

## RENDERING THE BEST RESULTS INTO ROMANIAN – A MATTER OF TYPOLOGICAL VARIATION

RUXANDRA DRĂGAN<sup>1</sup>

University of Bucharest  
Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures

**Abstract.** English (Germanic) and Romanian (Romance) are typologically different in the expression of both change-of-location and change-of-state events (cf. Talmy 1985, 2000). English favours Goal of Motion (GM) and resultative constructions, which combine manner verbs with directional PPs and Result Phrases, respectively; Romanian typically opts for inherently directed motion and change-of-state verbs to achieve the same goals. At the same time, the existing typological differences have been shown to impact both the translation strategies rendering change events, and the syntactic structures they produce (Slobin 2004, 2005, 2006; Capelle 2012; Alonso 2018 et al.). The present article examines the strategies used by professional translators to translate resultatives into Romanian, and the resulting syntactic patterns, shown to be dependent on the type of resultative translated (fake/true). It demonstrates that the mostly compensatory techniques generate structures which, overall, reflect Talmy's lexicalization patterns for Romance and support the uniform treatment of GM and resultatives crosslinguistically. It also argues that the higher syntactic/semantic variation of resultatives (*vs.* GM) is responsible for the higher number of strategies and patterns translating them.

**Keywords:** resultative construction; Manner; Result; lexicalization patterns; translation strategies.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Ruxandra Drăgan** is Associate Professor in the English Department, University of Bucharest and a Fulbright scholar with a fellowship at the University of Connecticut. Her doctoral thesis, *Aspects of Lexical Structure: Verbs in Locative Constructions in English and Romanian*, was published by Bucharest University Press in 2012. In 2016 she also published *Modern Approaches to the Derivation of English Resultative Constructions* (Printech Publishing House). Her theoretical research focuses on the linguistic representation of change of location/state structures at word level (denominal/deadjectival verbs) and sentence level (resultative and Goal of Motion constructions) in English and Romanian. She is currently conducting research in the field of translation studies, focusing on the translation of Goal of Motion and resultative constructions into Romanian and other Romance languages; e-mail: ruxandra.dragan@lils.unibuc.ro.

## 1. Introduction

It has long been argued in the literature that languages vary in the way they describe motion events and that this variation depends on their lexical and syntactic resources (see Talmy 1985, 2000; Mateu 2002; Folli/Ramchand 2005; Zubizarreta/Oh 2007; Beavers/Levin/Tham 2010; Slobin 2004, 2005, 2006; Ibarretxe-Antuñano 2003, 2015; Levin/Rappaport Hovav 2019, et al.). Talmy (1985, 2000) proposes that Germanic and Romance languages are typologically different in that the former express the Path of motion in a satellite (a preposition or a particle) and conflate the Manner of motion in the verb, in what is known as the 'Goal of Motion' construction, whereas the latter conflate the Path of motion in the verb and mostly omit the expression of Manner or lexicalize it as adjunct. The particulars of these lexicalization patterns prompted Talmy to label Germanic languages S(atellite)-framed and Romance, V(erb-framed). At the same time, many of the studies on the expression of motion have also shown that there is a correlation between the expression of change of location in Goal of Motion constructions and that of change of state in resultative constructions in S-framed languages (see Talmy 1985, 2000; Levin/Rappaport Hovav 1995; Snyder 2001; Mateu 2002; Goldberg/Jackendoff 2004; Zubizarreta/Oh 2007; Ramchand 2008; Farkas 2013, et al.). Thus, semantically, they both express 'change', aspectually, they are both telic, and, syntactically, they follow the same lexicalization pattern, i.e., they use a verb to express the manner of change and a satellite (PP or RP) to denote the result of change. Consequently, these studies have argued that the two constructions should be treated uniformly, especially since there also appears to be a crosslinguistic correlation between the availability of Goal of Motion and resultatives in S-framed languages and their unavailability in V-framed languages.

On the other hand, the research into the different lexicalization patterns that express motion across languages has been used in the field of translation studies to show that the aforementioned typological differences directly impact both the strategies translators employ to render motion events, and the syntactic structures these strategies produce (see Slobin 2004, 2005, 2006; Capelle 2012; Alonso 2018, et al.). This is particularly evident when the source and target languages are typologically different, as is the case of English and Romanian. In

Drăgan (2021), I show that the unavailability of Goal of Motion in Romanian means that translators either reduce the construction to a Path verb with an optional directional/locative PP, i.e., the Romance speakers' preferred lexicalization pattern (cf. Talmy 1985, 2000), or they have to resort to a number of compensatory strategies to render both the Path and the Manner components, i.e., by means of various types of adjuncts. In Drăgan (2022), I show that the absence of true/strong resultatives in Romanian may produce similar results and I propose my own compensation techniques to translate them; significantly, they appear to generate structures which mirror Talmy's two lexicalization patterns for change-of-state situations in Romance, that is, structures that either omit or incorporate the Manner component.

