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INTRODUCTION

This book brings together fifteen papers focusing on the morphosyntax of Romance varieties. The papers tackle different theoretical issues concerning current linguistic theory (relevant both for comparative and diachronic approaches) including parameters, features and their hierarchical organization, grammaticalization, word order changes, and the level of verb movement in different varieties. All the papers included here were presented at the workshop bearing the same title held at the University of Bucharest in November 2015.

We dedicate this book to Professor Martin Maiden in honour of his 60th birthday. In addition to his seminal contributions to Romance linguistics, Professor Maiden also undertook the challenging task of co-editing recent reference works such as The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages (2010, 2013) and The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages (2016), two comprehensive works which have reshaped the paradigm of Romance linguistics. More importantly, however, Professor Maiden is a very dear friend (and indeed one of the informal fathers) of the winter workshops in Bucharest (which accompany the Annual Conference of the Department of Linguistics). We believe that offering this book to him on the occasion of his 60th birthday is a fitting way of acknowledging his many significant contributions to Romance and Romanian linguistics and of thanking him for all his generosity.

The Editors
PART I:

THE NOMINAL DOMAIN
1. Objectives

The first section describes three syntactic structures of old Romanian, linked by common mechanisms of inversion in the order of constituents and nominal ellipsis: the genitival phrase, the partitive prepositional phrase and a combined genitive-incorporating partitive prepositional phrase, all occupying argumental positions, atypical for the syntactic composition of these phrases.

The second part deals with a special type of nominalization and compounding (the type deaproapele (“the fellowman”) [de + Adv + Det]), whose derivation has features in common with the first three constructions, but which has gone a step further in the process of recategorization. In contrast to the first three structures, in this construction inversion and ellipsis obligatorily associate with the phenomenon of recategorization of prepositional phrase headed by de as a noun. This is a complex phenomenon: lexically, the incorporation of the preposition takes place, therefore a process of compounding ([PP de [AdvP aproape]] > [DP deaproapele]); grammatically, a process of nominalization/substantivization takes place, with all its syntactic and inflectional effects.

2. Constructions ‘linked’ by inversion and nominal ellipsis

2.1. In old Romanian, a genitive can occur as a subject and as an object obligatorily preceded by the genitive/possessive marker a(l) (1a–c) and
optionally accompanied by the floating quantifier toți “all” (1d). The possessive phrase, which has the same distribution like the genitival phrase, has an identical behaviour (1f).

(1)  

a.  
și \([_{\text{GEN-P ai lui}}_{S}]_{\text{pre el}}\)  
and AL.M.PL his DOM him  
nu-1 priimiră (CC\(^1\).1567: 1\(^v\))  
not=CL.M.3SG.ACC welcome.PS.3PL  
“and his people did not receive him”

b.  
așa \([_{\text{pre [GEN-P ai lui]}}_{DO}]_{so DOM AL.M.PL his}\)  
so AL.M.PL his va  
nu-i AUX.FUT.3SG  
părăsi in nevoie (CC\(^1\).1567: 83\(^v\))  
leave.INF in need  
“so he will not leave his people in need”

c.  
\([_{\text{GEN-P Ai domnilor-voastre}}_{S}]_{vor}\)  
AL.M.PL lordships=your AUX.FUT.3PL  
avea leage la domnu nostru  
have.INF trial at lord our  
și la noi (DÎ.1595: CII)  
and at us  
“your lordship’s people will have a trial with our lord and with us”

d.  
Și se boteză  
and CL.REFL.ACC.3SG baptize.PS.3SG  
însuși și \([_{\text{GEN-P ai lui}}_{S}]_{[toți]}\)  
himself and AL.M.PL his all  
aciaș (CPr.1566: 78)  
here  
“and he and all his people were baptized here”

