transitions.

It is currently accepted that complex transitions, that is, accomplishments, have a composite temporal structure (see Dowty 1979, Grimshaw 1990, Pustejovsky 1992, Kamp & Reyle 1994, among many), including a process followed by a change of state, and a resulting state. In Parsons' 1990 terms, a (complete) event (accomplishment) consists of an activity phase, when the event holds, followed by a culmination point, when the change of state takes place, leading to a resulting state. The *in*-phrase, characteristic of accomplishments, measures the distance between the beginning of the

activity and the culmination point. The composite temporal structure of a complete event (accomplishment) may be represented as a three-phase structure, including an activity phase (I), a culmination (II), which is the change-of-state moment, and a resulting state (III), as shown in Kamp & Reyle (1994).

- (36) I II III
 activity culmination resulting state

Predications pertaining to different aspectual classes, as well as aspectual operators focalize particular zones of this aspect template. The English *have-perfect*, for instance, focalizes the resulting state (phase III). An accomplishment lexicalizes phases I and II, an achievement focalizes phase II, while activities focalize phase I. The crucial distinction between transitions (telic predications) and activities (atelic predications) is that the former include, while the latter exclude, the culmination point (see Parsons 1990).

Each of the eventualities in a complete event is identified by a particular argument, the Agent identifies the activity, the Theme ‘measures out the event’ (cf. Tenny 1987) and identifies the change of state. It is, therefore, the Theme (Object) that identifies the culmination of the event, guaranteeing its telicity, and expressing the specific difference between transitions (accomplishments and achievements) and activities. The fact that Themes rather than Agents express the difference between activities and transitions (accomplishments, achievements) explains why Themes need to be overtly expressed in telic predications.

The hypothesis that the infinitive and the supine NO structures express transitions (accomplishments) is supported by Dowty’s tests, presented in Dowty (1979). Predictably, both the infinitive and the supine NO structures pass all the three tests identifying accomplishments, briefly reviewed below.

1. The NO structures accept ‘in’-modifiers:

- (37) (a) *construirea podului în două luni* (infinitive)
 ‘the building of the bridge in two months’
 (b) *cititul ziarelor de dimineață într-o oră* (supine)
 ‘the reading of the morning newspapers in an hour’

2. The NO structures appear in the phrase *a trebui X-timp pentru Y* ‘take X-much time to Y’:

- (38) (a) *I-au trebuit numai două luni pentru scrierea romanului.* (infinitive)
 ‘He took only two months for the writing of the novel.’
 (b) *Le-au trebuit două luni pentru tăiatul lemnelor.* (supine)
 ‘They took two months for the cutting of the wood.’

3. The NO phrases may occur as complements of the verbs *a termina/a isprăvi* ‘finish’:

- (39) (a) Au terminat deja construirea podului. (infinitive)
 ‘They have already finished the building of the bridge.’
 (b) El a terminat deja cititul presei de dimineață. (supine)
 ‘He has already finished the reading of the morning press.’

As expected, recategorization of the accomplishment into an activity is possible when an appropriate Object (a bare plural, for example) and/or a suitable time-phrase is chosen:

- (40) (a) construirea catedralei vreme de secole (infinitive)
 ‘the building of the cathedral for centuries’
 (b) cititul de ziare ore întregi pe zi (supine)
 ‘the reading of newspapers for hours daily’

5.1.2 Aspectual interpretation of the supine NS structure

In contrast, the supine NS structure is ALWAYS an activity/process. That is why its Object need not be lexicalized. It is sufficient that the Agent be activated, through case-assignment. There is a clear aspectual contrast between the NO and the NS supine e-nominals. While the NO structure allows an accomplishment, as well as an activity, reading, being compatible with both types of modifiers, the NS supine structure is uniquely interpretable as an activity, being compatible with activity modifiers (‘for’-phrases) but incompatible with accomplishment modifiers (‘in’-phrases). Consider the following examples, which contain supine nominals:

- (41) (a) pescuitul lui Ion în ape tulburi **ani în șir**
 ‘Ion’s fishing in troubled waters for years on end’
 (b) *pescuitul lui Ion în ape tulburi **în doi ani**
 ‘Ion’s fishing in troubled waters in two years’
 (42) (a) cântatul lui în baie **ore în șir**
 ‘his singing in the bathroom for hours on end’
 (b) *cântatul lui în baie **în zece minute**
 ‘his singing in the bathroom in ten minutes’

Moreover, the NS structure is not felicitous in the *a trebui X-timp pentru Y* ‘take X-much time to Y’. Compare the NO/NS supine structures again:

- (43) (a) *Au trebuit ani în șir pentru pescuitul lui Ion în ape tulburi. (NS)
 ‘Ion’s fishing in troubled waters took years on end.’
 (b) I-au trebuit ani în șir pentru cumpăratal mașinii. (NO)
 ‘It took him years on end to buy the car.’

We conclude that the NO structure is interpretable as a transition (accomplishment, achievement) or as an activity while the NS structure is always an activity, an aspectual contrast which has syntactic consequences.