The present article extends the investigation into the translation of resultatives into Romanian by focusing on the solutions professional translators employ to render both fake/weak and true/strong resultatives. The analysis relies on a corpus of 107 original tokens selected from five volumes of J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* series, each translated by two different translators. My aim is twofold: (1) to identify the strategies selected by professional translators to render resultatives into Romanian, and (2) to determine if their strategies also yield syntactic structures that follow Talmy's lexicalization patterns for Romance and support the uniform treatment of GM and resultatives across languages.

The article is structured as follows: Section 2. defines resultatives and provides two classifications for them. One aims to outline their variety and, thus, prove that they form a family of constructions. The other classification endorses a comparative analysis of English and Romanian resultatives, since only one type of resultative is shared by the two languages. Building within the theoretical framework provided by Hervey/Higgins (1992), Section 3. identifies the translation strategies adopted by the professional translators who worked on the *Harry Potter* series and demonstrates that they depend on the type of resultative to be translated. Section 4. provides a bird's-eye view of the relation between resultatives and Goal of Motion constructions by comparing the translation techniques used to render both types and the syntactic structures they produce. Section 5. summarizes the conclusions.

## 2. Classifying Resultatives

Resultatives are secondary predicate structures of the type [DP<sub>1</sub>-V-(DP<sub>2</sub>)-RP] (where RP = AP, PP, PrtP or DP), in which the Result Phrase expresses the final location/state achieved by the entity undergoing change (either DP<sub>1</sub> or DP<sub>2</sub>) as a result of the process denoted by the verb (Farkas 2013; Drăgan 2016). For instance, in *Madge mopped her face dry on a towel.*, Madge's 'face' is the direct object entity ending up 'dry' as a result of the 'mopping' process she herself performs. Notice that a literal translation of this structure does not yield a resultative, which indicates that Romanian lacks the ability to derive such constructions. The literal translation of *Madge mopped her face dry on a towel.* – *Madge și-a șters fața uscată cu un prosop.* can only mean that Madge's face was dry (in the sense that she had complexion problems) when she mopped it with the towel.

One aspect that is immediately apparent when assessing the definition provided for resultatives is its complexity, which is due to the fact that resultatives do not represent a single construction, but rather encompass a variety of patterns classified according to diverse criteria. In fact, they have been defined as 'a family of constructions' due to their variability (cf. Goldberg/Jackendoff 2004), which is illustrated below:

- (1) Shiver's axe squashed his nose flat.
- (2) She'd wipe that Cheshire cat's smile off his lips.
- (3) She walked herself tired.
- (4) The woman sank into despair.
- (5) He followed her in/into the room.
- (6) She painted her nails a striking shade of pink.
- (7) The boy rolled clear of the bushes.

The examples above illustrate the many ways in which resultatives vary. They can be built on syntactically different verbs, transitives like *squash* in (1), *follow* in (5) and *paint* in (6), transitives used intransitively, i.e., with unselected objects, like *wipe* in (2), unergatives like *walk* in (3), and unaccusatives like *sink* in (4) and *roll* in (7). The postverbal DP object may be a subcategorized direct object (selected by V) like *his nose* in (1), *her* in (5), and *her nails* in (6), or a non-subcategorized direct object (not

selected by V) like *that Cheshire cat's smile* in (2) and the fake reflexive direct object *herself* in (3). The Result Phrase is usually an AP like *flat* in (1), *tired* in (3) and *clear* in (7), but whereas in (1) and (3) it denotes the resulting state achieved by the affected entity, as is the nature of adjectives, in (7) it exceptionally denotes the resulting location of the affected entity together with its PP complement *of the bushes*. Alternatively, the RP may be a PP like *off his lips* in (2), *into despair* in (4), and *into the room* in (5), but once again, while it is in the nature of prepositions to provide spatial information, as is the case in (5), which overall is interpreted as a change of location situation, a PP operating as RP may also contribute a metaphorical 'resulting state' interpretation, as in the other two PP-based resultatives ((2) and (4)). Finally, notice that the RP may also be a PrtP (*in* in (5)), and even a DP like *a striking shade of pink* in (6). In its turn, the affected entity, i.e., the host of the RP predicate, while typically a direct object that conforms to the Direct Object Restriction (Levin/Rappaport Hovav 1995), may also be the subject (underlying object) of an unaccusative verb, like *the woman* in (4) and *the boy* in (7)), or, in the case of *he* in (5), the subject of a transitive verb whose object is not an affected entity, but one determining the subject's path of motion by its own motion. A discussion concerning the high degree of variability of resultatives, brief though it may be, is quite necessary since, as will be discussed later, the tight or loose semantic and syntactic relations between their constituents will determine both the choice of translation strategy and the resulting syntactic structures in Romanian.

A different classification of resultatives emerges if one considers the aspectual nature of the verbs they are based on:

- (8) She swept the floor spotless.
- (9) He drank the pub dry.
- (10) She cut the dough into thin stripes.
- (11) He broke the jug into shards.

