ON THE ORIGIN OF THE ROMANIAN CONJUNCTION/COMPLEMENTIZER *DE*[*]

ION GIURGEA[1]

Abstract: The origin of the conjunction/complementizer *de* constitutes an open problem, as none of the etymologies proposed until now is satisfactory. Following Sava (2012), I distinguish consecutive/coordinative *de* (de_1) from temporal/conditional *de* (de_2), as these uses point to different origins: de_1 must come from a deictic adverb meaning 'thus, and then', indicating temporal sequence and result, whereas de_2 originates in a temporal subordinator. I argue that the most likely etymon of de_1 is Latin *inde*, although other possibilities (*dein*, *unde* or *dē+hīc/hāc*) cannot be completely excluded. For de_2 I propose Lat. *unde*. Relative *de* (de_3) represents a secondary development of de_1 or de_2. I argue that ORo. *înde* and the MoRo. *inde* (a regional term from Transylvania) do not continue Lat. *inde*, but represent two independent developments of *unde*.

Keywords: etymology, pseudo-coordination, Romanian, historical linguistics.

1. INTRODUCTION

The conjunction/complementizer *de* constitutes an open problem in Romanian linguistics, both regarding its syntactic analysis and its origin. Regarding its synchronic analysis, the first problem concerns even its category, as can be seen from the label 'conjunction/complementizer'. First, some terminological clarifications are in order, due to the differences between traditional grammar and modern grammars rooted in the generative tradition with respect to the categorization of clause-relating elements. I will avoid terms that are potentially ambiguous such as 'conjunction'[2]. I will use the term 'coordinator' for the traditional 'coordinating conjunction' and the generative 'conjunction', the term 'subordinator' as a cover-term for traditional 'subordinating conjunctions', and the term 'complementizer' for subordinators which cannot be assigned to other categories such as adverbs or prepositions (thus, I do not reserve this term for subordinators introducing complement clauses, but I also include subordinators introducing adjunct and relative clauses).

[*] I am very grateful to Donca Steriade and Dana Zamfir for their valuable comments on preliminary versions of this article.

[1] The "Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, giurgeaion@yahoo.com.

[2] The syntactic behavior of what are traditionally called 'coordinating' and 'subordinating conjunctions' is so different that their inclusion in a single category 'conjunction' is disputable and has been rejected in generative grammars. I will use the term 'conjunction' only in the meaning 'conjunction of constituents', 'constituent formed by coordination'.

RRL, **LXIV**, *1*, p. 3–28, Bucureşti, 2019

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

Whereas a subordinator status is undisputable, there are contexts in which *de* behaves as a coordinator, the clearest situation being when the clause which follows *de* has the imperative mood (the imperative cannot be embedded in Romanian):

(1) Mergi de-mi adu dosarul!
go.IMPV.2SG *de*-me.DAT bring.IMPV.2SG file-the
'Go bring me the file!' (Caragiale, O. I, 160, in DLR s.v. *de*)

Even in one of its uses where it is generally described as a complementizer, namely, when it introduces what looks like the complements of various classes of verbs, it shows a paradoxical behavior in that it heads clauses with *independent modality* even with verbs normally selecting irrealis complements (see (2)) and with aspectual verbs (see (3)), which lack even independent tense (Landau 1999). Thus, 'x wanted'+*de*+*p* in (2) is interpreted as 'x wanted *p* and thus *p* happened'; in (3), 'x stopped *de* not-*p*' is interpreted as 'x stopped *p* (and therefore *p* was no longer the case)'.

(2) Dumnezeu a vrut de nici n-a adiat vântul măcar!
God has wanted *de* not-even not-has breezed-softly wind-the at-least
(non-standard Modern Ro.: Frăteşti, Ilfov county, in Vulpe 1980:97)
'It was God's wish that there wasn't even the slightest breath of wind.'
(3) Numa atuncea se oprea de nu plângea
only then REFL stop.IMPF.3SG *de* not cry.IMPF.3SG
'It was only then that (s)he would stop crying'
(non-standard Modern Ro.: Burzuc, Bihor county, in Vulpe 1980:115)

The independent modality and tense, manifested in the use of the indicative in all its tenses, with their normal deictic interpretation (i.e., referring to the utterance-time), indicate a coordinator status. However, in these examples the clause introduced by *de* also provides somehow the content of the internal argument of the verb in the first clause – note that the verbs *vrea* 'want' and *se opri* 'stop' require an object (an internal argument), and in (2)-(3) the material in the *de*-clause provides the content of the object. Thus, if we adopt a coordinator analysis, we should say that *de* triggers somehow deletion of the complement of the first member of the coordination, under identity with the relevant part of the second member (for (3), all the verbal projections except for those introducing modality, tense and negation; for (2), we should only exclude modality and probably tense, which is in principle dependent after bouletic verbs):

(3)′ [se-opri-IND.IMPF [~~plâng~~]] [de [nu plâng-IND-IMPF [$t_{plâng}$]]]
(2)′ [vrea-IND.PF [~~nu adia~~]] [de [nu-adia-IND-PF [t_{adia}]]]

This type of asymmetric coordination, in which the second member provides the content of a missing complement of the verb in the first member, has been described in the linguistic literature under the name of *pseudo-coordination* (see Croitor 2017 for pseudo-coordination in Romanian and de Vos 2005 for a detailed treatment of pseudo-coordination in English and Afrikaans). A pseudo-coordination analysis for this type of *de* has been proposed by Sava (2012). A clear example of pseudo-coordination from modern standard Romanian is (4)a. Besides the fact that the conjunction here is the general coordinator *şi*

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

'and', a piece of evidence that the second clause is not an object clause comes from interpretation: (4)a asserts the completion of the action reported by the second clause ((s)he finished writing the letter), as expected if the mood, aspect and tense (indicative perfective past) of the second clause are interpreted, as in a main coordinate clause; however, the complement clause of the verb 'begin' never implies completion of the started action, as can be seen from (4)b and from its English counterpart:

(4) a. S-a apucat și a scris scrisoarea.
REFL-has started and has written letter-the
'(S)he began to write the letter, and (s)he wrote it.'
b. S-a apucat să scrie scrisoarea.
REFL-has begun SBJV write.3 letter-the
'(S)he began to write the letter.'
|≠ (S)he wrote it

If we use *de*, we get the completion interpretation in (4)a, rather than the interpretation in (4)b (where (s)he may or may not have finished writing), which shows that *de* behaves as a coordinator in a pseudo-coordination construction, rather than as a subordinator:

(5) S-a apucat de a scris scrisoarea.
REFL-has started *de* has written letter-the
'(S)he began to write the letter, and (s)he wrote it.'

An analysis of pseudo-coordination constructions is a complex task I will not undertake in this article, which is dedicated to the history of *de*. For our purposes, it suffices to recognize that what have been treated as complement clauses in *de* are instances of pseudo-coordination (with the exception of *de să* clauses and indirect interrogatives, see sections 2.1 and 2.2 below). I will call this use of *de* 'pseudo-completive'.

Before getting to the historical part, I will briefly present the attested uses of *de*, which are much more developed in old Romanian and contemporary non-standard varieties than in modern standard Romanian (section 2). As I am interested in the origin of *de*, I will provide examples from Old Romanian, without considering its evolution from Old to Modern Romanian. I will then proceed to the etymological issue, the main goal of this paper (section 3). In both the descriptive and the diachronic part, I heavily rely on Sava's (2012) dissertation, which summarizes the various etymological proposals and provides a detailed picture of the uses of *de* in Old Romanian.

2. USES OF *DE*

Sava (2012), following Roques (1907), identifies two major classes of uses, which may rely on different etyma. As these classes roughly correlate with the normal position of the clause introduced by *de*, we may refer to them as 'postposed' and 'preposed' *de*; however, as the type for which the normal position is preposed also developed some postposed uses, it is safer to use the labels de_1 and de_2. Moreover, as the historical relation of the relative complementizer *de* with these two types is not fully clear, I will use the label

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

de$_3$ for this type of *de*. Here is a tableau of these types, exemplified under (7) and treated in detail in the rest of the section:

	Uses	Position
(6)	de$_1$: result, coordination + result, pseudo-purpose (purpose + result), pseudo-completive (+subjunctive): purpose, completive (subordinator)	postposed
	de$_2$: conditional, temporal	preposed /
	indirect interrogative	postposed
	de$_3$: relative	postposed

(7) a. de$_1$: Mă doare de-mi vine să urlu
me hurts *de*-me.DAT comes SBJV scream.1SG
'It hurts so badly that I feel like screaming'

b. de$_2$: De-aş fi ştiut, aş fi venit
de-would.1SG PRF known would.1SG PRF come
'If I had known, I would have come'

c. de$_3$: ăla de miroase puternic (non-standard Modern Ro.: Vulpe 1980: 136)
that *de* smells strongly
'the one that smells strongly'

2.1 *De*$_1$

De$_1$ includes the pseudo-completive use briefly described in the introduction. This use is naturally derived from the function of introducing result clauses (the consecutive use), which is attested since the oldest texts and is preserved in the modern standard language (where the pseudo-completive use has disappeared)[3]:

(8) După aceea eu amu fost sărac, de n-am avut cu ce mă plăti
after that I have been poor *de* not-have.1SG had with what me pay.INF
'Then, I was poor, so that I could not pay for myself' (DÎ, II, Gorj, 1563–1564)

Sometimes the consequence relation between the two connected clauses is inferred by considering the event described in the second clause as the goal of the action described in the first clause. In such cases *de* is claimed to have a final (purposive) use (cf. Zafiu 2016), but we should notice that the use of the indicative correlates with a realis interpretation, which is not found in bona fide purpose clauses:

(9) ci ne-a<u> venit de ne-au fost domni (DÎ, XVIII, Târgovişte, 1599)
which us.DAT-have come *de* us.DAT-have been rulers
'who came here so to be our sovereigns (and so they were)'

(10) o deade la meşter de o legă (DÎ, LIX, Galaţi, 1570–1571)
it.ACC gave.3SG to craftsman *de* it.ACC bound.3SG
'She gave it (= a psalter book) to a craftsman to bind it (and he bound it)'

[3] The complementizer use was still attested in non-standard regional varieties in the second half of the 20th century (Vulpe 1980: 97, 115, 119), with a reduced frequency.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

Given this interpretation, *de* can be analyzed as a coordinator, with a richer meaning than 'and', including, besides logical conjunction, the purpose or consequence relation (Densusianu 1938, Rosetti 1986, Dragoş 1995, Gheţie et al. 1997, Pană Dindelegan 2016 include *de* both under coordinators and subordinators; for the difficulty to decide between a coordinative and subordinative status in the case of the purpose use, see Avram 1960, Dragoş 1995: 116, 120, Gheţie et al. 1997: 361, Nedelcu, 2008: 646, Zafiu 2016). An argument in favor of a coordinator status is the existence of examples in which the second clause has an imperative:

(11) pasă de te pocăiaşte (CC[2] 1581: 5, apud Zafiu 2016)
go.IMPV.2SG *de* REFL.2SG repent.IMPV.2SG
'go and repent'

We may call this use 'pseudo-purpose', as it involves, like the pseudo-completive use, a richer meaning (with an intended result component) added to a coordinating element. Note that bona fide subordinate purpose clauses never imply the achievement of the intended result.