5.2 *Aspectual features of the two nominalizing affixes*

The discussion so far has shown that nominalizations of the same verbs based on different suffixes yield e-nominals with different aspectual and syntactic properties:

- (44) (a) cititul cărții ‘the reading of the book’ (supine)
 cititul lui Ion ‘Ion’s reading’
 (b) citirea cărții ‘the reading of the book’ (infinitive)
 *citirea lui Ion ‘Ion’s reading’

These different aspectual properties must be due to the semantic contribution of the nominalizing affix. The data examined in section 5.1 clearly indicate that nominalizing affixes have aspectual features, acting like aspectual operators which focalize different zones of the event template.

Given that the infinitive e-nominal appears only in the NO structure, which basically expresses transitions, one might propose that the infinitive nominalizing suffix is [+Telic], perfective. The infinitive suffix derives transitions and focalizes the culmination (phase II) and the state resulting from the culmination of the event (phase III) in (36). This view of the infinitive suffix *-re* explains several properties of the infinitive nominalization.

First, since the culmination of a transition is identified by the Object (Theme), the Object is obligatory (lexicalized and Case-assigned) in the infinitive nominalization. Secondly, the fact that the infinitive nominalization focalizes the resulting state in the event template (phase III in (36)) explains the ease with which the infinitive nominalization develops result readings, by metonymic shift. Any informal survey of the infinitive nouns in dictionaries shows that they have developed an important amount of polysemy, going from the event reading to abstract and/or concrete result meanings. Here is an example:

- (45) (a) Exprimarea adevărului cerea curaj. (event)
 express.INF + the truth-the.GEN required courage
 ‘Expressing the truth required courage.’
 (b) Exprimarea lui era greoaie. (result, abstract)
 express.INF + the he.GEN was slow
 ‘The manner of his expressing himself was slow.’
 (c) Exprimările de pe tablă sunt incorecte. (result, concrete)
 ‘The expressions on the blackboard are incorrect.’

Thirdly, since (with accomplishments) the obligatory culmination phase presupposes the activity phase, infinitive nominalizations are easily recategorized as activities, through suitable Objects and/or time modifiers, which always focus the reading on phase I (cf. example (40a) above).

In sum, the infinitive suffix *-re* is [+Telic] and infinitive e-nominals are basically transitions and, by implication, activities.

The characteristic of the supine suffix is its occurrence in the NS e-nominal, where the infinitive is excluded. Aspectually, the NS e-nominal is ALWAYS an ACTIVITY. One may assume then that the $-(V)t$ supine suffix is an activity operator, that is, it is $[-\text{Telic}]$. The supine suffix focalizes the activity phase (I) of the event template in (36). Several properties of the supine nominalizations follow from the $[-\text{Telic}]$ feature of the nominalizer.

First, activities are sufficiently identified by their Subjects (Agent); so that in this case it is enough to lexicalize or otherwise identify this participant. This is what makes the event NS structure possible with the supine.

Secondly, since the supine suffix focalizes the activity phase (I) of the event template, the resulting state (III) does not have to be part of the lexicalized meaning. This explains why the supine usually fails to generate (concrete) result nouns based on the NO structure. Since its (activity) meaning is predictable, the supine nominal is seldom listed in dictionaries, and when it is listed, it is not polysemous. The few available supine result nouns relate to the NS event structure and are derived from unergative verbs; these result nouns designate concomitants of the activity. Characteristic examples are *rîsul* 'the laughter', *plînsul* 'the weeping', *ciripitul* 'the chirping', which designate the respective activity (e-reading) or some of its concomitants, such as the noise being produced (r-reading).

Thirdly, as is well known, activities regularly 'pass into' accomplishments if the activity is bounded by specifying an Object which induces the culmination and resulting state (see Pustejovsky 1992 for an interesting account). Therefore, the supine e-nominal may also express transitions, naturally, (only) in the NO structure.

- (46) (a) Cititul capitolului i-a luat o oră. (accomplishment)
 'The reading of the chapter took him an hour.'
 (b) Cititul revistei timp de oră l-a relaxat. (activity)
 'The reading of the magazine for an hour relaxed him.'

Concluding on the aspectual features of the nominalizing affixes, we will say that the infinitive *-re* suffix is $[\text{+Telic}]$ and basically forms perfective nominalizations (transitions), while the supine is $[-\text{Telic}]$ and basically forms activity nominalizations.

This result regarding the aspectual features of the two affixes, obtained by analysing transitive nominalizations, is further confirmed by examining nominals derived from intransitive (ergative and unergative) verbs.

According to our analysis, the choice between the two affixes largely depends on the semantics of the base verb, the aspectual class playing an important part. A second discriminating factor is stylistic: the supine nominal is informal, familiar or popular and less productive; the infinitive is educated, more formal, applicable to neologisms and highly productive. These differences are, in part, apparent in (47) below.

Let us consider ergative verbs first. Ergative verbs, like transitives, designate transitions (achievements or accomplishments); therefore, like transitive verbs, they should be compatible with both suffixes. The examples in (47) show that this prediction is borne out: both nominalizations are possible in principle, though not both of them are always stylistically felicitous.