Specifically, the constructions in (8) and (9) classify as true/strong resultatives because both are built on atelic activity/process verbs (*sweep* and *drink*) recategorized as telic (i.e., accomplishments) only in the context of the RPs *spotless* and *dry*. The Result Phrases operate as triggers of recategorization,

since they denote the resulting state achieved by the direct object entities *the floor* and *the pub* as a result of all the sweeping and drinking. In contrast, the verbs *cut* and *break* in (10) and (11), respectively, are already telic, they themselves denote inherently delimited change-of-state situations. Consequently, they license fake/weak resultatives, in which the RPs are not triggers of recategorization, instead, they merely further specify/detail the resulting state inherent in the meaning of each verb. In other words, unlike the RPs in (8) and (9), the PPs *into thin stripes* in (10) and *into shards* in (11) are, in a sense, semantically 'selected' by the verbs.

Since from a syntactic perspective, true and fake resultatives have identical structures, i.e., they consist of three elements – the entity undergoing change, the RP denoting the resulting state or location, and the Manner-denoting verb, this classification is often disregarded by linguists; however, it becomes quite relevant, once the translation of the two types of resultatives is taken into account:

- (12) ?A măturat podeaua imaculată. < She swept the floor spotless.
- (13) \*A băut cârciuma uscată. < He drank the pub dry.
- (14) A tăiat coca (în) fâșii subțiri. < She cut the dough into thin stripes.
- (15) A spart carafa (în) țăndări. He broke the jug into shards.

What the examples in (14) and (15) reveal is that Romanian does have fake/weak resultatives built on the same telic change-of-state verbs *a tăia* (*cut*) and *a sparge* (*break*) as in the original structures. The Result Phrases, syntactically expressed as the (optionally elliptical) PPs (*în*) *fâșii subțiri* (lit. 'in thin stripes') and (*în*) *țăndări* (lit. 'in shards') (see Drăgan 2005), fulfill the same function, i.e., they lexically 'refine' the resulting state denoted by the verb. Thus, the dough does not end up merely cut, but cut in stripes, and likewise, the jug ends up broken in shards. Notice that the Romanian version faithfully mirrors the English construction, a feature that will be discussed in the next section.

On the other hand, the structures in (12) and (13) indicate that Romanian cannot derive strong resultatives. The equivalent of *He drank the pub dry.* in (13) is mere gibberish, as there is no semantic compatibility between the direct object *cârciuma* (*the pub*) and the AP *uscată* (*dry*), not only as RP, but not even as a bona fide modifier of the noun. The example

in (12) is somewhat more acceptable if *spotless* is analysed as noun modifier *and* one can think up a scenario in which sweeping a spotless floor makes sense. Nevertheless, under no circumstances is the Romanian structure analysable as a resultative construction.

The possibility of deriving fake/weak resultatives in Romanian and the absence of strong resultatives from it will be revisited in the next section, where they are shown to trigger the use of distinct translation strategies.

### 3. Strategy Meets Typology

Given the considerable variability of English resultatives, which was detailed in the previous section, it is to be expected that translators will have to adopt and adapt diverse strategies to render the meanings of both fake/weak and true/strong resultatives. At the same time, it is also reasonable to expect that these will generate a wide range of syntactic structures, which will go beyond the patterns proposed by Talmy (1985, 2000) for the expression of change-of-location/change-of-state events in V-framed languages.

As mentioned before, there is a correlation between the typological classification of resultatives and the strategies appropriate for their translation. In particular, fake/weak resultatives, which are built on aspectually telic verbs in both languages, allow for the use of *literal translation*, a technique that closely follows both the form and the intended meanings of the original structures (see (16) to (18) below):

- (16) a. ... but Uncle Vernon [was tearing]<sub>change of state verb</sub> [the letters]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub> [into pieces]<sub>RP-PP</sub> before his eyes.  
 b. Dar Unchiul Vernon deja [rupea]<sub>change of state verb</sub> [scrisorile]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub> [bucățele]<sub>RP-elliptical PP</sub> sub ochii lui.
- (17) a. ... [the stag]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> [dissolved]<sub>change of state verb</sub> [into silver mist]<sub>RP-PP</sub>.  
 b. [Cerbul]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub>. [se dizolvă]<sub>change of state verb</sub> [într-o ceață argintie]<sub>RP-PP</sub>.

- (18) a. On the contrary, [his face]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> [split]<sub>change of state verb</sub>  
[into a wide smile]<sub>RP-PP</sub>...
- b. ... din contră, [fața]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> i [se destinse]<sub>change of state verb</sub>  
[într-un zâmbet larg]<sub>RP-PP</sub>.