When the matrix verb itself, even if it does not require a clausal complement, includes a meaning of command (e.g. *trimite* 'send', *se sfătui* 'take counsel with'), *de* may be analyzed either as a pseudo-purpose coordinator or as pseudo-completive coordinator.

A clear pseudo-completive coordinator status can be assumed for cases when the matrix verb requires a complement. This type is rare in the earliest attested stage (the 16th century; see Gheorghe & Mîrzea Vasile 2013, Hill & Alboiu 2016) and increases in the 17th-18th centuries, after which it decays, disappearing from the standard language (but surviving in non-standard varieties, see Vulpe 1980):

(12) au poruncitu de au făcut un sicreiu (Ureche, 178, apud Hill & Alboiu 2017:174)
has ordered *de* have made a coffin
'He ordered (them) to make a coffin (and so they did)'

The verbs and expressions taking *de* + indicative belong to two types[4]: (i) verbs/expressions for which the occurrence of the event described in the second clause is a result of the event in the matrix clause, either a necessary result (*apuca, începe* 'begin', *avea obicei, obişnui* 'use to', *se deprinde* 'get accustomed to', *face* 'make' (causative), *cuteza* 'dare', *se apuca* 'start', *găsi vreme* 'find time to', *isprăvi* 'finish', *păzi* 'take care to', *se învrednici* 'succeed') or an attempted/envisaged result, whose fulfillment is asserted by the *de*-clause (*pune, porunci, învăţa* 'command', *îndemna* 'urge, advise', *stărui* 'insist', *zice* 'say' with the meaning 'command', *vrea* 'want', *se ispiti* 'attempt', *nevoi* 'strive to, attempt', *sta* 'insist to', *avea voie* 'be allowed to', *lăsa* 'allow', *cere* 'ask', *ajuta* 'help'); (ii) impersonal and raising verbs which imply the occurrence of the event in the complement clause: *se întâmpla*, *se prileji*, *nimeri* 'happen', *fi* 'be' with the meaning 'happen', *ajunge, sosi, cădea* 'to come to'[5]:

[4] This inventory is based on Drăganu (1923), Sava (2012) and Hill & Alboiu (2016).

[5] To these verbs, the modern Romanian dialectal data reported in Vulpe (1980) add one attestation of *plăcea* 'like':

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

(13) aşea lăcomindŭ la <a> altuia, sosescŭ de pierdŭ şi al său
thus coveting to (-the)-other.GEN turn.3PL *de* lose.3PL also the REFL.POSS
'Thus coveting someone else's belongings, they end up losing also their own'
(Costin, L. 89, apud Hill & Alboiu 2017: 176)

As shown in (3) above, cessation verbs take negation in the *de*-clause (beside *se opri*, I found an example of this type with *se lăsa* 'cease', cited by Drăganu 1923: 272).

The limitation of *de* + indicative to these verbs and the realis interpretation clearly indicate that the origin of this construction is the result clause[6]: first, it is precisely for these verbs that V(*p*) can have '*p* happened' as a consequence. Secondly, result clauses, unlike final clauses, refer to actual results of the main clause – more precisely, the propositions they introduce are evaluated at the same possible worlds as the matrix clause (if the proposition in the matrix clause is claimed to be true in the real world, so is the proposition in the result clause, and so on), which correlates in Romanian with the use of the indicative mood.

This type of *de*-clauses contrasts with genuine complement clauses, represented by infinitives and subjunctives, by the realis interpretation.

Hill & Alboiu (2016) claim that the realis interpretation was not obligatory before the 18th century, but the examples they provide are not convincing. I discuss their alleged counterexamples in detail in an Appendix.

The pseudo-completive use with verbs of the type 'happen, come to' explains, via ellipsis, the collocation *cum de* 'how was/is it possible that', still current in modern standard Romanian:

(14) Cum de n-am ştiut?
how *de* not-have.1SG known
'How could I not know?'

De$_1$ may also combine with the subjunctive (introduced by the marker *să*), in final and complement clauses, in which case the realis interpretation is suspended, the *de*-clause being synonymous with infinitives and subjunctives. In such cases, *de* is a subordinator. In modern Romanian, *de* + subjunctive can be found in result clauses, the subjunctive indicating a potential result:

(15) Copilul... se făcuse un băiat de să nu te înduri de el
child-the REFL had-become a boy *de* SBJV not REFL bear.2SG of him
'The child had become such a boy that one could not bear [to separate from] him'
(Ispirescu, *Legende* 141, apud Drăganu 1923: 267)

(i) Îi mai plăcea de bea
3SG.DAT more like.IMPV.3SG *de* drink.IMPV.3SG
'(S)he liked to drink sometimes / (S)he also liked to drink'

In this case, *plăcea* 'like' + an activity complement has a reading in which it implies the performance of this activity on several occasions. The verb in the *de*-clause is indeed an imperfect with a habitual reading.

[6] For the realis interpretation of *de* + indicative, see Drăganu (1923), Frâncu (2000), Repina (2006), Sava (2012).

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

De$_1$ is also found in Aromanian (with the form *di*) and Meglenoromanian (with the forms *di* or *dă*), with the same uses (result, see (16)a-b, purpose + achieved result, see (16)c, temporal sequence or purpose + achieved result, see (17)a–b, pseudo-completive – i.e. achieved result –, see (16)d; the examples below, except (17)b, are taken from Drăganu 1923: 260–272):

(16) a. Se aspar căpârle di-ń fug (Ar., Papahagi, *Basme*, 26)
REFL get-frightened.3PL goats-the *de*-me.DAT run.3PL
'My goats get frightened and (so that) they run away'
b. Plăndzi di ţi-aspardzi ocl´il´ (Ar., ibid. 3)
weep.2SG *de* you.DAT break.2SG eyes-the
'You're weeping so much/so hard that you're breaking your eyes'
c. Si duţi di lu află (Ar., Jahresbericht II, 50, 29)
REFL goes *de* him meets
'She goes to meet him (and she meets him)'
d. Cum putuşĭ di'nviţaşĭ ahtare băteare muşată cu fluiara?
how could(PRF).2SG *de* learned.2SG such play beautiful with pipe-the
'How were you able to learn to play the pipe so beautifully?'
(Ar., Obedenaru, *Texte macedo-române... de la Cruşova*, II, 46)

(17) a. Si toarnă di lę trei tăciuni prinşi (Megl., Papahagi, *Megleno-Români*
REFL turns-back *de* takes three embers glowing I, 101)
'She turns back and takes three glowing embers'
b. ia-li di li speală (Megl., Capidan 1935, s.v. *di*)
take.IMPV.2SG-them *de* them wash.IMPV.2SG
'Take them and wash them / Go and wash them!'

Examples of Aromanian *di* in pseudo-coordination with aspectual verbs can be found in ALAR:

(18) Acăţă di-alģaşti perlu. (ALAR I, map 16, point 19)
began.3SG *de*- whitens hair-the
'The hair began to turn white'

In the ALAR map 16, for the verb 'turn gray (about the hair)', I found this construction ('began/begins' + *de* + 'whitens') in 8 cartographic points (3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 19, 25, 35).

2.2 *De*$_2$

De$_2$ is mostly used as a conditional complementizer:

(19) **de** veţi priimi mine, priimi-veţi cela ce m-au tremes
if will.2PL receive me receive-will.2PL the-one that me-has sent
'If you receive Me, you will receive the One who has sent Me' (Coresi, Tetr. 138^{v})

As it introduces a conditional, it mostly precedes the main verb, by which it differs from *de*$_1$ which is always postposed. Like in various other languages, including the rest of

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

Romance, the conditional complementizer is also used to introduce indirect polar interrogatives. In this use, *de*$_2$ normally follows the matrix verb:

(20) Lasă să vedem **de** va veni Ilie să mântuiască el
let.IMPV.2SG SBJV see.1PL if will.3SG come Elias SBJV save.3.SBJV him
'Let's see whether Elias will come to save him' (Coresi, Tetr. 64^{v})

The causal and concessive use of *de*, noticed in some studies (see Drăganu 1923, Gheorghe & Mîrzea-Vasile 2013, Zafiu 2016) are contextual values of the conditional one (the concessive is usually accompanied by an 'even'-focal particle: *şi, măcar*).

Although it is the most frequent conditional complementizer in Old Romanian, *de* is certainly not the oldest conditional marker, which is *se/să* (< Lat. *si*). Indeed, in the most archaic texts, such as *Codicele Voroneţean*, it has been noticed that *de*$_2$ has a temporal value and the normal conditional complementizer is *se* (Roques 1907, Zafiu 2016)[7]:

(21) Deaci, **de** venreră cătră elu, dzise cătr-înşii (Cod. Vor. 9^{v})
then when came.3PL towards him said.3SG towards them
'Then, when/as they came towards him, he said to them: (...)'
Greek: ὡς δὲ παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτόν, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (Acts 20.18)
as but came.3PL to him told.3SG them
Slavonic: i jakože priidošę kŭ nemu, reče kŭ němŭ
and as came.3PL to him said.3SG to them

As shown by Drăganu (1923:257), instances of a temporal use ('after') can also be found in folkloric poetry, as an archaism.