(47) *Ergative verbs*

	Infinitives	Supines
a veni (come)	venirea	venitul acasa
a pleca (leave)	plecarea	plecatul
a ajunge (arrive)	ajungerea la timp	ajunsul la timp
a ateriza (land)	aterizarea	aterizatul
a debarca (debarck)	debarcarea	debarcatul
a ezita (hesitate)	ezitarea	?ezitatul
a învia (resurrect)	învierea	înviatul
a îmbătrîni (grow old)	îmbătrînirea	?îmbătrînitul
a întineri (grow young)	întinerirea	întineritul
a decădea (decay)	decăderea	?*decăzutul
a sosi (arrive)	sosirea	sositul
a urca (ascend)	urcare	urcatul
a coborî (descend)	coborîre	coborîtul
a păli (grow pale)	pălire	pălitul

The ergative verbs above designate transitions (achievements or accomplishments). All of them accept the [+Telic] infinitive nominalizer. In all cases the unique argument, projected as an Object, will be lexicalized in the e-nominal. As anticipated, the supine nominal is also possible, since the supine nominal can express transitions in the NO structure, if the activity inherently expressed by the [–Telic] supine suffix is bounded by an appropriate incremental Object. Though it is in principle possible, the supine is sometimes stylistically infelicitous.

Let us turn to unergatives now. Since the infinitive nominalizer *-er* is [+Telic], it is expected to be incompatible with unergative verbs, which are [–Telic], designating activities. In contrast, the supine nominalizer, which is [–Telic], should be compatible with unergative bases. These predictions are, indeed, confirmed, as is shown in (48):

(48) *Unergative verbs*

	Infinitives	Supines
a rîde (laugh)	*rîderea	rîsul
a plînge (cry)	*plîngerea lui	plînsul lui
a respira (breathe)	*respirarea lui	respiratul lui
a dormi (sleep)	*dormirea lui	dormitul lui

a munci (work)	*muncirea	muncitul
a lucra (work)	*lucrarea lui (r)	lucratul lui
a călători (travel)	*călătorirea	călătoritul
a sforăi (snore)	*sforăire	sforăitul
a lătra (bark)	*lătrare	lătratul
a mieuna (mew)	*mieunare	mieunat
a trăi (live)	trăire(*e/r)	trăitul
a locui (live)	*locuirea	locuitul
a sta (stand)	stare (*e/r)	statul
a zace (lie)	*zacere	zăcutul
a ciripi (chirp)	*ciripire	ciripitul
a vorbi (speak)	vorbire(e*/r)	vorbitul
a ofta (sigh)	oftare(*e/r)	oftat
a ploua (rain)	*plouare	plouatul
a pocni (crack)	*pocnire	pocnit
a sălta (jump)	*săltare	săltat
a urla (roar)	*urlare	urlat

The behaviour of unergative verbs contrasts sharply with that of ergative ones and is clearly in line with our analysis. THE GREAT MAJORITY OF UNERGATIVE VERBS HAVE ONLY THE SUPINE FORM. With most unergative verbs, the infinitive is not even used as a result nominal. Some verbs allow a result reading of the infinitive nominal but must use the supine in the e-nominal. Few verbs exhibit parallel forms. Unergative verbs thus behave like transitive verbs with null prototypical objects, confirming our hypothesis that the latter should be analysed syntactically like the former.

Although we have not conducted an exhaustive statistical analysis of the infinitive/supine nominalizations, the examples above are hopefully sufficient to establish the telicity (perfectivity) of the infinitive *-re* suffix and the imperfectivity of the supine *-(V)t* one. The supine suffix is more permissive; it allows the semantic properties of any base verbs to go through. The infinitive is more constrained, operating like a filter on verb bases and rejecting unergative verbs.

The incompatibility of this suffix with unergative verbs because they are [–Telic], designating activities, follows from its characterization as [+Telic]. Moreover, since (a) the infinitive suffix does not combine with unergative verb, and (b) event NS structures should be based on unergative verbs, it is predictable that there is no infinitive NS event nominal.

5.3 *Aspect, case and the projection of DPs*

We have described the infinitive as a [+Telic], and the supine as a [–Telic], nominalization, but this characterization is insufficient since BOTH nominalizations accept both telic and atelic interpretations through

appropriate selection of Objects and modifiers. In particular, since in appropriate contexts, such as the one below in (49), activity [–Telic] readings of the infinitive nominalization are possible, it is not obvious why the infinitive should not countenance the [–Telic] interpretation in the case of the NS nominal.

- (49) *construirea catedralei vreme de secole*
 ‘the building of the cathedral for centuries’

It appears that a semantic explanation in terms of the aspectual class of the affix and the semantics of the base verb is insufficient.

The required constraint is that the infinitive nominalization requires the projection of an Object, which would serve as telicity identifier, while the supine nominal is not subject to this restriction. If this constraint is enforced, then the infinitive will not operate on unergative verbs (because they lack an Object) and the difference between infinitive and supine nominalizations will duly follow. In this section, we propose a Minimalist feature-checking account of this problem, explaining how the aspectual type and the functional structure of the DP ultimately determine the syntactic organization of the nominalization.