All the source text (ST, henceforth) examples above are built on telic verbs denoting change of state (*tear*, *dissolve*, and *split*), as are their Romanian corresponding forms (*a rupe*, *a dizolva*, and *a se destinde* – the last one an equivalent of *relax* rather than *split*, though telic nevertheless). In their turn, the RPs in the English constructions are all PPs that further specify the resulting states inherent in the meanings of the verbs, the same interpretations being attributed to their Romanian PP equivalents as well; as already discussed, the RP in (16b) – *bucățele* (*pieces*) – is analysed as an elliptical PP, since all fake/weak resultatives are PP-based in Romanian. It is important to notice at this point that the combination of a change-of-state verb with an RP-PP denoting the resulting state, which stands for a Romanian fake/weak resultative, is structurally similar to the [Path verb + directional/locative PP] combination used to express directed motion events, which is the lexicalization pattern preferred by V-framed language speakers according to Talmy (1985, 2000).

Unlike fake/weak resultatives, true/strong resultatives do not have corresponding structures in Romanian, which makes their translation problematic as translators have to either accept a fair amount of translation loss (usually in the form of Manner omission) or adopt compensatory strategies to capture all meaning components. The dominating strategy in Hervey/Higgins' (1992) terms is *grammatical transposition*. This is a technique that replaces a given grammatical structure in the ST, here, the compact [Manner verb + RP] combination, with a different grammatical structure in the target text (TT, henceforth), which in Romanian is a syntactically-heavy structure, namely, either a combination between a change-of-state verb and a phrasal Manner adjunct, or a combination between a Manner verb and a Result-denoting clausal adjunct.

According to Hervey/Higgins (1992), translators employ grammatical transposition simultaneously with other compensatory strategies. For instance, grammatical transposition can be applied concurrently with the strategy of *compensation in place*, which replicates a certain effect in



the ST in a different place in the TT. For resultatives, this means that the [Manner verb + RP] combination becomes a [change-of-state verb + Manner adjunct] structure (see (19) to (21) below):

- (19) a. ... the book was screaming! Harry [snapped]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [it]<sub>DO</sub>  
[shut]<sub>RP-AP...</sub>  
b. ... cartea țipa! Harry [o]<sub>DO</sub> [închise]<sub>change of state verb</sub>  
[degrabă]<sub>AdvP...</sub>  
c. Cartea țipa! Harry [o]<sub>DO</sub> [închise]<sub>change of state verb</sub>  
[repede]<sub>AdvP...</sub>
- (20) a. [The lid]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> [creaked]<sub>Manner verb</sub>  
slowly [open]<sub>RP-AP</sub>.  
b. [Capacul]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> începu [să se deschidă]<sub>change of state verb</sub>  
încet, [scârțâind]<sub>gerund</sub>.
- (21) a. [Pecked]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [us]<sub>DO</sub> [half to death]<sub>RP-PP</sub> when she  
brought your last letters...  
b. Aproape că [ne]<sub>DO</sub>-[a omorât]<sub>change of state verb</sub> [cu ciupitul]<sub>PP</sub>  
când a adus ultimele scrisori de la tine...

In all three examples above, the dominant Manner component in the ST is 'demoted' to adjunct, albeit of different types (AdvP in (19b), gerund in (20b) and PP in (21b)), occurring at the left edge of the structure in the TT; in contrast, the Result Phrase in the ST is 'promoted' to main verb position *and* becomes a change-of-state verb. Notice that, once again, the resulting syntactic pattern denoting change of state is structurally identical to the lexicalization pattern proposed by Talmy (1985, 2000) for the expression of directed motion events with a manner component in V-framed languages, i.e., a Path verb associated with a Manner adjunct.

A more elaborate lengthening of the original structure is triggered by the application of *compensation by splitting*, which refers to the use of several words in the TT to express the meaning of a single word in the ST. In the case of resultatives, this means that the RP, which may be a single-word (AP) constituent or a three-word (PP) constituent, is translated as a complex clausal adjunct. In Drăgan (2022), I pointed out

the frequent occurrence of two particular Adverbial Clauses – of Time and Result, but the corpus has revealed the possibility of other types of both subordinate and main clauses, as illustrated below:

- (22) a. [Pecked]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [us]<sub>DO</sub> [half to death]<sub>RP-PP</sub>  
when she brought your last letters...
- b. [Ne]<sub>DO</sub>-[a ciupit]<sub>Manner verb</sub> aproape [de ne-a omorât]<sub>AdvCl of Result</sub>  
când ne-a adus ultimele scrisori de la tine.
- (23) a. He had let Harry [talk]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [himself]<sub>fake reflexive DO</sub>  
[into silence]<sub>RP-PP</sub> without interruption...
- b. Îl lăsase pe Harry [să vorbească]<sub>Manner verb</sub>  
[până terminase tot]<sub>AdvCl of Time</sub> ce avea de spus, fără să-l întrerupă.
- (24) a. ... sneered Uncle Vernon, [shaking]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [the letter]<sub>DO</sub>  
[open]<sub>RP-AP</sub> with one hand...
- b. ... îl luă în râs unchiul Vernon, [scuturând]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [scrisoarea]<sub>DO</sub>  
cu o mână [ca să o despătorească]<sub>AdvCl of Purpose...</sub>
- (25) a. Harry [stuffed]<sub>change-of-state V</sub> [the cloak]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub>  
quickly [out of sight]<sub>RP-PP</sub>.
- b. Harry [strânse]<sub>change of state verb</sub> repede [mantia]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub>  
[ghemotoc]<sub>RP-PP</sub> și [o ascunse]<sub>coordinated MCl</sub>.