e.  
Că, iată, dragii miei,  
because behold dear.DEF.VOC my  
\([_{\text{POS-P al meu}}_{S}]_{apropie}\)  
AL.M.SG my draws.near  
câtă mine (Ev.1642: 310)  
towards me  
“because, behold, my dear ones, my man is coming closer to me”
f. Eu săntu păstoriulu cela
I am shepherd.DEF CEL.M.SG
bunulu, şi cunoscu
good.M.SG.DEF and know.1SG
[POS-\textit{ale saleşu}]_{DO} şi-su cunoscutu
AL.F.PL his and=am know.PPLE
[PP de [POS-\textit{ale meleşu}]_{AL.PREP.OBJECT}] of AL.F.PL my
“I am the good shepherd and I know his things and I am known for my things” (CC².1581: 487)

b. [PP ca [NP \textit{neşte} [GEN-P \textit{ale} \textit{unoru} like some AL.F.PL some
striiini] Ø] au pre
strangers have.3PL DOM
eale (CC².1581: 486)
them
“but they treat them like those of strangers”

The occurrence of this construction – which is the result of ellipsis (the ellipsis of the head noun; for types of ellipsis, see Nicolae 2012; 2013), is facilitated by the frequent inversion of the order of constituents in old Romanian DPs, i.e. the genitive preceding the head noun (2a,b).

(2) a. se duse de
CL.REFL.3SG go.PS.3SG that
cemhā [DP [GEN-P \textit{ai}_k \textit{lui}_i \textit{robi}_k t_i] call.PS.3SG AL.M.PL his slaves
şi deade lor avuţia
and give.PS.3SG them wealth.DEF
lui (CC¹.1567: 107')
his
“He went to call his slaves and gave them his fortune”

b. Iară fraţii cei mici
and brothers.DEF CEL.M.P little.PL
cheamă-se [DP [GEN-P \textit{ai}_k \textit{lui}_i] call=CL.REFL.3PL AL.M.PL his
\textit{ucenici}_k t_i] (CC².1581: 41)
apprentices
“and the little brothers are called apprentices”
An extremely interesting example is (1g), in which the indefinite article *nește* precedes a genitive, as an effect of head ellipsis and substitution by the genitive.

2.2. A similar phenomenon occurs in partitive PPs, which, in OR, admit the ellipsis of the quantified nominal head, whose effect is the occurrence of the prepositional partitive restriction in argumental position, subject (3a,b) or direct object (4a-d). In 16th century texts, the most frequent partitive preposition is *de* (3, 4), but also the other partitive prepositions (*den/din* “of”; *dentre/dintre* “of”), that introduce the partitive restriction, may occur as arguments, subjects (5a–c) and objects (6a–d). Usually, partitive prepositions select an NP whose head is in the plural (see (3a,b), (4a,b), (5a–c), (6c)); the selection of a singular form is also possible, with collective or mass nouns ((4c); (6a,b,d)); see also Pană Dindelegan (2016: 327).

(3) a. știe tatălu vostru den
knows father.DEF.NOM your from
ceriu că trebuiaște-vă [ PP de
heaven that need=CL.DAT.2PL of
acealea]s(CC2.1581: 216)
those
“your heavenly father knows that you need those”

b. după potopu au fostu [ PP de
after flood AUX.PERF.3PL been of
toate bucatele]s (CC2.1581: 51)
all foods
“after the flood there were all kinds of food”

(4) a. Cum au fostu zâsă
how AUX.PERF.3SG be.PPLE say.PPLE.F
noao, [ PP de toate legumile]DO
us.DAT of all vegetables
să mâncămu (CC2.1581: 51)
SĂSUBJ eat.SUBJ.1PL
“how we were told, to eat of all kinds of vegetables”

b. [ PP di toate]DO să cumpere
of all.F.PL SĂSUBJ buy.SUBJ.3SG=PL
“to buy a bit of everything” (DÎ.1600: XXII)
c. vom mânca de acest strâns | (Sind.1703: 100°)
gathered
“we shall eat of what we have gathered”

(5) a. au picat și den săimeni și den căzaci | Turkish.soldiers and of Cossacks
“some of the Turkish soldiers and some of the Cossacks fell” (CLM.1700–50: 267°)
b. s-au strânsu târgoveți și den slugile townsmen and of servants
neguțitorilor | (CLM.1700–50: 176°)
“some of the townsmen and of the traders’ servants gathered”
c. iar unii dzicè că dintre and some said.3PL that of dânșii | them
otrăvit | poison.3SG
“and some said that one of them poisoned him”