The idea, in essence, is that the aspectual [\pm Telic] feature of the nominalizing affix constrains the projection of the e-nominal’s a-structure. The feature [+Telic] in a nominalizing affix (and thus in a nominalization) IS PARASITIC ON THE FEATURE [+D], WHICH IS SATISFIED THROUGH MERGE WITH A DP, that is, through the projection of an internal argument, just as in the case of verbs.

Furthermore, the feature [+Telic] must be checked by adjunction to some functional head. Since, at least in Romanian, Aspect is not among the grammatical categories of the noun, the only possibility is that the aspectual feature is checked as a free rider, when some other feature representing some nominal category of the nominalization is checked.

We suggest that the relevant nominal projection is Case, in the sense that telicity is checked at the same time as case, in the Gen(itive) CaseP. The GenCaseP is a functional projection in the DP, in whose specifier the GenCase is checked (see Cornilescu 1995, Coene 1999 for details). The GenCaseP is a good candidate for being the site of Aspect/Case checking in nominals, since it is Case which licenses the DPs projected by virtue of the aspectual properties of the nominalizing affix. Aspectual properties will, therefore, be verified in the GenCaseP (or in the lowest GenCaseP if there are several GenCase projections in the DP). Summarizing, the feature [+Telic] entails the feature [+D], forcing Merge with a (lexical) DP. A lexical Object needs Case. The features [+Gen, +Telic], are simultaneously checked when the noun raises to Gen⁰ (overtly in Romanian) and the DP object raises to SpecGenCaseP.

Given this account, the behaviour of the Romanian infinitive nominal follows entirely from the characterization of the *-re* suffix as [+Telic]. The suffix needs to check the features [+Telic, +D]. The feature [+D] can be checked only if the verb is transitive or ergative, allowing Merge with a DP. It is now understandable why the infinitive suffix does not operate on unergative verbs, which are [–Telic, –D]. The infinitive suffix is thus a filter (in the sense of Karttunen 1973) on verb bases, selecting only verbs that match its [+D] feature. Therefore, even if the infinitive nominalization may countenance activity readings based on the NO structure, through the association of the features [+Telic, +D], it cannot countenance eventive readings based on unergative verbs, so the NS structure is excluded. This is the result we were after.

In contrast, the supine suffix is marked [–Telic]. It behaves like a hole (in the sense of Karttunen 1973), letting the properties of the verb-base go through. It may inherit a [+D] transitivity/ergativity feature from the basic verb and then an Object will be projected and the syntax of the resulting supine nominal is the same as the syntax of the infinitive. The aspectual feature is checked by the objective GenCaseP. A transition reading obtains if the Direct Object is suitable, as in (50).

- (50) Scrisul acestui roman în două luni reprezintă o victorie.
 ‘The writing of this novel in two months represents a victory.’

Unlike the infinitive suffix, the supine freely combines with unergative verbs (basic ergative verbs or transitive verbs with prototypical Objects) since to identify a [–Telic] event it is sufficient to identify its Agent.

As before, the feature [–Telic] is checked in the GenCaseP but this time it is the Subject DP that checks the aspectual feature of the nominalization. It follows, then, that the uniquely necessary argument, the Subject, occupies the unique Case position:

- (51) Cîntatul lui Ion în baie îi
 sing.SUP+the the.GEN Ion in the bathroom
 enervează pe vecini.
 irritates PE the neighbours
 ‘Ion’s singing in the bathroom irritates the neighbours.’

The relation between telicity and case assignment has often been discussed in the literature (de Hoop 1993, Borer 1994, and others). It has been proposed that Accusative case should be checked in the specifier of AspPs, so that the Accusative feature of the DP should be matched with the Accusative/Aspectual feature of the verb.

Since DPs lack the functional category of Aspect, the relation between telicity and Case is expressed in a different way: Aspect features of the head

noun are checked as FREE RIDERS BY THE CASE HEAD (Gen⁰). In (Romanian) DPs, aspectual features can only be made manifest through Merge and Case. The bounded nature of an event must be interpreted as the syntactic projection of an Object which is the delimiter of the event. In contrast, to satisfy telicity, verb syntax disposes not only of the projection of a delimiting internal Object but also of the grammaticalized category of Aspect and of the projection of other types of delimiters than the internal Object. This allows the ‘perfectivization’ of any eventuality:

- (52) (a) A plouat deja.
 ‘It has already rained.’
 (b) A citit două ore.
 ‘He has been reading for two hours.’
- (53) A călătorit pînă la Ploiești.
 ‘He has travelled to Ploiești.’

All of these express delimited events, accomplishments, although the verbs are unergative.⁴ In IPs, the feature [+Telic] is certainly independent of the assignment of Accusative Case. Aspectual features and Case features need not be checked in the same projection.

5.4 *More on a-structure and event-identification*

The analysis of event structure and event identification at the level of IPs has revealed some generalizations. One is formulated in (54).

- (54) If an event is identified, all the participants count as such.

Secondly, as mentioned earlier, different types of eventualities require or allow different identifiers. This is spelled out in (55).