While in (22b) to (24b), the RP is translated by means of Adverbial Clauses of Result, Time, and Purpose, respectively, introduced by specialized complementizers (*de* for Result, *până* for Time and *ca să* for Purpose), the structure in (25b) is an interesting example of literal translation operating concurrently with compensation by splitting. Thus, the resultative is translated as a verbal collocation (*a strânge ghemotoc*) consisting of the change-of-state verb (*a strânge (stuff)*) and the elliptical PP further lexically specifying the resulting state entailed by the meaning of the verb (*ghemotoc < în formă de ghemotoc (≈ in a wad)*), to which a second (coordinated) Main Clause is added to render the RP (*out of sight* is translated as *o ascunse (he hid it)*). Quite significantly, unlike the previous resulting structures, the ones generated by compensation by splitting

(with the exception of (25b)) actually preserve the order, if not the syntactic nature, of the constituents in the ST, thus deviating from Talmy's aforementioned lexicalization patterns. Specifically, the Manner component is translated as main verb and the Path as adjunct, though notice that in English, the RP is a compact phrase with complement status, not a clausal adjunct.

*Compensation by merging* is another choice, which reduces a complex phrase in the ST to a single word or a shorter phrase in the TT. For resultatives, this means that the construction is shortened to a mere main verb denoting change-of-state or a manner verb pragmatically reinterpreted as telic (see (26) to (28) below):

- (26) a. ... Uncle Vernon [slammed]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [the door]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub> [shut]<sub>RP-AP</sub>.  
 b. ... unchiul Vernon [trânti]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [ușa]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub>.
- (27) a. He [pushed]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [the door]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub> [ajar]<sub>RP-AP</sub>  
 and peered inside.  
 b. [Crăpă]<sub>change-of-state verb</sub> [ușa]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub>  
 și aruncă o privire înăuntru.
- (28) a. The storm [had blown]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [itself]<sub>fake reflexive DO</sub> [out]<sub>RP-PrP</sub>  
 by the following morning...  
 b. Până a doua zi dimineața, [furtuna]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> [se potolise]  
 change of state verb...  
 c. [Furtuna]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> [trece]<sub>Path verb</sub> până în dimineața următoare...

Though all three examples above are instances of compensation by merging, they illustrate different manners of implementing this strategy. The main verb *slam* in (26a), which in the ST is an atelic semelfactive recategorized as telic in the context of the RP-AP *shut*, is pragmatically reinterpreted as telic in Romanian, since Romanian speakers frequently use *a trânti ușa* (*to slam the door*) to mean *to slam the door shut*. In the other two cases, the resultative is reduced to telic main verbs – *a crăpa ușa* (*push the door ajar*) in (27b), and *a se potoli/a trece* (*blow itself out*) in (28b, c). Notice that, while *a se potoli* (*calm down*) is a bona fide change-of-state verb, *a trece* (*pass*) is a verb of inherently directed motion used metaphorically

as 'change-of-state'. Overall, the resulting structures follow Talmy's Path verb-based lexicalization pattern for motion events in V-framed languages.

*Communicative translation* is a solid alternative to all the compensation strategies described so far, and translators seem to make frequent use of it. This technique entails the rendering of ST expressions by means of other idiomatic expressions in the TT, provided they are culturally and situationally appropriate for the context (see (29) to (32) below):

- (29) a. Dudley [had laughed]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [himself]<sub>fake reflexive DO</sub>  
[silly]<sub>RP-AP</sub> at Harry...
- b. Dudley [se stricase de râs]<sub>idiomatic expression</sub>  
uitându-se la Harry...
- (30) a. ... it'll really [wipe ]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [the smiles]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub> [off  
their faces]<sub>RP-PP</sub> if we win.
- b. ... [o să-i lăsăm paf]<sub>idiomatic expression</sub> când o să câștigăm!
- (31) a. ... and [the Dursleys' living room]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub>  
[was whipped]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [out of sight]<sub>RP-PP...</sub>
- b. ... iar salonul familiei Dursley  
[dispăru]<sub>change of state verb</sub> [cât ai clipi]<sub>idiomatic expression...</sub>
- (32) a. ... it [would have scared]<sub>change of state verb</sub> [him]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub>  
[out of his wits]<sub>RP-PP</sub>.
- b. ... [și-ar fi ieșit din minți]<sub>idiomatic expression</sub> de groază.
- c. ... [s-ar fi speriat de moarte]<sub>idiomatic expression</sub>.