The evolution from a temporal subordinator to a conditional one was repeated later in Romanian – ORo. *deaca/deca/dacă* 'after' > MoRo. *dacă* 'if'.

De$_2$, as well as *de*$_3$, appear to be absent in Aromanian and Meglenoromanian[8].

[7] The temporal value is hard to distinguish from a conditional one when the tense is future, as in the following example:
(i) vreame de voiu dobândi, chiema-te-voiu (Cod. Vor. 32^{v}: Acts 24.25)
time *de* will.1SG obtain call-you.ACC-will.1SG
In this example, the Slavonic and Greek versions have a participle as V_1 + main verb as V_2 (Slavonic *vremę že polǫčivŭ prizovǫ tę*, Greek καιρὸν δὲ μεταλαβὼν μετακαλέσομαί σε), so *de* does not translate an explicit conditional.
For the sequence *de* + *se* there is one example with a conditional use (58r), one with a polar indirect interrogative use (22^{v}, see (ii)) and one with an optative use in a main clause (80^{v}), which may be related to the conditional (cf. modern Ro. *de-aş fi* 'if I were' etc.). As the conditional element here is *se*, it is not clear whether these uses reflect the existence of a conditional meaning of *de*$_2$.
(ii) dzise cătră cela ce sta, sutaşului, Pavelu, de se "omu cela rrimleanu,
said.3SG to the-one who stood.3SG centurion-the.DAT Paul *de se* man-the that Roman
fără osându binre easte voao a-l bate?" (Cod. Vor. 22^{v}: Acts 22.25)
without condemnation good is you.DAT to-him beat
'Paul said to the one standing by, the centurion, whether "it is right for you to beat the Roman man, without having him be [judged and] convicted" '

[8] Drăganu (1923) claims that the temporal meaning 'since' can be found in Aromanian, but the single example he offers is not convincing: *adžun fui ş-nu ń-deditŭ măncu; şi sătos fui* ***di*** *nu ń-deditŭ tr s-biau* (Codex Dimonie in Jahresbericht IV, 1a); the original biblical text (Matthew 25.42)

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

2.3 *De*$_3$

***De*$_3$**, called a 'relative pronoun' in traditional studies (see GLR I: 161, Vasilescu 2008: 282, DLR, Sava 2012, Gheorghe 2016), should probably be analyzed as a relative complementizer, as it is uninflected and cannot combine with prepositions (in Romanian, like in the rest of Romance, prepositions must be fronted together with wh-phrases, they cannot be stranded like in English). It is found since the earliest texts (see (22)) and survives in regional varieties to these days, but has never become more frequent than the wh-relativizers (*ce, care*).

(22) Cinre e omul de va vrea viaţă (...) ? (Psalt. Hur. [c.1500] 28^{r}, Ps. 33.13)
who is man-the *de* will.3SG want life
'Who's the man who will desire life (...) ?'

3. THE ETYMOLOGY OF *DE*

3.1 *De*$_1$

As we have seen in the previous section, the basic meaning which can be identified for *de*$_1$ is that of result, as already noticed in Meyer-Lübke (189: §560). As *de*$_1$ + indicative is still a coordinator, even in its pseudo-purpose and pseudo-completive uses, it is reasonable to assume that *de*$_1$ was initially a coordinator indicating result (Dimand 1904, apud Sava 2012), paraphrasable by 'thus, therefore', or just temporal succession – 'and then'. The fact that the pseudo-completive use is secondary can be seen along the historical development of Romanian: in the oldest attested stage (the 16th century), the pseudo-completive use is rare compared to the pure result use[9]; the pseudo-completive use increases in the 17th and 18th centuries. Analyzing the occurrences of *de* in DÎ, I found only 3 clear pseudo-completive uses (with *pune* 'order', *se tocmi* 'agree', *avea voie* 'be allowed') and 5 on the borderline between final+result and pseudo-completive (with *trimite* 'send', *se băga* 'let oneself get involved in, undertake', *da* 'give'), compared to 25 instances of *de*$_1$ that are not pseudo-completive (14 result, 4 result or pure coordinator, 7 pseudo-purpose, i.e., purpose+result); moreover, *de să* occurs only once, in a purpose clause. In the most archaic texts, the manuscripts with rhotacism, Hill & Alboiu (2016) report that the (pseudo-)complementizer[10] use is absent. In Matthew's Gospel from Coresi's *Tetraevanghel* (1560-1561), I found no example in which *de*$_1$ + indicative is used to translate a complement clause. I used for comparison Makarije's *Četvoroblagověstie*, a Slavonic translation of the gospels printed in 1512 in Wallachia, which is likely to be the

has 'and' in the place of Arom. *di*, not 'since' as Drăganu interprets it: 'I was hungry and you didn't give me to eat, I was thirsty **and** you didn't give me to drink' (*ἐπείνασα γάρ, καὶ οὐκ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν, ἐδίψησα,* ***καὶ*** *οὐκ ἐποτίσατέ με*). In the other sources I consulted, I found no example of *de*$_2$ or *de*$_3$ in the South-Danubian dialects.

[9] For the reduced frequency of complementizer *de* in the 16th century, see Gheorghe & Mîrzea Vasile (2013), Hill & Alboiu (2016), Gheorghe (2016).

[10] Hill & Alboiu call 'complementizer *de*' what we refer to as 'pseudo-completive *de*'.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

original of the Romanian version printed by Coresi (see Dimitrescu's preface to Coresi, Tetr.), and, for a better understanding of the structures, the Greek text which constitutes the remote original of the Slavonic text (I used a philological edition of the Greek New Testament). Most occurrences of *de*$_1$ translate the sequence anterior participle – main verb ('anterior participle' refers to the Slavonic perfect active participle, translating a Greek aorist participle), following the schema in (23), exemplified in (24)–(25):

(23) V_1.PTCP V_2.IND/IMPV → (Ro.) V_1.IND/IMPV *de* V_2.IND/IMPV

(24) Ro.: şi mearse de se spânzură (Coresi, Tetr. 62^r: Matthew 27.5)
and went.3SG *de* REFL hanged.3SG
Slavonic: i šédĭ udávi-sę
and go.PTCP.PRF.MSG.NOM hanged.3SG-REFL
Greek: καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἀπήγξατο
and leave.PTCP.AOR.MSG.NOM hanged.3SG.MID

(25) Ro.: Scoală de ia coconul şi muma lui şi
get-up.IMPV.2SG *de* take.IMPV.2SG child-the and mother-the his and
fugi în Eghipet (Coresi, Tetr. 3^r: Matthew 2.13)
run.IMPV.2SG in Egypt
Slavonic: Vŭstávĭ poími otróčę i m‹a›t‹e›rĭ ego
get-up.PTCP.PRF.MSG.NOM take. IMPV.2SG child.ACC and mother.ACC his
Greek: ἐγερθεὶς παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ
get-up.PTCP.AOR.MSG.NOM take. IMPV.2SG the child and the mother his

I found 22 examples of this type, most of them (18) with motion verbs in the first clause ('go', 'get up', 'sit down', 'come', 'leave', 'descend', 'fall down'); the other 3 verbs are 'take' (+object), 'untie' and 'send'.

In one of the examples, *de* might be interpreted as pseudo-completive (see (26); the verb in the first clause, *lăsa*, means 'leave' but also 'let, allow'), but this is most likely due to an error which has occurred in the printing process, because in the corresponding Slavonic text as well as in its Greek source, the second verb is singular, not plural, and has the same subject as the first one, which is an anterior participle, so that the actual meaning was not 'he let them go' but rather 'leaving them, he went away'. It is known that the persons who printed the book were not the same as the translators, see Dimitrescu's preface to Coresi, Tetr.; we may thus imagine that some person involved in the printing process, having this pseudo-completive *de* in his grammar, inadvertently substituted the singular which must have occurred in the manuscript Romanian translation with the plural expected here if the *de*-clause had furnished the content of a missing argument of the verb in the first clause, as is characteristic for the pseudo-completive use:

(26) Ro.: Şi lăsă ei de se duseră (Coresi, Tetr. 34^r: Matthew 16.4)
and left/let.3SG them *de* REFL went.3**PL**
Slavonic: i ostávlĭ ix otíde
and leave.PTCP.PRF.MSG.NOM them went-away.3**SG**
Greek: καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἀπῆλθεν
and leave.PTCP.AOR.MSG.NOM them went-away.3**SG**

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

In 7 examples, *de* translates a coordination structure – 2 with the connector 'and' and 5 paratactic (in 4 of them, both verbs are imperative; in the fifth case, the second verb is imperative). 5 out of these 7 examples involve motion verbs as V_1 ('go out', 'get up', 'go', 'come'). In all cases the events described in the two clauses are successive.

In one example, *de* renders a V_1.PART V_2 sequence where V_1 is a simultaneous ('present') participle, but was erroneously understood as anterior (the text uses the perfective past in both clauses, which yields a succession interpretation).

I also found 2 examples where V_1 is a simultaneous ('present') participle (correctly translated using imperfective verb forms) and one example where V_2 is a simultaneous participle.

Other uses of *de* belong to de_2 (19 conditional clauses, 1 indirect interrogative, 1 reason clause, translating a postposed anterior participle[11]) and de_3 (4 adnominal relatives, translating adnominal participles, 1 free relative translating a definite participle). In one case *de* occurs after the copula 'be' and might be interpreted as a pseudo-completive de_1, with the copula interpreted as 'happen', but since the original text has a participle as V_2, we may also think of relative *de*:

(27) Ro.: Era amu de avea agonisit mult (Coresi, Tetr. 41[r]: Matthew 19.22)
was.3SG now *de* had.3SG possession much
Slavonic: bě bo iměǫ stežanïa mnóga
was.3SG for having possessions many
Greek: ἦν γὰρ ἔχων κτήματα πολλά.
was.3SG for having possessions many
'for he had many possessions'

De să (i.e. *de* + subjunctive) is rare (5 occurrences: 2 in purpose clauses, 1 in a complement clause, 2 in main clauses with a directive force, where the Slavonic text has *da*+indicative).