- (55) (a) A telic predication, based on a transitive or ergative verb, is identified if its Object is identified.
 (b) An activity is sufficiently identified if its Subject (Agent) or some adjunct identifies it.

[4] One of the referees calls attention to (Italian) examples like (i), which appear to be [+Telic] despite the empty object.

(i) Questa musica riconcilia con se stessi in poco tempo.
 ‘This music reconciles with oneself in a short time.’

The example is interesting but less problematic than it might appear at first sight. First, given the present tense and the impersonal interpretation, the sentence is not an accomplishment, but a state. Secondly, in Italian an Object *pro* is syntactically active, according to Rizzi’s tests cited in section 4.2. above, so that it might be an event identifier. Thirdly, in VPs, telicity does not depend on overt objects, as shown in examples (52b) and (53).

Thus, event participants syntactically realized as DPs may be event identifiers. In this section we will show that NOT ANY TYPE OF DP MAY SERVE AS AN EVENT IDENTIFIER.

We propose that the suitable type of DP may be given a morpho-semantic characterization suggested by Reinhart & Reuland (1993). A DP which may serve as an event identifier is one having the referential property [+R], initially proposed in Chomsky (1981):

- (56) An NP is [+R] iff it carries a full specification for ϕ -features and structural Case.

A DP (= 'NP' in (56)) may be an event identifier only if it meets this condition.

Several empirical facts noted above follow from the generalizations in (54) and (55), in conjunction with the above characterization of event identifiers.

In the first place, we can explain the absence of null prototypical objects in [+Telic] nominalizations. Null prototypical Objects, even if projected, could not serve as event delimiters since they do not have the [+R] property. Thus, even when null *pro* Objects are case identified by the verb, as is the case in VPs under Rizzi's 1986 proposal (cf. section 4.2 above), they will fail to have ϕ -features. Telic nominalizations cannot countenance prototypical Objects, because they fail to be event identifiers. For instance, a configuration where an implicit Direct Object were to satisfy the [+Telic, +D] feature of the suffix, and the Case position were to go to the Subject, would fail to go through, because the [+Telic] configuration should be identified by its Object, but this implicit Object would fail to have Case and ϕ -features, and thus would fail to identify the telic event.

In contrast, all lexical Objects meet condition [+R] in (56) and, as such, may serve as event identifiers. In as much as they check structural Case, they satisfy the [+Telic] feature of the affix, even though not all types of Object lead to accomplishment readings. The telicity feature of the affix is checked as long as Genitive case has been assigned. If Genitive has been assigned in an infinitive e-nominal, IRRESPECTIVE of the type of Object, the [+Telic] feature is checked and the infinitive nominal is well-formed. Example (57a), containing a bare plural (BP) Object with an existential reading, is perfect and contrasts sharply with example (57b), where the Object is not expressed:

- (57) (a) încheierea de tratate importante de către cele două puteri
'the concluding of important treaties by the two powers'
(b) *încheierea de către cele două puteri
'the concluding by the two powers'

Thus, BPs may receive structural Case in nominals and consequently may license the event-reading of infinitive nominals, functioning as event

identifiers. On the other hand, in (58) below, even though the nominal has a syntactically [+Telic] affix and the feature [+Telic] is checked, it acquires an activity reading, because of the BP Object.

- (58) citirea de romane sentimentale ore în șir
 ‘the reading of sentimental romances for hours on end’

In the second place, when the Object is lexical (even when it is a BP) and satisfies condition (56) above, the event is sufficiently identified to ALLOW THE ARGUMENTAL FUNCTION of the implicit Agent. While BP Objects may activate an Agent, implicit Objects cannot do so. The BP Object activates an implicit Agent capable of control (59a, c) and of licensing an adjectival adjunct small clause (59e, g). An implicit Object can do neither of these (59b, d, f, h):

- (59) (a) Preferă citirea de romane de aventuri pentru a se relaxa.
 ‘He prefers reading adventure stories to relax himself.’
 (b) *Preferă citirea pentru a se relaxa.
 ‘He prefers reading to relax himself.’
 (c) construirea de noi apartamente pentru a satisface cererile locuitorilor
 ‘the building of new apartments to satisfy the population’s demands’
 (d) *construirea pentru a satisface cererile locuitorilor
 ‘the building to satisfy the population’s demands’
 (e) adoptarea de hotărâri importante **obosit**
 ‘the making of important decisions when tired’
 (f) *adoptarea **obosit**
 ‘the making tired’
 (g) abordarea de probleme importante **nepregătit**
 ‘the tackling of important problems when unprepared’
 (h) *abordarea nepregătit
 ‘the tackling unprepared’

This discussion shows that the Agent of a transitive nominalization is always identified (see 2.2 above) either because it is assigned case itself (in languages like English, where there is a case position for it) or because the Theme has been identified.

In activity nominalizations, the event identifier is the Subject (Agent). It is the Subject that gets Genitive case, checking the aspectual feature of the nominal. It must be the case that the Subject satisfies the condition in (56), both when it is lexical and when it is a case-marked *pro*. We are led to believe that an implicit Agent is projected when it is the event identifier and satisfies condition [+R] in (56).