With the exception of (31b), which is built on the prosaic change-of-state verb *a dispărea* (*disappear*) accompanied by the idiomatic clausal structure *cât ai clipi* (*≈ in a flash*), in all the examples above, the predicate is translated by a telic, change-of-state verbal idiom, as suggested by the telic English approximations in brackets (*a se strica de râs* (*≈ burst/split one's sides with laughter*) in (29b), *a lăsa paf* (*≈ flabbergast, flummox*) in (30b), *a-și ieși din minți* (*≈ go out of one's mind, lose one's mind*) in (32b), *a se speria de moarte* (*get scared to death*) in (32c)). It bears mentioning at this point that Romanian translators can access a substantial inventory of idiomatic

expressions, both manner- and change-denoting, which they frequently employ in order to preserve the graphic quality of both resultative and Goal of Motion structures. However, it is interesting to notice that the two semantically distinct types of idiomatic expression are not evenly distributed in so far as resultatives are often rendered by change-denoting idioms, whereas Goal of Motion structures are often 'improved' through the use of manner-denoting idiomatic phrases (see also Drăgan 2021).

A similar tendency to translate resultatives using telic (change-of-state) predicates is also apparent when translators opt for *free translation*, a strategy that will not be illustrated here since, apart from evincing a preference for telicity, it does not generate any regular syntactic patterns relevant to the present analysis.

#### 4. Beyond Resultatives

As pointed out in the introduction, three main ideas laid the foundation for the present analysis.

Firstly, Goal of Motion and resultative constructions should receive a uniform treatment as they share a number of features (see Talmy 1985, 2000; Levin/Rappaport Hovav 1995; Snyder 2001; Mateu 2002; Goldberg/Jackendoff 2004; Zubizarreta/Oh 2007; Ramchand 2008; Farkas 2013, et al.). Semantically, they denote 'change of location/state', aspectually, they are telic (in fact, they are mostly cases of aspectual recategorization from atelic to telic structures in which the directional PP or the Result Phrase are the triggers of telicity), and, syntactically, they are built on Manner-denoting verbs associated with satellites (directional PPs and RPs) which express the Path/Result of change.

Secondly, the possibility or impossibility of deriving both Goal of Motion and resultatives crosslinguistically appears to be systematic and subject to typological variation. Talmy (1985, 2000) distinguishes between S-framed languages like English, and V-framed languages like Romanian. The former are claimed to conflate the Manner of motion/change in the verb and to express the Path/Result of change in the satellite (as directional PP or Result Phrase). The latter conflate the Path/Result of change in the verb

and typically leave out the Manner of change, which may, nevertheless, be optionally expressed as some type of adjunct, as illustrated below:

- (33) a. [The girl]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> [rushed]<sub>Manner verb</sub>  
 [into the room]<sub>directional PP</sub>  
 b. [Fata]<sub>affected entity-subject</sub> [a intrat]<sub>Path verb</sub> ([în grabă]<sub>Manner adjunct-PP</sub>/[grăbită]<sub>Manner adjunct-Predicative adjunct</sub>) [în cameră]<sub>locative PP</sub>.
- (34) a. He [slammed]<sub>Manner verb</sub> [the gate]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub> [shut]<sub>RP-AP</sub>.  
 b. [A închis]<sub>change of state verb</sub> [poarta]<sub>affected entity-DO</sub> [trântind]<sub>Manner adjunct-gerund-O</sub>.

According to Talmy (1985, 2000), Goal of Motion is the lexicalization pattern favoured by speakers of S-framed languages to describe motion events, while resultatives are preferred when describing change-of-state events. In contrast, the [Path verb + (directional/locative PP)] is the lexicalization pattern preferred by speakers of V-framed languages to describe motion and change-of-state verbs are preferred to express change-of-state events. Alternatively, speakers of V-framed languages may choose to also express the Manner of motion or Manner of change and they do so by adding adjuncts to the skeleton structures (Path verb/Change-of-state verb + (directional/locative PP) + Manner adjunct]). However, Manner is specified only if absolutely necessary for some reason. In written narratives, Manner specification is a must for stylistic reasons: translators wish to preserve the graphic impact and dynamic flavour of the source text, so they typically opt for the syntactically heavy structure that incorporates the Manner component.

Thirdly, the literature on the translation of motion events has shown that the typological classification of the source and target languages, and the lexical and syntactic resources available in the respective languages trigger the use of particular translation strategies, and produce syntactic structures that typically mirror the lexicalization pattern(s) favoured by the target language (see Slobin 2004, 2005, 2006; Capelle 2012; Alonso 2018, et al.).

Consequently, since Goal of Motion and resultatives are to receive a uniform treatment for the reasons stated above, since they are both

subject to typological variation, and given that this typological variation prompts the selection of certain translation strategies and the generation of certain syntactic patterns that generally reflect the preferred lexicalization pattern(s) of the target language, it follows that Goal of Motion and resultative constructions should be translated into Romanian using the same strategies, which should produce similar, if not identical syntactic structures that should reflect the lexicalization pattern(s) typical of Romance.