(6) a. să oprea<ś>că de șă SUBJ stop.3SG=3SG of here
nainte den bir | DOM (DÎ.1600: XXX)
on tax
“but they should keep a part of the tax from now on”
b. să însoare pre Pătrașco marry DOM Pătrașco=prince and să-i dea | give.3SG of ruda relative emperor
“to marry prince Pătrașco and to give him one of the emperor’s relatives as a wife”
  “sell a part of your fortunes”

d. să-și răscumpere SĂSUB=CL.REFL.DAT.3PL pay.back.3PL
  [[PP den singele] ce le of blood.DEF that CL.DAT.3PL
  șăimeanii do.PLUPERF.3PL Turkish.soldiers.NOM
  lor] _DO_ (CLM.1700–50: 187”) their
  “to pay back some of the blood of the Turkish soldiers
  that he had shed”

As in the case of the genitive, the placement of the prepositional partitive restriction in an argumental position is the result of ellipsis: the nominal head is elided (the head of the partitive construction). As in the case of the genitive, ellipsis is favoured by the frequent anteposition of the partitive restriction (7a–c):

(7)  
  a. [[DP[{PP dentr-a patra parte}i] of=A fourth part
  giumățate t_1] (DIR.A.I.1601: 21) half
  “a half of the forth part”
  b. mergând [[DP [PP dintr-aceia]i] going of=those
  unii t_1] (CIst.1700–50: 17”) some.M.PL
  “some of those going”
  c. au și peritu [[DP [PP den AUX.PERF.3PL also died of
  munteani]i] câțva t_1] (CLM.1700–50: 229”) Wallachians some.M.PL
  “some of the Wallachians died”

2.3. A special type of ‘de’ partitive structure (see also Frâncu 1983; Giurgea 2013: 103; Pană Dindelegan 2016: 331) is the one that includes a genitive (8a) or a possessive phrase (8b,c). Examples like (9a–c) suggest
that the mechanism by which the partitive structure containing a genitive / a possessive occurs in argument position is the variation in word order resulting from the topicalization of the partitive structure. We can notice, in (8a,c), the coordination of an NP selected by a verb with a partitive prepositional phrase resulted of an ellipsis.

(8)  
a.  când va cădea cineva  
then AUX.FUT.3SG fall.INF somebody.NOM  
in boală, [au [PP de [GENP ai  
in disease or of AL.M.PL  
casei]], au [DPmăcar şi  
house.DEF.GEN or even also streinii]s (AAM.1713: 23v)  
strangers.DEF.NOM  
“when someone gets ill, either somebody in the family or even strangers”

b.  au [PP de-[POS P al  
AUX.PERF.3SG take.PPLE of=AL.M.SG  
nostru]DO şi  
our and  
ne-au dat  
CL.DAT.1PL=AUX.PERF.3SG give.PPLE  
[PP de-[POS P al său]]DO  
of=AL.M.SG his  
“they took from what is ours and they gave some of his own” (DPar.1683: III/95v)

c.  strângându- [[DP oşti] şi [PP de  
gathering armies and of  
[POS P ai săi]]DO (CLM.1700–50: 171v)  
AL.M.PL his  
“gathering armies and some of his people”

(9)  
a.  Şi periră acolo [DP [PP de-i  
and die.PS.3PL there of=AL.M.PL  
lui Por]i  4.000 de mii t.]  
LUI.GEN Por 4000 of thousand  
şi [DP [PP de-i lu  
and of=AL.M.PL LUI.GEN  
Alexandru]j  6.000 t.] (A.1620: 33v)  
Alexandru 6000  
“And 4000 of Por’s people and 6000 of Alexander’s died there”
b. că lesions iau unii  
because easy take.3PL some.M.PL  
[DP [PP de [GENP ale altora]];  
of others.GEN  
cuvinte]  
words (CIst.1700–50: 39")  
“because some take some of other people’s words easy”  
c. nu numai streini, ce și  
not only strangers but also  
[DP [PP de [POSp a noștri]];  
of our  
moldoveni]  
Moldavians  
“not only strangers, but also some of our Moldavians”  
(NL.1750–66: 65)