We can conclude that de_1 in the language of Coresi's *Tetraevanghel* is essentially a coordinator (see especially the fact that in 4 examples the clause introduced by *de* has an imperative verb), but is not equivalent with 'and'; it is used to explicitly indicate succession, and probably also (intended) result (at least in some cases). Therefore, it is mostly used to render asymmetric relations between two verbs, in which one of the verbs is a participle in the original[12]. However, we cannot be sure that pseudo-completive de_1 did

[11] The example is
(i) Ro.: Greşii de vândui sânge nevinovat (Coresi, Tetr. 62[r] = Matthew 27.4)
did-wrong.1SG *de* sold.1SG blood innocent
Slavonic: sŭgrěšixŭ prědávĭ krŭvĭ nepovínǫ
did-wrong.1SG deliver.PCTP.PRF.MSG.NOM blood innocent.FSG.ACC
Greek: ἥμαρτον παραδοὺς αἷμα ἀθῷον
did-wrong.1SG deliver.PTCP.AOR.MSG.NOM blood innocent
'I have sinned having betrayed innocent blood'

[12] This use is not a peculiarity of Coresi's *Tetraevanghel*, but can be found in other 16th century texts. Here is an example from *Codicele Voroneţean* (ms. dated 1560-1580, representing a copy of an earlier translation):
(i) Ro.: venre întru pâlcu de spuse lu Pavelu (Cod. Vor. 26[r]: Acts 23, 16)
came.3SG in troop *de* said.3SG the.DAT Paul

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

not exist in the language of the translators of Coresi's *Tetraevanghel*: as the pseudo-completive use is also found in the South-Danubian dialects (see section 2.1 above), it is possible that it represents a common Romanian development and its absence in the translated texts is due to the fact that it had no counterpart in the original text (such a productive use of a pseudo-coordination construction is crosslinguistically exceptional; it is clearly absent from New Testament Greek). The possibility that the pseudo-completive use of *de*$_1$ represents a more recent development which took place independently in Dacoromanian and the South Danubian dialects cannot be excluded either (the fact that this use is rare in the 16th century original texts, as I could confirm by examining the occurrences of *de* in DÎ, supports this hypothesis).

To conclude, the origin of *de*$_1$ must be sought in an adverb showing result or temporal sequence, equivalent to 'thus', 'and then'. The fact that the result meaning must be old is demonstrated by its presence in Aromanian and Meglenoromanian. As *de*$_1$ is, thus, of what is called "common Romanian" age and since such adverbs are rarely borrowed, it is the most likely that *de*$_1$ continues a Latin word or, at least, is a Romanian creation based on Latin words. The Turkish origin suggested in Meyer-Lübke (1899: §560) must certainly be rejected. A substrate origin, also suggested by Meyer-Lübke (loc. cit.), based on the comparison with Alb. *dhe* 'and', and adopted by Tiktin (TDRG I s.v. *de*), can of course never be completely excluded (as the pre-Roman languages of the Balkans are unknown), but the comparison with Albanian *dhe* is problematic: first, this word means 'and, also', lacking the temporal sequence or result additional meaning which characterize *de*$_1$. Secondly, the Albanian interdental fricative *dh-* in word-initial position does not correspond to Romanian *d-* (see Rosetti 1986: 242-243, Brâncuş 1983: 13). Moreover, Çabej (1986: I 151) argues that *dhe* is a shortened form of *edhe* 'and, also'. Orël (1998: 85) proposes that *edhe* comes from Proto-albanian **e* (= Albanian *e* 'and', < Indo-Eur. **ōd*) + **de* (< Indo-Eur. **dō*, cf. Slavonic *da*) with *d*>*dh* in intervocalic position, but there is no independent evidence, in Albanian, for the existence of this **de*. In any case, as I have already said, the probability for a word of this type (an adverb meaning 'and then, thus') to be borrowed is small.

However, no convincing Latin etymon has yet been proposed as yet. The preposition *de* 'from', later 'of', which has become an important functional preposition in Romanian, as well as in the rest of Romance, has been proposed as the etymon of *de*$_{1,2,3}$ by Drăganu (1923)[13] – a proposal adopted in many studies: Scriban (1939), Procopovici (1948), Iordan (1954), Ciorănescu (1966), ILR II: 292, DLR, Sava (2012), Gheorghe (2013) – but, as Meyer-Lübke (1899: §560) already noticed, Lat. *de* could never have become an adverb or coordinative connector. Indeed, the transformation of a very frequently used monosyllabic preposition into an adverb has no parallel in the Romance domain. The general tendency goes in the opposite direction: the prepositions of Latin, as well as other Indo-European languages, generally originate in particles that could occur without a complement, functioning thus as (spatial) adverbs; after they start taking obligatory complements, they

Slavonic: vŭšĭdŭ vŭ plŭkŭ, sŭkaza Pavŭlu
enter.PTCP.PRF.NOM.MSG in troop said.3SG Paul.DAT
Greek: εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν παρεμβολὴν ἀπήγγειλε τῷ Παύλῳ
enter.PTCP.AOR.NOM.MSG in the troop announced.3SG the.DAT Paul.DAT

[13] Previously, Philippide (1894:51–52) had proposed Lat. *de* as an etymon, but only for *de*$_2$ in its conditional use. Drăganu (1923) extended this proposal to all uses of *de* (*de*$_{1,2,3}$).

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

never return to the stage where the complement was optional. New adverbs come from prepositional phrases based on nouns or other adverbs (see *împotrivă* 'against' < *în potrivă*, *afară* 'outside' < Lat. *ad foras, înainte* 'before' < *în* + *ainte* < *a* + **inte* < Lat. *(ab)ante*, *apoi* 'then' < Lat. *ad post*, *îndărăt* 'back' < *în* + **dărăt* < Lat. *de retro*, etc.; cf. Väänänen 1967:99 for the tendency of reinforcing adverbs in the evolution from Latin to Romance). Moreover, the semantic development from an ablative preposition to an element which indicates result or succession is highly unlikely[14]. Manoliu's (2006) proposal that *de* represents an extension to finite forms of the preposition *de* used with infinitives cannot account for the coordinating use of *de* and for the characteristic realis meaning of *de* + indicative (therefore, the verbs or nouns that take *de* + infinitive are different from those that take *de* + indicative, see Sava 2012:118); moreover, as Jordan (2009:42-43) shows, *de* + infinitive is very rare in the oldest texts – it is absent from Coresi's *Lucrul apostolesc* and his 1577 bilingual Psalter and is attested only once in *Codicele Voroneţean* – which indicates that it is more recent than de_1.[15]

Schuchardt's hypothesis (in *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, 1892, 204, apud Meyer-Lübke 1899: §560) that $de_{1,2,3}$ reflects a mixture of Latin *de* with South-Slavic *da* is likewise unacceptable because the preposition *de* and the Slavic complementizer *da* have a totally different distribution – *da* is a complementizer which introduces finite clauses, whereas the preposition *de* cannot directly combine with a finite verbal form. Moreover, Slavic *da* corresponds to the Romanian subjunctive *să* marker, being found in irrealis clauses[16], whereas the peculiarity of *de*, as I have shown, is the realis interpretation (unless it combines with the subjunctive marker *să*).

There are in fact several possible Latin candidates for an adverb/sentence connector *de* meaning 'and then; thus, therefore', but they involve certain irregular phonetic developments, which may explain why they have not been considered in previous studies. We should look for an ablative deictic adverb – 'from there/here, from now/then', which can indicate both result and succession, similar to Old Ro. *de aci* 'from here' which yielded Modern Romanian *deci* 'thus, so'. The most suitable candidate, given the meaning and

[14] Such an evolution is proposed by Drăganu (1923), who derives de_2 as well as de_1 from the temporal use of Latin *de* 'since; after'. But, notwithstanding the difficulty of the change of distribution from preposition to (adverbial) complementizer taking finite clauses, the meanings of the preposition *de* can at most explain de_2, assuming that its initial meaning was temporal anteriority. As de_1 indicates an event occurring *after* the event described in the matrix, possibly being its result, its meaning is rather the opposite of the meaning of de_2 and the preposition *de*.

[15] Densusianu (1938: 410) admits the possibility of an extension from *de* + infinitive only in the case of *de* + subjunctive.

[16] Here are examples from Coresi, Tetr.:

(i) vru amu Irod să ceară coconul **să**-l piarză voao (Coresi Tetr. 3[r])
wanted now Herod SBJV search.3.SBJV child-the SBJV-him destroy.3.SBJV you.DAT
Slavonic: xoštetŭ bo Irodŭ iskati otročęte, **da** pogubitŭ je (Matthew 2.13)
wants for Herod search child.GEN so-that destroy.PFV.3SG him
'For Herod wants to look for the child, in order to destroy him'

(ii) nu vrea mine **să** fiu împărat (Coresi, Tetr. 164v)
not want.IMPF.3 me.ACC SBJV be.1.SBJV emperor
Slavonic: ne chotęvŭšęję mĭně **da** cěsarĭ bimĭ bylŭ (Luke 19.27)
not want.PTCP.PRF.ACC.PL me.ACC that emperor be.OPT.1SG been
'who didn't want me to be emperor'

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

frequency of use it had in Latin and the extent to which it was preserved in the Romance languages, is *inde*, which had both spatial and temporal meanings – 'from there, thence, thenceforward, thereafter, thereupon, then'. As shown in REW 4368, this word is pan-Romance (besides Romanian *înde*, which I will discuss below, REW cites Old It. *inde*, *nde*, It. *ne*, *indi*, Veronese *de*, Old Logudorese *nde*, Engadinese, Friulian *in, end*, Fr. *en*, Occ. *en, ne*, Catalan *ne*, Old Sp., Old Asturian, Old Portuguese *ende*). Interestingly, this word has become a clitic in many varieties, undergoing the higher degree of phonetic reduction specific to clitics (see It. *ne*, Fr., Occ., Cat. *en*). For Romanian, we may obtain *de* by a similar irregular phonetic reduction, from the form **nde/n̥de* expected for common Romanian if *inde* had become unstressed (it has been argued that the sequences unstressed *i-* and *a-* + tautosyllabic nasal evolved to syllabic nasals in common Romanian, and the *î-* which we find in modern Dacoromanian represents an epenthetic vowel, see Puşcariu 1928: 780, Petrovici 1930: 70–71, Densusianu 1938: 32, Avram 2012: 82–88; for the interpretation of the word-initial ɲ used in the earliest texts for the present-day unstressed *în-/îm-* as a syllabic nasal, see Avram 1964: 125-126, 1990: 65, 76–80[17]). A form *nde* is also found in Old It., and its reduction to *de* is attested in Veronese.