Overall, these predictions are borne out. Grammatical transposition and some form of compensation (compensation in place, compensation by splitting) generate structures that incorporate the Manner component of both Goal of Motion and true/strong resultatives in fairly creative ways, as PPs, AdvPs, Predicative adjuncts, gerunds, clausal structures, etc. (see Drăgan 2021 for the translation of GM). They do not mirror Talmy's typical lexicalization pattern for Romance since they lexicalize the Manner component; instead, they do reflect the syntactically-heavier pattern discussed in (33b) and (34b), for instance, which is required when the specification of Manner contributes to the preservation of the stylistic features of the source narrative. Notice, however, that the Manner-denoting structures that render RPs into Romanian are often more clausal in nature than the Manner-denoting lexical items translating the manner-of-motion/sound emission verbs of GM constructions. This might be because, while the constitutive elements of motion events are more tightly related both semantically and syntactically in both languages, the semantic and syntactic relations obtaining between the elements of strong resultatives are looser, there is little *c/s*-selection involved and, as a result, the structures rendering them into Romanian need to be highly explicit.

In addition, grammatical transposition and the above-mentioned compensation techniques are also responsible for the generation of a number of motion-denoting syntactic micropatterns based on special lexical items such as light-verb collocations, idiomatic verbal and adverbial expressions, reduplicatives, alliterations, etc. (see Drăgan 2021). As illustrated in the previous section, idiomatic expressions are also used to render the meaning of resultatives, but, in this case, the strategy involved is simply communicative translation. At the same time, it has been pointed out that the idiomatic expressions translating the two

constructions tend to differ semantically in so far as manner-denoting idioms are involved in the translation of Goal of Motion, while change-denoting idioms are involved in the rendering of resultatives.

Compensation by merging is an interesting strategy since it tends to produce opposing effects. In the translation of GM constructions, the technique yields single-item (main verb) structures that incorporate the Manner component by using Path-Manner verbs like *a se năpusti* (*charge, lunge*), *a se repezi* (*rush at*), *a se cățăra* (*scrabble*), *a năvăli* (*barge*), which lexicalize both the Path and the Manner of motion. In contrast, when compensation by merging is applied to resultatives, it reduces them to change-of-state predicates, omitting the Manner component altogether. Thus, the strategy either reflects Talmy's typical lexicalization pattern for Romance (i.e., the pattern based on the single change-of-state verb) when rendering resultatives, or it generates a novel pattern that succeeds in incorporating both Path and Manner in a single item, when translating Goal of Motion.

Literal translation also operates on both constructions; it is used to render fake/weak resultatives and Goal of Motion constructions built on Manner verbs that in Romanian denote boundary-crossing events (e.g., *a sări* (*jump*) in *a sări în șanț* (*jump into the ditch*), where *în șanț* (lit. *in the ditch*) is a locative PP reinterpreted as the Goal of motion). The generated structures, in such cases, are practically identical to the original constructions, except for the examples involving purely dynamic prepositions like *into*, for which Romanian does not have an equivalent.

Last but not least, the analysis has revealed that translators use more varied strategies to render resultatives into Romanian. Apart from grammatical transposition, literal translation and the various compensation techniques, they also resort more often to free translation and communicative translation – two strategies that allow for more freedom in interpretation, made necessary by the looser semantic and syntactic ties existing between the constitutive elements of resultatives.

## 5. Conclusions

Overall, the present study has indicated that the choice of translation strategy when rendering resultatives into Romanian depends on the



type of construction involved. Fake/weak resultatives are rendered by means of literal translation, while true/strong resultatives are translated by grammatical transposition, a variety of compensation techniques, communicative translation and free translation. The difference in number of strategies is due to the quirky semantic and syntactic relations existing between the constitutive parts of true/strong resultatives, which force translators to 'get creative' when rendering their meanings.

The syntactic structures generated by the application of the above-mentioned strategies generally mirror Talmy's lexicalization patterns for Romance – [change-of-state verb + optional Result-denoting PP] for fake/weak resultatives, and [change-of-state verb + Manner adjunct] for true/strong resultatives. These are lexicalization patterns that resultatives basically share with Goal of Motion constructions; hence, their existence further supports the uniform treatment of Goal of Motion and resultative constructions crosslinguistically.

However, there is more variation in the choice of translation strategies to render resultatives due to their semantic and syntactic quiriness.