The ellipsis of the nominal head is common to the three patterns (§§2.1; 2.2; 2.3), facilitated by the postposition of the head (see also Nicolae 2016: 568). There is a significant difference between the first (§2.1) and the last two patterns (§§2.2; 2.3): the first one occurs when there is an anaphoric component that conserves morphosyntactic features of the elided component (e.g. the possessive-genitival marker “al”), a structure that resembles the ‘cel’ nominal ellipsis structure (cel frumos ‘the beautiful one’; see Dragomirescu, Nicolae 2016), while the pattern with a partitive PP is characterized by the complete loss of the information of the elided component.

3. Adverb nominalizations; deaproapele (“the fellowman”), a special type of nominalization

Many studies dedicated to old Romanian signal the frequency of nominalized adverbs (see, for example, Densusianu 1961 [1938]: 198, where the locatives (mai)susul “higher.DEF”, (mai)giosul “lower.DEF”, the tense adverbs apoia “afterwards.DEF”, apoii “then.DEF”, apoile “then.DEF”; astăzile “today.DEF”, the quantitatives multa “much.DEF”, destulul “enough.DEF” are listed as nominalized adverbs (10). In some studies on old Romanian, the discussion of adverb nominalization takes place in a larger context of adjective and participle nominalization (Stan 2012; 2013: 27–8; Dragomirescu, Nicolae 2016; the latter make a terminological distinction between nominalization, realized by attaching the enclitic determiner, and nominal ellipsis, realized with the determiner cel, a free
morpheme (*noua* vs *cea nouă* “the new one”; *derepţii* vs *cei* *d(e)repti* “the righteous”).

(10)  

a. începu de la apoii  
start.PS.3SG from afterwards.PL.DEF 
întâii (CT.1560–1: 42\textsuperscript{v})  
until first.PL.DEF 
“he started from the last ones to the first ones”

b. voru fi întâii  
AUX.FUT.3PL be.INF first.PL.DEF.NOM 
apoii şi apoii  
and afterwards.DEF and afterwards.DEF.NOM 
întâii (CC\textsuperscript{2}.1581: 201)  
first.PL.DEF 
“the first ones will be the last and the last ones will be the first”

3.1. A syntactic pattern similar to the ones discussed under §2 is the one in which the nominal head is elided, when it is accompanied by an adverbial modifier of the noun, introduced by the preposition *de* and placed, just like in the other elliptical phrases, in argumental position (11a,b):

(11)  

a. Dumnedzău învaţă să agiutorim  
God teaches \text{SĂ} _{\text{SUBJ}} help.SUBJ.1PL 
[[fratele nostru]DO şi  
brother.DEF our and  
[deaproapele nostru cel  
fellowman.DEF our CEL.M.SG sărac]]DO (CazV.1643: 228\textsuperscript{v}) 
poor 
“God teaches us to help our brother and our poor fellowman”

b. Iară [de-aproapele nostru]S iaste tot  
and fellowman.DEF our is all 
omul ce-i trebuiaşte milă  
man that=CL.DAT.3SG need.3SG pity 
şi agiatoriu de la noi  
and help from us 
“and the fellowman is anyone that needs our pity and help” (CazV.1643: 344\textsuperscript{v})
One can notice that, in this context, a different *de* is used, which is not partitive *de*, but a functional *de*, specialised for introducing nominal modifiers. The construction is based on an adverbial modifier of the noun, of the type (12):

(12)  
\[ \text{a. era } \text{*rudă de aproape lu} \]  
was relative of close LUI.DAT  
Hristos (CC1.1567: 198r)  
Christ  
“he was a close relative of Christ”  
\[ \text{b. ca nește } \text{frați de-aproape} \]  
like some brothers of=close  
“like close brothers” (CazV.1643: 293r)

Usually, adverbial modifiers of the noun occur postnominally (12), but, like all the other constituents that are subordinate to the archaic NP, they can also occur prenominally (13a-c), a word order that facilitates the licensing of ellipsis.