For the loss of the initial nasal of the forms **nde/n̥de*, due to the phonetic erosion characteristic of function words, we have parallels in Aromanian: Lat. *intrō* > *(î)ntru* > *tru*, *tu*; Lat. *intrā* > *ntră* > *tră*.

A potential problem for this etymology is the fact that, according to the Dictionary of the Romanian Academy (DA), Romanian would have another form traced back to *inde*: the adverb *inde* 'where', used in Transylvania, with an archaic form *înde* meaning 'when, as' (Cod. Vor. 31^{v},5). DA explains the unexpected semantic evolution via a contamination with *unde* 'where'. This explanation is not very convincing. Scriban (1939) prefers to see *înde, inde* as mere variants of *unde*; TDRG treats *inde* as a variant of *unde* and has a special article for the archaic *înde*, for which it suggests as etymon the same *unde*[18]. I think TDRG's solution is correct. The form *inde* may owe its *i-* to the influence of *dinde* 'from where' (mentioned by DA s.v. *inde*), which might have appeared spontaneously from *de-unde* in fast speech – cf. the contraction *pănde* < *pă unde*. The form *înde*, which appears in a few of the earliest texts, should indeed be separated from *inde* 'where', because it has a different meaning and distribution – it is a temporal and conditional subordinator, never attested as an interrogative word (the following list exhausts the attestations of *înde* I've been able to find in the Old Romanian texts, using indices and the digitalized corpus of the "Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics):

(a) in Cod. Vor. 31^{v} (Acts 24, 20) it corresponds to an absolute anterior participle in the original (*înde stătuiu în gloată – stavšŭ mi vŭ sŭnĭmišti* 'as I stood before the council');

(b) in Psalt. Hur. 41^{v} (Psalm 48, 18) it corresponds to Slavonic *vŭnjegda* 'when' (Coresi's bilingual Psalter has no subordinator here);

(c) in Psalt. Hur. 45^{v} (Psalm 54, 13) and 69^{v} (Psalm 80, 14) it corresponds to Slavonic *ašte*, Greek *εἰ* 'if' (Coresi's bilingual Psalter has conditional *să/se* in both examples);

[17] See Avram (1962, 1968, 1986) for arguments in favor of the view that the support vowel *î-* is absent from the underlying phonological representation even in modern Romanian (important evidence comes from the behavior of this vowel in sandhi).

[18] Unfortunately, the new editions of TDRG (Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1988 and 2003) abandon this etymology (without even citing it!), adopting DA's etymology instead.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

in Cod. Bratul[19] it corresponds to:

(d) a preposed anterior participle[20] in 51 (*înde veni – prišedše* 'having come'), 121 line 17 (*e-nde auziră – slišavše že* 'having heard'), 128 (*e-nde trecură întânia paze şi a doao – prišedša že prĭvǫę straže i vtorǫę* 'having passed the first guard and the second'), 130 line 8 (*e-nde deşchiseră – otvrĭzše že* 'when/after they opened [the gate]'), 155 (*E-nde binevestiră ciătăţiei aceiia – blagověstvovavša že gradu tomu* 'after they preached the gospel to that city'), 158 (*e-nde veniră întru Ierusalim – prišedšę že vŭ Ier‹u›s‹a›l‹i›mĭ* 'and after they came to Jerusalem'), 190 (*e-nde auziră di-mvierea morţilor – slišavše že ot vŭskrěšenia mr‹ŭ›tvi‹xŭ›* 'when they heard about the ressurection of the dead'), 199 (*e-nde auziră elu Achila şi Prischila – slišavše ‹že› ego Akilla i Priskilla* 'Aquila and Priscilla, having heard him'), 201 (*e-nde auziră – slišavše že* 'having heard'), 208 (*e-nde auziră elu – slišavše že i* 'when they heard and...' – here *i* 'and' seems to have been erroneously translated with *elu* 'him, it'), and 230 (*înde văzură elu – viděvše ego* 'having seen him');

(e) a preposed absolute anterior participle in 129 (*e-nde bătu Petru poarta curţiei – tlŭknŭvšu že Petru vrata dvoru* 'when Peter knocked at the gate of the yard'), 130 (*e-nde fu ziuă – d‹ĭ›nĭ že byvšu* 'as soon as it was day'), 178 (*e înde zi fu – d‹ĭ›ni že byvšu* 'as soon as it was day'), 223 (*E-nde ră̆dică-se Chiprulu şi lăsemu elu de-a stânga – vŭzniku že Kipru i ostavlĭšǫ ego ot šuǫ* 'after Cyprus appeared and (we) outstripped it on the left hand'), 227 (*e-nde fumu noi întru Ierusalim – bivše že nam‹ĭ› vĭ Ier‹o›s‹o›l‹u›mě* 'when we arrived to Jerusalem'), 234 (*E multe înde fură pări* 'as there were many dissensions' – *mnodzě že bivši raspri* 'as there was much dissension'), 236 (*e-nde adunară-se cicea – sŭšedšem že se zde* 'when they had gathered here'), 258 (*e-nde acestuia fu* 'after this happened to him' – *semu že bivšu* 'after this happened') and 261 (*e-nde adunarăse ei – sŭšedše že im‹ŭ›* 'when they had gathered');

(f) a postposed absolute anterior participle in 121 line 6 (*înde pomeniiu* 'when/as I recalled' – *poměnǫše že* 'recalling'; here Coresi L. has *când pomeniiu*, and the Greek original, Acts 11.16, has a main clause – *ἐμνήσθην δὲ τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ Κυρίου* 'I remembered Lord's word') and 321 (*înde se deşertă moartea – upraznivše že se sĭmrtĭ* 'death being abolished');

(g) conditional *ašte* 'if' in 341 (*înde amu Dumnezeu îngerii ceia ce greşiră nu-i cruţă – ašte bo B‹og›ŭ a‹rxa›gg‹e›li sŭgrěšivšeę ne poštǫdě* 'if God did not spare the angels who sinned'; here Cod. Vor. has *se* 'if' and Coresi L. has *când* 'when'); in 362 and 363, *-nde* is preceded by *de* 'from, of' yielding the form *di-nde*, corresponding to Slavonic *ašte* (362: *di-nde aşa îndrăgi noi Dumnezeu – ašte sice vŭzljubi nas‹ŭ›* (*bogŭ* 'God' omitted): 'since God loved us so'; 363: *cine di-nde spune-va că... – iže ašte ispověstĭ jako...* 'whoever will declare/confess that...'; the co-occurrence of a relative and a conditional marker is probably due to the conditional marker *ἀν* in the Greek original: John's Epistle I, 4.15 *ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ὅτι...*);

(h) in five cases, the original has no subordinate clause: 148 (Acts 13.49-50: ***e-nde*** *purtase cuvântul Domnului prin toate laturile, e ovreaii întăriră curatele mueri... – pronašaaše že se slovo g‹ospod›ne po vŭsei strani, Iudei že naustišǫ častiviǫ ženi...* 'Lord's word was spreading over all countries, but the Jews stirred up the honorable women ...'),

[19] I am grateful to my colleague Dana Zamfir for having informed me of some of the attestations of *înde* in *Cod. Bratul* and of the attestations of $de_{1,2}$ in the same text, and for having checked the indices of a number of old Romanian texts for the presence of *înde*.

[20] Under 'participles' I include the invariable forms called 'gerundives' in Vaillant (1958).

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

149 (*e-nde răsipiră-se mulţimea cetăţiei – razdělišę že sę množestvomĭ grada* ‘and the crowd of the city was divided’; here the instrumental form *množestvomĭ* may have suggested an absolute participle construction; the Greek original, Acts 14.4, has coordination: *ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς πόλεως, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἦσαν σὺν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, οἱ δὲ σὺν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις* ‘and the people of the city were divided, some were for the Jews, some were for the apostles’), 169 (*e-nde sosi întru Dervie şi în Listră – prispě že vŭ Dervii i Lystrǫ* ‘(when) he came to Derbe and Lystra’), 406 (*e-nde împarte-se şi muiarea şi fata ce nu mărită-să – razděli se ž‹e›na i d‹ě›va[a] noposagšia bo* ‘woman and unmarried girl are separated’; there follows a break in the text); in 405 line 2, the relation between the two clauses is interpreted as conditional in the original: *e-nde legi-te muieriei, nu ceare dezlegarea – privezaeši že se ženě, ne išti razdrěšenia* ‘you are bound to a woman: don’t seek to be freed’ (= 1 Corinthians 7.27 *δέδεσαι γυναικί, μὴ ζήτει λύσιν*; Coresi, L. has conditional *să* here);

(i) in one case, 226, it looks as though the Romanian main verb corresponds to a postposed participle in the original, and the verb of the *(î)nde*-clause corresponds to the main verb (*E-nde nu supuindu-se elu tăcum, zisemu* ‘After we had stopped talking, as he did not obey, we said...’ – *ne povinuǫštu že se mu umlĭčaxom‹ŭ› rekšu* ‘as he did not obey, we stopped talking, saying...’ = Acts 21.14 μὴ πειθομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ἡσυχάσαμεν εἰπόντες); another possible analysis is that the translator erroneously combined two ways of rendering the anterior participle, first using *înde* and then the gerund (*supuindu-se* ‘obeying’);

(j) In Iorga’s *Apostle* (Galatians 3.25, p. 476 in Gafton’s edition of Cod. Bratul) it corresponds to a preposed absolute anterior participle: *înde veni credinţa – prišedšię věry* ‘when faith has come’, Greek *ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως*).