- (60) (a) Dormitul lui Ion in bucătărie deranjează
 sleep.SUP + the the.GEN Ion in the-kitchen
 pe toată lumea.
 PE everybody disturbs
 ‘Ion’s sleeping in the kitchen disturbs everyone.’
 (b) Cititul e o plăcere.
 ‘Reading is a pleasure.’

The null Case-marked *pro* Agent of activities may acquire ϕ -features through control or through the default arbitrary reading, and it may serve as an event identifier. Note the contrast between the infinitive and the supine nominalization of the same verb regarding ability to license predicative adjuncts, when the Object is not projected:

- (61) (a) Fumatul/*fumarea nemîncat ruinează sănătatea.
 ‘Smoking (supine/*infinitive) on an empty stomach ruins one’s health.’
 (b) Cititul/*citirea obosit nu dă randament.
 ‘Reading (supine/*infinitive) is inefficient.’

Since the Object is saturated in the lexicon in both cases, the difference between them is due to the fact that only in the supine nominals is there a Case-marked Agent *pro* in the GenCaseP, serving as an event identifier. In the infinitive nominals, the implicit Agent cannot be activated since the Object is missing; hence the contrast between the two forms.

The syntax of the DP, thus, illustrates a configurational interpretation of Aspect: aspectual features correlate with syntactic properties of the DP.

5.5 *A consequence*

An important confirmation of this analysis is the striking asymmetry of cognate verbs and nominalizations regarding their ability to accept DPs versus CPs as Objects. Here is a list of verbs that accept both CP and DP Objects.

- (62) *admite* ‘admit’, *afirma* ‘affirm’, *accentua* ‘emphasize’, *explica* ‘explain’, *certifica* ‘certify’, *declara* ‘declare’, *deduce* ‘infer’, *divulga* ‘divulge’, *menționa* ‘mention’, *raporta* ‘report’, *regreta* ‘regret’, *șopti* ‘whisper’, *susține* ‘hold’, *sugera* ‘suggest’, *imagina* ‘imagine’, *tăgădui* ‘deny’, *visa* ‘dream’, *citi* ‘read’, *scrie* ‘scribe’, *presupune* ‘suppose’, *remarca* ‘remark’, *observa* ‘observe’, *demonstra* ‘prove’, *argumenta* ‘argue’, *socoti* ‘reckon’, *considera* ‘consider’, *pretinde* ‘claim’, *plănuși* ‘plan’, *calcula* ‘reckon’, *dori* ‘wish’, *recunoaște*, ‘admit’, etc.

While the verb accepts both DP and CP complements, as examples (63a) and (64a) below show, the infinitive nominal accepts ONLY the DP while the CP is completely excluded. There is a sharp contrast between the correct examples, where the Object is a DP (see (63b), (64b), (65a), and (66a)) and

the incorrect examples where the Object is a CP (see (63c), (64c), (65b), (66b)). Since, in our analysis, use of the [+Telic] infinitive e-nominal depends on the features [+D] and on the checking of the Gen case feature, the absence of the CP complements is predicted. The interpretation of these infinitive facts depends on one's general assumptions regarding CPs. Thus, the absence of CP objects in the infinitive e-nominals may be taken to show that CPs cannot check the Genitive case feature (cf. Webelhuth 1992), and thus cannot check the aspectual feature of the e-nominal either. Alternatively, one might say that the place-holding empty category with which CPs are coindexed, some variety of *pro* (as suggested in Cardinaletti 1991, Rothstein 1995), cannot satisfy condition [+R], presumably because it lacks ϕ -features. Either way, the absence of the CP complement follows from the telicity of the suffix.

The examples become acceptable if a nominal is inserted to head the CP in a noun complement construction (see (63d), (64d), (65c), and (66c)). The contrasts are systematic and clear-cut.

- (63) (a) Au afirmat adevărul/că Primul Ministru a demisionat.
'They asserted the truth/that the Prime Minister had resigned.'
(b) afirmarea adevărului
the asserting of the truth
(c) *afirmarea că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'the asserting that the Prime Minister had resigned'
(d) afirmarea **faptului** că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'the asserting of the fact that the Prime Minister had resigned'
- (64) (a) Au explicat teorema/că Ministru a demisionat.
'They explained the theorem/that the Minister had resigned.'
(b) explicarea teoremei
'the explaining of the theorem'
(c) *explicarea că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'explaining that the Prime Minister had resigned'
(d) explicarea **faptului** că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'explaining the fact that the Prime Minister had resigned'
- (65) (a) menționarea acestei probleme
'mentioning this problem'
(b) *menționarea că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'mentioning that the Prime Minister had resigned'
(c) menționarea **faptului** că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'mentioning the fact that the Prime Minister had resigned'
- (66) (a) sugerarea adevărului
'suggesting the truth'
(b) *sugerarea că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'suggesting that the Prime Minister had resigned'
(c) sugerarea **faptului** că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'suggesting the fact that the Prime Minister had resigned'

Apparent counterexamples represent r-nominals, as shown by the possibility of using adjectival *de* time/place adjuncts or by the presence of the Subject (Agent).