(13)  
\[ \text{a. carea o am} \]  
which.DEF.ACC CL.ACC.F.3SG AUX.PERF.1SG  
arătat cătră acest show.PPLE towards this  
adevărati și de aproape true and of close  
prăiaten (SVI.~1670: 116r)  
friend  
“which I have shown to this true and close friend”  
\[ \text{b. întru ceale de-apoi} \]  
in those of=afterwards  
dzâle (DPar.1683: I/4v)  
days  
“in those later days”  
\[ \text{c. Socotind prorocul acea} \]  
judging prophet.NOM that  
\text{de-apoi a ta, } \text{Hristoase,}  
of=afterwards AL.F.SG your Christ.VOC  
\text{venire} (DPar.1683: III/109v)  
coming  
“as the prophet was thinking of your last coming, Christ”
3.2. Differently from the situations discussed above, in these contexts, inversion and ellipsis go one step further, being obligatorily accompanied by the phenomenon of recategorization of the de-PP phrase as a noun. This phenomenon is complex: lexically, it presupposes a process of P-incorporation, i.e. a process of compounding ([PP de [AdvP aproape]]) > [DP deaproapele]), resembling the one in dâns(ul) “he” (de + însu); grammatically, nominalization takes place, with all of its syntactic and inflectional effects.

The syntactic diagnostics which signal the loss of autonomy of the preposition and its incorporation as part of a lexical word in this structure are the following:

- occurrence of the structure as a S (see (11b), (14a,b)) and a DO (see (11a)); see also its occurrence as an IO (14c), where it can be coordinated with a prototypical indirect object); as a DO, deaproapele is constructed, like all personal nouns of this period, either with (15b,c) or without the differential marker pre (15a);
- occurrence in the genitive (16a,b);
- association with another preposition – any lexical preposition (cu “with”, cătră “towards”, spre “towards”) (17a,b); a decisive argument is its association with another instance of de, the first one being selected by the head (17c):

(14) a. Cine iaste [de-aproapele] who is of=close.one.DEF.NOM nostru]S? (CazV.1643: 292”)
our
“Who is our fellowman?”

b. A treia arată că AL.F.SG third shows that [de-aproapele]S nu să cheamă of=close.one.DEF not CL.REFL call.3SG omul (...) (CazV.1643: 341”)
man.DEF
“The third one shows that our fellowman is not called a man”

c. de folos iaste [[lui Dumnedzău]IO of use is LUL.DAT God şi [şi]IO şi [de-aproapelui and himself and of=close.one.DEF.DAT
“it is useful to God and to himself and to his fellowman”

(15) a. Să iubeşti [de-aproapele tău] DO
    SĂ SUBJ love.SUBJ.2SG of=close.one.DEF your
    ca săngur pre tine
    as yourself DOM you
    “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself”
    (ȘT.1644: 58)

b. Pentru ce tu bat
    for what you beat.2SG
    [pre de-aproapele] DO? (DPar.1683: III/35)
    DOM of=close.one.DEF
    “Why are you beating your fellowman?”

c. Sau [pre deaproapele său] DO
    or DOM of.close.one.DEF his
    îl pizmuiaște (CPV.~1705: 62)
    CL.ACC.M.3SG envy.3SG
    “or he envies his fellowman”

(16) a. să apuce hotarul
    SĂ SUBJ grasp.SUBJ.3SG border.DEF.ACC
    [GENp deaproapelui său] (Prav.1646: 54)
    of.close.one.DEF.GEN his
    “in order to take over the land of his fellowman”

b. glasului [GEN-P de-aproapelui]
    voice.DEF.GEN≡DAT of=close.one.DEF.GEN
    “(to) the fellowman’s voice” (DPar.1683: III/2)