As can be seen from all these examples, Ro. *înde* does not correspond semantically to Lat. *inde*. It probably represents the result of a reduction undergone by *unde* ‘where’ when used as a temporal subordinator, a context in which we can assume that it had become unstressed. As discussed above, word-initial *în-* (written ⰰ or ⰰⰿ) in 16th century Romanian probably represents a syllabic nasal. So, it may be assumed that unstressed *unde* was reduced to *nde* (see the frequent form *e-nde* ‘and when/if’), realized as *n̥de* (conventionally transliterated as *înde*) when there was no vocalic support for the initial *n-*. This account is supported by the fact that *unde* itself is also used as a temporal subordinator in Cod. Bratul (the text where the most occurrences of *înde* are found) and can be used to translate an anterior participle, exactly like *înde*:

(28) Ro. E unde auzi Anania cuvintele aceastea (Cod. Bratul 47)
and where heard.3SG Anania words-the these
Slavonic: slyšavše že Anania slovesa sia
hear.PTCP.MSG.NOM PTCL Ananias words-the these
‘When Ananias heard these words...’

Note also that where Cod. Bratul 362 has the form *di-nde* ‘since, if’ (see under (g) above), Coresi, L. has *d-unde*, lit. ‘from where’). Both *de unde* ‘from where’ and *unde* were sometimes used to introduce conditional clauses in ORo. (Densusianu 1938: 284, 289).

As in section 3.2 I will propose that de_2 itself comes from Lat. *unde*, we may consider this *înde, -nde* an older form of de_2. Notice however that de_2 itself is present in Cod. Bratul, although it is not very frequent. It translates Slav. *ašte* ‘if’ (64 in an indirect

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

interrogative; 427, 432, 435, 455 in conditionals) and direct interrogatives in 40, 98 and 242. As *de*$_2$ is only found in conditionals and uses derived from the conditional, whereas *înde* is predominantly temporal, these forms cannot be considered variants. I conclude that *înde* reflects a later reduction of *unde*.

In sum, it is unlikely that Lat. *inde* is continued by Rom. *inde/înde*, because of their totally different meaning and distribution. The most likely etymon of both these forms is *unde* 'where'.

It is generally agreed that Latin *inde* has been preserved in some compound forms: Old Romanian *decinde* 'on the other side' (Megl. *diţindea*), formed with the preposition *de* and the deictic particle *ecce*, Aromanian *dinde* (< *de* + *inde*), *didinde* < (*de* + *dinde*) 'on the other side', Old Romanian *tutindere, tutindene* 'everywhere, all over' < *tot(um)* + *inde* + *re* (> Mo. Ro. *pretutindeni* 'everywhere'). As in these contexts *inde* was stressed, the phonetic evolution has been different.

Another possible Latin etymon for *de*$_1$ is *dein*, a shortened form of *deinde* = *dē* + *inde*. This form had predominantly a temporal meaning in Latin, 'thereafter, then, next', which is suitable for *de*$_1$. In Romance languages, the form *deinde* was preserved in Old Venetian *dende*, Occ. *den*, Sp., Old Port. *dende* (REW 2525), as well as in Aromanian (see above). The evolution *dein* > *de*$_1$, however, is not fully regular either: final *-n* in monosyllables is preserved in *in* > *în* (the monosyllabic pronunciation of *-ei-* in *deinde* and *dein* is indicated by Latin poetry); a preserved *-n* < *-m* might be found in *can* 'rather' < Lat. *quam* (*can* > Modern Ro. *cam*, a more recent form, see DELR II; however, Lat. *quam* has a second result in Romanian, namely *ca* 'than, as', in which the final nasal was lost); in *cum* 'with', the final nasal was preserved as *-n* before vowels at an unattested stage of the language, which explains the form *cunus(ul)* 'with him' < * *con ipso*) (+ the article *–l*). Besides, we should assume that the diphthong *-ei* was reduced to *-e*: *dein* > **dei* > *de*.

An adverb meaning 'from here/there' could also have appeared from the preposition *de* + a deictic adverb; possible combinations which may have yielded *de* are *dē hīc* and *dē hāc*; *hīc* 'here' has been preserved in Romanian in *eccum/*accu- hīc* > *aci*; from *dē hīc*, we should assume a form **dei* (with diphthong) > *de*; *hāc* '(by) this way, on this side' (a perlative adverb) is preserved as a locative deitic adverb in many Romance languages, in composition with *eccum/ecce* (see REW 3965), and possibly also in the particle *-a* of Rom. *acesta* ('this one')[21]; from *dē hāc*, we should assume a form **dea* (with diphthong) > (in unstressed position) *de*.

Given that all the possible etymons involve special reduction processes, I prefer those based on *inde – inde* and *dein* – because they not only had a frequent use in Latin, but are also preserved in other Romance languages. Given that the loss of an initial nasal syllable is also to be assumed for *de*$_2$, as I will show in the next section (3.2), and that *inde* is pan-Romance, I consider *inde* as the most likely etymon. The transformation of a deictic adverb into a sentence connector and then a coordinator is a natural process, also found with Rom. *şi* 'and' < Lat. *sīc* 'so, like that'.

The pseudo-completive use of a coordinator element is a phenomenon found in other Balkan languages (see Scr. *te*, Bg. *ta*, Modern Greek *και*, Alb. *e*, cf. Sandfeld 1904, 1930, Skok 1973). Sandfeld (1930) gives examples of the verb 'order, command' followed by a

[21] Cf. Drăganu (1936/1938: 263), Rosetti (1986: 373). The preservation of *hāc* in Arom. *aoa* (< *ad hāc*), proposed by Candrea & Densusianu (1914), is unlikely, because it does not explain the *-o-*.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

coordinator, with the interpretation 'x ordered *p* and therefore *p* happened', in Serbo-Croatian (with *te* 'and'), Albanian (with *e*, the regular word for 'and') and Greek (with *και*, the regular word for 'and'), besides Ro. *de*. He also cites examples with 'begin', 'decide' and 'allow' for Modern Greek *και*, with 'can' for Albanian *e*, Modern Greek *και*, Macedonian *i* and Aromanian *di*, with 'want' for Modern Greek *και*, Alb. *e*, Arom. *de*. Weigand (1904, *Krit. Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der rom. Philologie*, apud Sandfeld 1930) noticed that Romanian is more similar to Serbian and Western Bulgarian, and differs from Modern Greek and Albanian, in that (i) the coordinators used in these environments are different from the normal word for 'and' – cf. Ro. *de* vs. *şi*, Scr. *te* vs. *i*, Bulg. *ta* vs. *i*, and (ii) Ro. *de* and Scr. *te* can also introduce relative clauses. Therefore, unlike Sandfeld, who proposes that all these phenomena have their origin in Greek, I consider that, if contact is involved in the special evolution of *de*, we should restrict it to languages which have a similar 'result coordinator' distinct from the unmarked coordinator 'and', i.e. Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian. Whether for these languages we may assume the influence of Ro. *de*, or the other way around, is a question which cannot be answered based on the data I dispose of. In any case, the initial meaning I reconstruct for Romanian, based on Latin *inde*, is compatible with an internal development. As for the Slavic forms, they are likewise derived from a deictic base (the demonstrative root *to-* 'that') and can be assumed to have undergone the same development as Ro. de_1: according to Vaillant (1977:§§ 1468-1469 and 1958:§324), Scr. *te* is related to Old Slavonic *tě* 'then' (compared to Lith. *taĩ* 'thus, so'), and the initial meaning of Bg. *ta* was 'thus, then' (compared to Lith. *tuõ* 'for that, immediately'; BER also compares Sanskrit *tāt* 'therefore', indicating as etymon an Indo-European ablative form of **to-*); Scr. *te* is assigned the basic meaning 'and then' by RJHSJ, vol. 74: 138.

3.2 de_2

Most researchers did not separate de_1 from de_2. However, since the ancestor of de_1 can be reconstructed as an adverb used as a sentence connector indicating result and succession, whereas de_2 was initially a temporal subordinator indicating anteriority ('after' or 'since', see section 2), it is hard to imagine a common source for these items, given the categorial difference (adverb vs. subordinator) and above all the significant semantic difference (in '*p* ***de*$_1$** ***q***', *q* is a result of *p* or follows *p*, whereas in '***de*$_2$** ***q*** *p*', *q* is anterior to *p* or is a condition for *p*). Therefore, following Roques (1907) and Sava (2012), I consider it likely that these items have different origins.

In the case of de_2, the semantic difference with respect to the preposition *de* is no longer a problem, as the preposition *de* can have the temporal meaning 'since' and also a causal meaning. Therefore it is no wonder that Drăganu (1923: 256) proposed that *de* as a subordinator first appeared with the temporal meaning 'from the moment that, since', from which all the other uses subsequently emerged.