#### SOURCES

- Rowling, J. K., 1997, *Harry Potter and the Sorcerer's Stone*, London, Bloomsbury.
- Rowling, J. K., 1999, *Harry Potter and the Prisoner of Azkaban*, London, Bloomsbury.
- Rowling, J. K., 2003, *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, London, Bloomsbury.
- Rowling, J. K., 2007, *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*, London, Bloomsbury.
- Rowling, J. K., 2002, *Harry Potter și piatra filozofală*, vol. 1, Ioana Iepureanu (trad.), București, Editura Egmont.
- Rowling, J. K., 2013a, *Harry Potter și prizonierul din Azkaban*, vol. 3, Ioana Iepureanu (trad.), București, Editura Egmont.
- Rowling, J. K., 2013b, *Harry Potter și Ordinul Phoenix*, vol. 5, Ioana Iepureanu (trad.), București, Editura Egmont.
- Rowling, J. K., 2013c, *Harry Potter și talismanele morții*, vol. 7, Ioana Iepureanu (trad.), București, Editura Egmont.
- Rowling, J. K., 2015, *Harry Potter și piatra filosofală*, vol. 1, Florin Bican (trad.), București, Editura Arthur.
- Rowling, J. K., 2016, *Harry Potter și prizonierul din Azkaban*, vol. 3, Radu Paraschivescu (trad.), București, Editura Arthur.

- Rowling, J. K., 2017, *Harry Potter și Ordinul Phoenix*, vol. 5, Tatiana Dragomir (trad.), București, Editura Arthur.
- Rowling, J. K., 2018, *Harry Potter și talismanele morții*, vol. 7, Tatiana Dragomir (trad.), București, Editura Arthur.

#### REFERENCES

- Alonso, R.A., 2018, "Translating motion events into typologically distinct languages", in *Perspectives*, 26 (3), pp. 357-376.
- Beavers, J., B. Levin, S. W. Tham, 2010, "The typology of motion events revisited", in *Journal of Linguistics*, 46, pp. 331-377.
- Capelle, B., 2012, "English is less rich in manner-of-motion verbs when translated from French", in *Across Languages and Cultures*, 13 (2), pp. 173-195.
- Drăgan, R., 2005, "On resultative constructions and în/in (-en) prepositions/prefixes in Romanian and English", in Burada, M. (ed.), *Conference on British and American Studies*, Brașov, Transilvania University Press, pp. 99-104.
- Drăgan, R., 2016, *Modern Approaches to the Derivation of English Resultative Constructions*, București, Editura Printech.
- Drăgan R., 2021, "Trailing Harry Potter into Romanian", in *Linguaculture*, 12 (1), pp. 163-178.
- Drăgan R., 2022, "Getting results in translation", in Alboiu, G., D. Isac, Al. Nicolae, M. Tănase-Dogaru, A. Tigău (eds.), *A Life in Linguistics – A Festschrift for Alexandra Cornilescu on Her 75<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, București, Editura Universității din București, pp. 227-242.
- Farkas, I. A., 2013, *Resultative Constructions in English and Romanian: A Comparative Analysis*, Cluj, Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană.
- Folli, R., G. Ramchand, 2005, "Prepositions and results in Italian and English: an analysis from event decomposition", in Verkuyl, H., H. de Swart, A. van Hout (eds.), *Perspectives on Aspect*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp. 81-105.
- Hervey, S., I. Higgins, 1992, *Thinking Translation. A Course in Translation Method: French to English*, London/New York, Routledge.
- Goldberg, A., R. Jackendoff, 2004, "The English resultative as a family of constructions", in *Language*, 80 (3), pp. 532-568.
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I., 2003, "What translation tells us about motion: A contrastive study of typologically different languages", in *International Journal of English Studies*, 3 (2), pp. 153-178.
- Ibarretxe-Antuñano, I., 2015, "Going beyond motion events typology: The case of Basque as a verb-framed language", in *Folia Linguistica*, 49 (2), pp. 307-352.
- Levin, B., M. Rappaport Hovav, 1995, *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax-Lexical Semantics Interface (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 26)*, Cambridge, MA/London, England, MIT Press.

- Levin, B., M. Rappaport Hovav, 2019, "Lexicalization patterns", in Truswell, R. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Event Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 395-425.
- Mateu, J. F., 2002, *Argument Structure: Relational Construal at the Syntax-semantics Interface*, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, PhD Thesis.
- Ramchand, G., 2008, *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First Phase Syntax*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Slobin, D. I., 2004, "The many ways to search for a frog: Linguistic typology and the expression of motion events", in Strömquist, S., L. Verhoven (eds.), *Relating Events in Narrative Volume 2: Typological and Contextual Perspectives*, London, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, pp. 219-258.
- Slobin, D. I., 2005, "Relating narrative events in translation", in Diskin, R. D., H. Bat-Zeev Shyldkrot (eds.), *Perspectives on Language and Language Development: Essays in Honour of Ruth A. Berman*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp. 115-129.
- Slobin, D. I., 2006, "What makes manner of motion salient? Explorations in linguistic typology, discourse and cognition", in Hickmann, M., S. Robert (eds.), *Space in Languages: Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, pp. 59-81.
- Snyder, W., 2001, "On the nature of syntactic variation: Evidence from complex predicates and complex word formation", in *Language*, 77, pp. 324-342.
- Talmy, L., 1985, "Lexicalization patterns: Semantic structure in lexical forms", in Shopen, T. (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description 3: Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, New York, Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-149.
- Talmy, L., 2000, *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Volume 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Zubizarreta, M. L., E. Oh, 2007, *On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.