(17) a. liubovul cătră Dumnezeu și
    love.DEF towards God and
    [PP cătră [dp deaproapele său]]
    towards of.close.one.DEF his
    “the love for God and for his fellowman”
    (VRC.1645: 2)

b. va vătăma foarte mult
    AUX.FUT.3SG hurt.INF very much
    [PP spre [dp deaproapele fieșcui]]
    towards of.close.one.DEF everyone.GEN
    “he will hurt everyone’s fellowman a lot”
    (Prav.1646: 170)

c. nu i să
    not CL.DAT.3SG CL.REFL.3SG
Inversion and Nominal Ellipsis

face milă [PP de]
becomes pity of
[PP de-aproapele său] (DPar.1683: III/20')
of=close.one.DEF his
“he will not have pity for his fellowman”

As an inflectional cue for nominalization, we mention the association with the enclitic article (18a,b):

(18) a. iubeaște [de-aproapele tău]DO
    love.IMP.2SG of=close.one.DEF your
    “love your fellowman” (Caz.V.1643: 274')

b. Tot însul [de-aproapelui]IO
    all man.NOM of=close.one.DEF.DAT
    s-agiuțe (DPar.1683: III/8'v)
    SĂ_SUBJ=help.SUBJ.3SG
    “all men should help their fellowmen”

As a noun, deaproapele does not have a plural form; other nominalizations de(n)apoiiur (of-after-PL “the things that follows”), alsăuri (al-his(POSS.ADJ)-PL “his belongings”) have a plural form, marked by the inflexion –uri, usually used as a nominalization device.¹

3.3. The nominalization deaproapele belongs to the 17th century, with a peak in the period 1640–1700. After 1700, its occurrence is ever increasingly rarer, as its nominal form is limited to the non-prepositional construction of the adverb (aproapele).

The form deaproapele is predominant in Moldova, in texts such as Caz.V.1643, ŞT.1644, Prav.1646, DPV.1673, DPar.1683; for example, in just one text (Caz.V.1643), the de-pattern occurs 14 times as a DO, 4 times

¹ Adverbal nominalization, irrespective of the nominalization pattern, selects common inflectional markers: the enclisis of the definite determiner and the neuter plural marker -uri: lăuntruri (inside.PL “insides”, CP¹.1577: 14r); nontrurile (inside.PL.DEF ‘the insides’, DPar.1683: IV.48'); napoiurile (back(wards).PL.DEF “the backward parts”, DPar.1683: IV.53')). It is interesting that other special nominalizations, some of which are accidental, have an -uri plural form, showing that -uri, even in his earliest occurrences, also had the supplementary function of nominal categorizer; see, for example, the nominalization of the possessive: alsăuri (al-his(POSS.ADJ)-PL), alsăurile (al-his(POSS.ADJ)-PL.DEF) “(the) belongings” (DPar.1683: III.127'; AD.1722–5: 121'); for the role of the inflexion -uri as a nominal categorizer, see Pană Dindelegan (2002: 38–9; 2009: 23).
as a S, 3 times as an IO, 5 times as a PP, one time as a predicative, 4 times as a genitive. Without being as frequent, the form *deaproapele* is not completely absent from Wallachia (a few example occur in Mârg.1691 or in Înv.~1700) or from Transylvania (see, in CDicţ.1691–7: 413, synonyms *rudă* “relative”, *priiatin* “friend”, *deaproapele* “the close one”; see also CPV.~1705: 62y).

4. Conclusions

Four old Romanian nominal constructions show the same mechanism of inverted word order and ellipsis, which makes possible the occurrence of non-prototypical constituents as arguments (the genitive phrase, the partitive prepositional object, the partitive prepositional object that incorporates a genitive phrase and an adverbial prepositional modifier; see also the placement of the genitive phrase on the right-hand side of the indefinite determiner *neşte* (1g)).

Only one of these constructions (a prepositional modifier of the noun) undergoes a further change, taking part in a process of compounding (the incorporation of the preposition *de*) and of nominalization (the result is *deaproapele* “the close one.DEF”).

In the 17th century, the pattern *deaproapele* [de+Av+Art]N has a high frequency in Moldova; rarely, it occurs in Wallachia and in Transylvania; afterwards, the structure *deaproapele* becomes obsolete, being replaced by its nominalized correspondent *aproapele*, without preposition ([Av+Art]N), still currently attested.
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