Drăganu's hypothesis is untenable for a syntactic reason: in Romance languages, in Latin, as well as in other Indo-European languages, prepositions cannot directly combine with a phrase headed by a finite verb[22]. Therefore, in order to combine a preposition with a

[22] In Romanian, an exception is *până* 'until' (Old Romanian also 'as long as'), which can take clauses with or without complementizers (*până (ce) a plecat* 'until (that) has left'); note however that this preposition differs from *de* in that it never combines directly with nominals, but only with

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

clause, one of the following mechanisms must apply: (i) the clause receives a complementizer, which allows it to occur in nominal positions (e.g. *fără (ca) să ştim* 'without SBJV know.1PL' = 'without our knowledge', *pentru că ştim* 'for that know.1PL' = 'because we know'); (ii) the clause receives non-finite inflection (e.g. *la prins peşti* 'at catch.SUP fish'), which historically comes from nominalizing suffixes (subsequently, prepositions taking non-finite inflections may become non-finite complementizers, cf. *fără a şti* 'without INF know.INF', with *a* initially meaning 'to'); (iii) an abstract noun or demonstrative is inserted, e.g. *din faptul că* 'from fact-the that...', *în timp ce* 'in time that' (= 'while'). Because of this general syntactic restriction on prepositions, we never find prepositions grammaticalized as finite complementizers (subordinators) in Romance, even when the meaning which would result is not problematic: Fr. **sans je sache* 'without I know.1SG.SBJV', Ro. **fără aibă* 'without have.3.SBJV', It. **per venga* 'for come.SG.SBJV', Ro. **pentru fie* 'for be.3.SBJV', **la pescuim* 'at/to fish.1PL', Sp. **en esperamos* 'in wait.1PL', Ro. **pe lângă uit* 'besides forget.1SG', etc. I know of no example, in Latin or any Romance language, of a preposition that cane to combine directly with a finite clause (without the mediation of a complementizer). Therefore, it is very difficult to accept Drăganu's proposal that the temporal use of *de* in *de dimineaţă* 'since morning' was extended to finite clauses to yield examples such as *de vădzu* 'since saw.3SG'[23].

I propose that de_2 comes from Lat. *unde* 'wherefrom, from which', used as a relative adverb. In Romanian the form *unde*, originally an ablative adverb, has replaced *ubi* in the meaning 'where', but common Romanian inherited both forms: *ubi* is preserved in ORo. *iuă, iuo* (still preserved in some northwestern varieties), Arom. *iu, iuo*, Istrorom. *iuvę*, and in Megl. in the compound *iuva* 'somewhere' (the initial *i-* in these forms may come from the agglutination of the adverb *ibi*, cf. DA, or *hīc*, cf. CDDE 900, or from the preposition *de*, cf. CDDE 900). The differentiation of a temporal subordinator 'since, when, after' from the interrogative and relative adverb *unde* may have taken place before *unde* lost its ablative value, but also after this moment: a use of the spatial relative adverb 'where' as a temporal subordinator is attested at later stages of Romanian, for the form *unde*, which developed the meanings 'when, because, if' (see DLR). In the previous sub-section (3.1), we have seen examples of this evolution for the form *înde*, which arguably originates in *unde*. In sum, I propose that the evolution seen in ORo. *înde* had already taken place before in Romanian, at an unattested stage, leading to the temporal and conditional complementizer de_2: as an unstressed subordinator with temporal and conditional use, *unde* was reduced to **nde*, being thus differentiated from the spatial adverb *unde* 'where'. Later, **nde* was further reduced to *de*. For the fact that accented and unaccented uses of a word may be differentiated into two distinct words as a result of the phonetic reduction of the unaccented forms, there are other examples in Romanian: the Latin distal demonstrative *ille*

temporal adverbials (the term 'adverbial' covers PPs, adverbs and adverbialized nouns: *până {la apus / atunci / seara}* 'until {at dusk / then / evening-the}'). More importantly, it does not continue a Latin preposition; although its origin is not fully clear, it appears that it originates in an adverb (Lat. *paene* or *porro*); the combination with a finite verbal form may derive directly from the adverbial use.

[23] A similar proposal had been previously made by Philippide (1894: 51–52) for conditional *de*, analyzed as an extension to finite clauses of the Latin *de* with the meaning 'about': *de va veni* 'about he will come' → 'if he will come'. Besides the difficulty of combining a preposition directly with a finite form, this hypothesis is contradicted by the evidence, discussed in section 2.2, that the oldest meaning of de_2 was temporal.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

yielded under stress the strong forms of the 3rd person pronouns (*illu(m) > ị̂el(u)*, *illa > ị̂a*, etc.) and in unstressed positions the 3rd person clitic forms (*illu(m) > lu*, *illa > uă > o*, etc.), the enclitic definite article (*illu(m) > -lu*, (*-a*)+*illa > -a*) and the article *al*; Lat. *habēmus*, *habētis* 'we have, you$_{pl}$ have' > perfect auxiliary *am, aţi*, lexical verb *a(i)emu*, *a(i)eţi* (forms preserved in Aromanian; in Dacoromanian they were transformed into *avem(u), aveţi* with *-v-* analogical after *avui, avut < *habūi, *habūtus* 'had(.PST/.PTCP)', see Densusianu 1938: 34, Rosetti 1986: 147).

Now, if the evolution *nde>de* must be assumed for *de*$_2$, it follows that the evolution *inde>de*$_1$ should not be considered unacceptable for phonetic reasons. One may even consider the possibility that *unde* with the meaning 'whence', when used as a sentence connector, could evolve to *de*$_1$, indicating result – '*p*, whence *q*' = '*p*, and from *p*, q' (relative wh-words in Latin may be used as relators at the sentence level, being anaphoric either to a referential constituent situated very close in the preceding sentence, or to the content of the whole sentence; such a use is found sometimes in MoRo. – e.g. *Nu m-a sunat;* ***de unde*** *rezultă că e încă supărat* 'He didn't call me; **whence** it follows he's still upset'). This would collapse *de*$_1$ and *de*$_2$ into a single word. However, I consider the hypothesis proposed in the previous sub-section (*de*$_1$ < *inde* or *dein*) more probable for the following reasons: (i) *de*$_2$ is not attested in South-Danubian dialects, which suggests that it was initially distinct from *de*$_1$; (ii) as *inde* is attested in all other Romance languages, and *dein* was also preserved in some varieties, it is more likely that at least one of these forms was also preserved in Romanian (this holds especially for *inde*; note nevertheless that *inde* was preserved in compounds, see *decinde*, *dinde*, *tutindere* discussed in section 3.1).

For other Balkan languages, Sandfeld (1930) cites no parallel for *de*$_2$ (which seems, indeed, impossible to derive from a coordinator; Sandfeld discusses as a Balkanic feature the evolution coordinator>subordinator). However, for *te*, the Serbocroatian equivalent of *de*$_1$, Tomić's dictionary (Tomić 1998-1999) also gives the meaning 'if' (alongside: 'and, and then', 'so that', 'therefore, consequently', 'all the most', 'that', '(for...) to, in order to', 'because', 'which'). The meaning 'if' (*ako*) is treated as secondary, occasional in RJHSJ s.v. *te*, vol. 74: 143, being illustrated with only two examples; *te* in these examples is not sentence-initial, whereas for Ro. *de*$_2$ the sentence-initial position is common, which is problematic for a coordinator origin.

3.3 *de*$_3$

Whereas for *de*$_1$ and *de*$_2$ the possibility of different etyma is an open issue, it is certain that the relative complementizer *de*$_3$ is not etymologically distinct from subordinating *de*: another Latin origin for a relativizing *de* is nowhere to be found, and no convincing external etymon has been proposed.[24] However, I treat it separately because it is not fully clear which one of the other two *de*'s (*de*$_1$ or *de*$_2$) is the origin of *de*$_3$.

Sava (2012:127) suggests that relative *de* may be derived from coordinating *de*, i.e. it would be an instance of *de*$_1$. Drăganu (1923) derives relative *de* from a temporal *de*

[24] Vrabie (2000) proposes that relative *de* comes from Bulgarian *de,* a late and dialectal reduced form of the relative subordinator *kăde* (etymologically 'where') or *deto* (< *kăde* +*-to* 'DEF'). However, as Sava (2012) points out, this hypothesis is problematic because (i) relative *de* is already found in the 16th century, at a date where Bulg. texts show the longer form *deto*, and is found even in Transylvania, where Bulgarian influence is unlikely, and (ii) Old Ro. had an invariable relative word (*ce*), so Vrabie's claim that *de* was borrowed because it had the advantage of being invariable is not correct.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

meaning 'since' (Ro. *de vreme ce*), but also cites examples where it is difficult to decide between a relative and a *result* interpretation of *de*, which suggest that de_3 might actually come from de_1. Indeed, examples where the nominal is understood as having a certain quality which is manifested by the property described in the *de*-clause, see (29), may provide contexts in which result *de* has been reanalyzed as a relativizer:

(29) Am un cal de se duce ca vântul (Ispirescu, *Legende* II, 262, apud
have.1SG a horse *de* REFL goes like wind-the Drăganu 1923:268)
'I have a horse that runs like the wind / such a (swift) horse that he runs like the wind'

On the other hand, the evolution from a subordinator meaning 'where' to a relative complementizer is attested in Modern Greek (*που*) and Bulgarian (*kăde, kăde-to* > *gdeto, deto*, see Vrabie 2000). Therefore, if de_2 comes from unstressed *unde* 'where', as I propose, it is possible that de_3 has the same origin. Note that de_3 appears to be absent from Aromanian and Meglenoromanian, dialects which also lack de_2. If de_3 has the same origin as de_2, this is not a coincidence.

To conclude, relative *de* is a secondary development of one of the other two *de*'s. It is not clear to me whether it originates in de_1 or in de_2.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The Latin origin of *de* is the most likely solution, but the identification of an exact etymon is difficult because this form must have been subject to phonetic reduction correlated to its use as a function word. There are several possible Latin candidates. As a coordinator (with secondary pseudo-completive and pseudo-final uses) and a result subordinator, *de* probably continues Latin *inde* or *dein* (< *deinde*). In the temporal and conditional use, *de* originates in *unde* (> **nde* > *de*). This etymon can even be assumed for the result and coordinator *de* (based on the use of relative words as sentence connectors), but, given the difference in geographic distribution between temporal-conditional *de* (restricted to Daco-Romanian) and result-coordinator *de* (also found in the South Danubian dialects), as well as the good preservation of *inde* across Romance, I consider *inde* a more plausible etymon for the result-coordinator *de*. Finally, relative *de* represents a secondary development, either of the result *de* or of the spatial and temporal subordinator coming from *unde* and reflected in the temporal and conditional *de*.