- (67) confirmarea de ieri că a primit pachetul
confirm.INF + the DE yesterday that (he) got the parcel
'yesterday's confirmation that he got the parcel'
- (68) încercarea (lui) de anul trecut de a pleca în America
attempt.INF his DE year last DE to go to America
'his attempt (of) last year to go to America'

In fact, for many of the verbs above, in addition to the infinitive *-re* nominalization, there are derived r-nominals, based on suffixes other than the infinitive one (for example, *-ție*, *declarație* 'declaration'). They behave just like the nominals in (67) and (68) above, namely, they may lexicalize a Subject (Agent) in the Gen case, and they license adjectival *de* place/time adjuncts (see (69b) and (71b) below). Interestingly, these nominals DO NOT ALLOW THE NOUN + DP OBJECT STRUCTURE, which is the hallmark of the event reading (see examples (69a) and (71a)). It is these derived nominals that combine with CPs, filling the gap in the NO structure. Note that these derived r-nominals are in complementary distribution with the infinitive e-nominal: the infinitive e-nominal requires a DP Object and excludes a CP Object, as well as a lexicalized Gen Agent, or a *de* time/place adjunct, as seen in (70) and (72). The examples below illustrate a very general pattern.

- (69) (a) *declarația adevărului (derived r-nominal)
'the declaration of the truth'
- (b) declarația **de** ieri a președintelui
declaration-the DE yesterday of the president
'yesterday's declaration of the president'
- (c) declarația (lui Ion) că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'(Ion's) declaration that the Prime Minister had resigned'
- (70) (a) declararea adevărului (infinitive e-/r-nominal)
'declaring the truth'
- (b) *declararea lui Ion
declare.INF + the the.GEN Ion
'Ion's declaration'
- (c) *declararea că Primul Ministru a demisionat
declare.INF + the that the Prime Minister had resigned
- (71) (a) *afirmația adevărului (derived r-nominal)
'the assertion of the truth'
- (b) 'afirmația **de** ieri a comandantului'
'the commander's assertion yesterday'
- (c) afirmația președintelui că Primul Ministru a demisionat
'the president's assertion that the Prime Minister had resigned'

- (72) (a) afirmarea adevărului (infinitive nominal)
 ‘asserting the truth’
 (b) *afirmarea **de** ieri a comandantului
 ‘assert.INF + the DE yesterday AL commander + the.GEN
 ‘the commander’s asserting yesterday’
 (c) *afirmarea că Primul Ministru a demisionat
 assert.INF + the that the-Prime Minister had resigned
 ‘the asserting that the Prime Minister had resigned’

In conclusion, the infinitive e-nominal is [+Telic] and it is grammatical only if the features [+D], [+Gen] have been checked; a CP Object cannot satisfy these features and will not be licensed in the infinitive e-nominal. The absence of the CP complement ultimately follows from the Telicity of the suffix.

As anticipated, the supine nominalization fares (slightly) better. One would expect the event NS structure to be available, with the Subject checking the Gen feature of the nominalization and the Object position occupied by the CP. Remember, though, that the NS supine always denotes an activity and notice that the CP-taking verbs in (62) do not denote activities. Moreover, stylistically, they belong to more formal language. This is why, for semantic and stylistic reasons, the supine of these verbs is awkward even with DP objects. Yet, in contexts where an activity interpretation becomes possible, the supine does appear with CP Objects, while the infinitive is still excluded. This is illustrated in (73).

- (73) (a) Socotitul/*socotirea cât va costa excursia i-a luat mult timp
 ‘Reckoning (supine/*infinitive) how much the trip would cost took him much time.’
 (b) Raportatul/*raportarea că obiectivele au fost atinse devenise un obicei.
 ‘Reporting (supine/*infinitive) that the goals had been attained had become a habit.’
 (c) Declaratul/*declararea că totul este în regulă nu rezolvă problemele.
 ‘Declaring (supine/*infinitive) that everything was OK did not solve the problems.’
 (d) Plănuitul/*plănuirea unde se va afla în fiecare zi a excursiei îi ia mult timp.
 ‘Planning (supine/*infinitive) where he would be everyday during the trip takes him much time.’

The absence of CPs in perfective infinitive nominalizations as well as the occurrence of CPs in the supine NS structure provide strong confirmation for our analysis. Since CPs cannot check Case (or any other functional category of the noun), the aspectual feature of the e-noun remains unchecked, and the nominal cannot activate its a-structure.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis presented above leads to the conclusions set out below.

1. E-nominals and the corresponding verbs share an a-structure. Nominalization does not involve suppression of any argument position. Rather, with both verbs and nouns, projection is mediated by choice of aspectual type.
2. E-nominals may have distinct aspectual properties; they may be [+Telic] (transitions) or [–Telic] (activities). This difference is due not only to the inherent properties of the verbal base and the choice of arguments/adjuncts, but also to the inherent SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF THE NOMINALIZING SUFFIXES.
3. The aspectual properties of the affix determine the projection of the arguments. A [+Telic] suffix requires THE PROJECTION OF A DP OBJECT, WHICH IS, THEREFORE, OBLIGATORY IN E-NOMINALS BASED ON [+TELIC] SUFFIXES. This is the required qualification of Grimshaw's 1990 theory. In [–Telic] nominals, the Subject may be the only lexical DP, and has clear argumental properties.
4. The more constrained behaviour of transitive nominalizations in comparison with transitive verbs (the impossibility of leaving the Object out, or of accepting implicit objects) follows from the fact that Aspect and Case features are checked in the same (Case) projection, so that the checking of the [+Telic] feature of the nominalization entails the checking of objective Genitive case. Clausal Objects fail to check case and cannot survive if the nominalizing affix is [+Telic].
5. The aspectual type of a suffix determines which arguments are EVENT IDENTIFIERS and must be lexicalized. Event identifiers must have the [+R] property, i.e. they must have structural Case and ϕ -features. When the event is identified, all the event participants count as identified, and they may be semantically active even when they are implicit arguments. This is the case of the Agent in the Romanian infinitive nominalization.
6. The analysis stresses the importance of Aspect among the parameters of nominalization.

REFERENCES

- Ackema, P. & Schoorlemmer, M. (1995). Middles and non-movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26. 173–197.
- Borer, H. (1994). On the projection of arguments. In Benedicto, E. & Runner, J. (eds.), *Functional projections* (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers 17). 19–48.
- Bottari, P. (1989). *Livelli di rappresentazione lessicale: complementazione nominale e complementazione frasale*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Padua.
- Cardinaletti, A. (1991). *Pronomi nulli e pleonastici nelle lingue germaniche e romanze*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Venice.
- Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. (1988). On SI constructions and the theory of Arb. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19. 521–581.

- Coene, M. (1999). *Definite null-nominals in Romanian and Spanish: a generative approach to the syntax of DP*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Antwerpen.
- Cornilescu, A. (1995). Romanian genitive constructions. In Cinque, G. & Giusti G. (eds.), *Advances in Romanian linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1–51.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1994). *The syntax of Romanian: comparative studies in Romance*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dowty, D. R. (1979). *Word meaning and Montague grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Giorgi, A. & Longobardi, G. (1991). *The syntax of noun phrases: configuration, parameters, and empty categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hale, K. & Keyser, J. (1991). On the syntax of argument structure. *Lexicon Project Working Papers* 14. Cambridge, MA: Center for Cognitive Science, MIT.
- Hoekstra, T. (1992). Aspect and theta theory. In Roca I. (ed.), *Thematic structure: its role in grammar*. Berlin: Foris Publications. 145–174.
- Hoekstra, T. & Roberts, I. (1993). Middle constructions in Dutch and English. In Reuland & Abraham (eds.), 183–220.
- de Hoop, H. (1993). *Case configuration and noun phrase interpretation*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Groningen.
- Jaeggli, O. (1986). Passive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17. 587–623.
- Kamp, H. & Reyle, U. (1994). *From discourse to logic*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Karttunen, L. (1973). Presupposition of compound sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4. 169–193.
- Koster, J. (1984). On binding and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15. 417–459.
- Koster, J. (1987). *Domains and dynasties*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kupferman, L. (1991). L'aspect du groupe nominal et l'extraction de *en*. *Le Français Moderne* LIX.2. 113–147.
- Parsons, T. (1990). *Events in the semantics of English*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Picallo, C. (1991). Nominals and nominalization in Catalan. *Probus* 3. 279–316.
- Pustejovsky, J. (1992). The syntax of event structure. In Levin, B. & Pinker, S. (eds.), *Lexical & conceptual semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 47–83.
- Reinhart, T. & Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24. 657–720.
- Reuland, E. & Abraham, W. (eds.) (1993). *Knowledge and language* (vol. II). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rizzi, L. (1986). Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17. 501–557.
- Rothstein, S. (1995). Pleonastics and the interpretation of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26. 499–529.
- Rubin, E. (1994). The category and constituent structure of modifiers. Ms., University of Paris VII.
- Safir, K. (1987). The syntactic projection of lexical thematic structure. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5. 561–602.
- Siloni, T. (1997). *Noun phrases and nominalizations*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Szabolcsi, A. (1994). The noun phrase. In Kiefer F. & Kiss, K. (eds.), *Approaches to Hungarian syntax* (Syntax and Semantics 27). San Diego: Academic Press. 179–263.
- Tenny, C. (1987). *Grammaticalizing aspect and affectedness*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.
- Valois, D. (1991). *The internal structure of DP*. Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.
- Webelhuth, G. (1992). *Principles and parameters of syntactic saturation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, E. (1985). PRO and the subject of NP. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3. 297–315.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. (1995). Emphatic or reflexive: French *lui-même*. *Journal of Linguistics* 31. 333–374.
- Zubizarreta, M. L. (1987). *Levels of representation in the lexicon and in the syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Author's address: English Department, University of Bucharest, 7–13 Pitar Mos Street, Bucharest 3, Romania.*
E-mail: acornile@pcnet.pcnet.ro