5. APPENDIX: ON ALLEGED IRREALIS USES OF *DE* + INDICATIVE IN OLD ROMANIAN

Hill & Alboiu (2016) claim that de_1 + indicative in (what looks like) complement clauses did not have an obligatory realis interpretation before the 18th century. As support for this claim (which has never been made by any previous researchers, as far as I know), they produce seven examples claimed to lack the reality (actualization) implication. I do not find any of these examples incompatible with a realis reading.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

Three examples come from Dosoftei's Versified Psalter, which is a highly elaborated poetic version of the Psalter:

(30) Pusără-ş ochii **de** mă omoară /
put.PAST.3PL-REFL.DAT eyes-the *de* me kill.3
şi cu pământul mă împresoară, (Dosoftei, PV 107)
and with Earth-the me surround.3

They give the translation 'They decided to kill me and to surround me with earth'. The original text (Psalm 16, 11) reads: *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἔθεντο ἐκκλῖναι ἐν τῇ γῇ* (Slavonic *oči svoi vŭzložišę ukloniti na zemljǫ*)[25] 'they have set their eyes so as to put me to the ground' (the interpretation of the object as 'me' is supported by the preceding clause: *ἐκβαλόντες με νυνὶ περιεκύκλωσάν με* – 'Having casted me out, they encircled me'). The original suggests an attempt of killing, not an actual killing. However, in Ro. the verb *kill* in the present indicative, in a sentence such as *mă omoară* 'they're killing me', can be interpreted figuratively ('to torture severely') or indicate an *attempt* of killing (as its English equivalent).

(31) Că eu te văz în tot ceasul gata/
for I you.ACC see in all time-the ready
De mă sprejineşti, Doamne(,-n direapta) (Dosoftei, PV 101)
de me support.2SG Lord.VOC in right-the

The authors do not mark the verse boundary and omit the last word of the second line. Their translation is 'For I see you, God, ready to support me at any time.' Here, there is no reason to think that the actual support did not take place; on the contrary, the original text (Psalm 15, 8) refers to an actual support by God: Greek *(προωρώμην τὸν Κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διαπαντός), ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μού ἐστιν, ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ* = Slavonic *(prědŭzrěxŭ Goda prědŭ mnojǫ vynǫ) jako o desnǫjǫ mene estĭ, da ne podvižǫ sę* '(I foresaw the Lord always before my face); for he is on my right hand, so that I should not be shaken'. The image is that of the Lord's standing by the speaker's side so as to prevent him from tottering or being shaken, which corresponds to Rom. *sprijini* 'support'.

(32) Ca un mire când stă **de** purcede /
like a groom when stands *de* proceeds
Dintr-a sa cămară unde şede,
from-the his room where sits

They translate 'Like a groom who is ready to proceed out of the room where he's sitting', interpreting *sta* 'stay, stand' as 'be ready to'. But *sta* in Dosoftei's time also had the meaning 'begin, attempt' (see DLR, the meaning under III.2). Most importantly, the original text (Psalm 18, 6) presents the movement as realized: Greek καὶ αὐτὸς ὡς νυμφίος ἐκπορευόμενος ἐκ παστοῦ αὐτοῦ, (ἀγαλλιάσεται ὡς γίγας δραμεῖν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ.) = Slavonic

[25] For the Slavonic text, I used a Church Slavonic version available on-line (https://pomog.org/bible_slav). For the Greek text, I used the on-line version available on www.ellopos.net (https://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/chapter.asp?book=24)

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

i toj jako ženixŭ isxodęj ot črĭtoga svoego (vŭzradujetŭ sę jako ispolinŭ tešti pǫtĭ) 'and he (is) like a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, (he will exult as a giant to run his course)'.

In three other examples (chapter 6, ex. 22b-c and e; one from *Palia de la Orăştie*, one from Varlaam's *Cazanie* and one from the so-called Teodorescu's Codex), the authors' argument against the realis interpretation is the use of the future tense. But the indicative future, as a tense of the indicative mood, presents the event as actually occurring in the future (therefore, a claim that *p will happen (at a future time t)* is falsified if *p* does not occur at *t*, which is not the case for *p may happen*). Moreover, in the first two examples the verbs in the first clause imply the realization of the event in the *de*-clause (if the event in the first clause is also realized): *face* 'make' and *nemeri* 'get to, succeed'. We should note that *the realization is relative to the current world of the first clause* (which may differ from the real world, if the matrix clause is embedded), as is typical for coordination structures in general (e.g. in *I hope [[he will come] and [we'll go together]]*, both of the coordinated clauses *he will come* and *we'll go together* are evaluated at the worlds introduced by the matrix verb *hope*). Thus, in (33) (ex. 22c in Hill & Alboiu 2016, chapter 6), both the matrix verb (*nemeri* 'get to, succeed') and the verb in the *de*-clause (*tăia* 'cut') are in the modal scope of *nedejdui* 'hope':

(33) nedejduind că va nemeri **de** va tăia şi pre Hristos (Varlaam C, 11[r])
hoping that will.3SG succeed *de* will.3SG cut also DOM Christ
'hoping that he will also get to kill Christ'

In the third example with future tense, the matrix verb is *căuta* 'look for', which belongs to the class of verbs with an attempted result, where *de* can always be found (with the additional realization meaning; see section 2).

The last example (22d) has an 'attempted-result' verb, *nevoi* 'strive to', for which the use of *de* is expected:

(34) Deci, de-atunce nevoia cuconul **de**-mvăţa svânta carte.
so from-then strive.IMPF.3SG child-the *de* learn.IMPF.3SG saint-the book
'Since then, the child strived to study the holy book.' (Dosoftei, V. S. 58[v])

The authors provide no reason for considering that the actuality implication is suspended here. By checking the larger context of this sentence, one finds no indication that the attempt of studying the holy Bible might have failed (on the contrary, the child in question subsequently became a monk and, eventually, a saint).

CORPUS

Çetvoroblagovĕstie [The four Gospels], ed. by the hieromonk Makarije, Târgovişte, 1512.
Cod. Bratul = *Codicele Bratul* [1559–1560], ed. by A. Gafton, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2003.
Cod. Vor. = *Codicele Voroneţean* [1563–1583], ed. by M. Costinescu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1981.
Coresi, L. = *Lucrul Apostolesc. Apostolul*, printed by Coresi in Braşov in 1566, ed. by I. Bianu, Bucureşti, Cultura Naţională, 1930.
Coresi, Tetr. = *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi. Braşov 1560–1561*, *comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Măniceşti. 1574*, ed. by F. Dimitrescu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1963.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

DÎ = *Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea*, ed. by Gh. Chivu, M. Georgescu, M. Ioniţă, Al. Mareş, Al. Roman-Moraru, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1979.
Dosoftei, PV = Dosoftei, *Psaltirea în versuri* [1673], ed. by N. A. Ursu, Iași, Mitropolia Moldovei şi a Sucevei, 1974.
Dosoftei, V. S. = Dosoftei, *Viaţa şi petreacerea svinţilor* [1682-1686], ed. by R. Frenţiu, Cluj, Editura Echinox, 2002.
Psalt. Hur. = *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki* [1500-1510], ed. by I. Gheţie, M. Teodorescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.
Varlaam, C. = Varlaam, *Cazania* [1643], ed. J. Byck, București, Editura Academiei, 1964.

REFERENCES

ALAR = N. Saramandu, *Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului aromân*, ed. M. Nevaci, București, Editura Academiei, 2014.
Avram, A., 1962, "Interprétation phonologique du [î] initial en roumain", *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 7, 1, 21–37.
Avram, A., 1964, "Contribuţii la interpretarea grafiei chirilice a primelor texte româneşti", *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice*, IV, fasc. 1-5.
Avram, A., 1990, *Nazalitatea şi rotacismul în limba română*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
Avram, A., 1968, "Remarques sur les voyelles neutres du roumain et du français", *Word*, 24, 2, 8–13.
Avram, A., 1986, "Sandhi phenomena in Romanian", in: H. Andersen (ed.), *Sandhi phenomena in the languages of Europe*, Berlin / New York / Amsterdam, Mouton de Gruyter, 551–574.
Avram, A., 2012, *Studii de fonetică istorică a limbii române*, București, Editura Academiei.
Avram, M., 1960, *Evoluţia subordonării circumstanţiale cu elemente conjuncţionale în limba română*, București, Editura Academiei.
BER = *Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik*, Sofia, Bălgarska Academija na Naukite, Insitut za Bălgarski Ezik, 7 vol. 1971–2013.
Brâncuş, G., 1983, *Vocabularul autohton al limbii române*, București, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.
Çabej, E., 1986, *Studime gjuhësore*, Prishtinë, Rilindja.
Candrea, I.-A., O. Densusianu, 1914, *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române. Elementele latine* (*A–Putea*), București, Socec.
Capidan, T., 1935, *Meglenoromânii III. Dicţionar meglenoromân*, București, Monitorul Oficial şi Imprimeriile Statului.
CDDE = I.-A. Candrea, Ov. Densusianu, *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române. Elementele latine* (*A–Putea*), București, Socec, 1907–1914.
Ciorănescu, A., 1966, *Diccionario etimológico rumano*, La Laguna, Tenerife, Biblioteca Filológica, Universitad de la Laguna.
Croitor, B., 2017, "Un tip special de coordonare", in: A. Dragomirescu, A. Nicolae, C. Stan, R. Zafiu (eds), *Sintaxa ca mod de a fi: omagiu Gabrielei Pană Dindelegan, la aniversare*, București, Editura Universității din București, 149–157.
Densusianu, O., 1938, *Histoire de la langue roumaine*, II, *Le XVIe siècle*, Paris, Ernest Leroux.
DA = Academia Română, *Dicţionarul limbii române*, coord. by Sextil Puşcariu, București, 1913–1948.
DELR = *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române*, coord. by M. Sala, A. Avram, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011–.
DLR = *Dicţionarul limbii române*, *serie nouă*, coord. by I. Iordan, A. Graur, I. Coteanu, (since 2000) M. Sala, G. Mihăilă, București, Editura Academiei, 1965–2010.
Dimand, B., 1904, *Zur rumänischen Moduslehre*, Vienna, Gerold.
Dragoş, E., 1995, *Elemente de sintaxă istorică românească*, București, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică.
Drăganu, N., 1923, "Conjuncţiile *de* şi *dacă*. Un capitol de sintaxă românească", *Dacoromania*, 3, 251–284.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

Drăganu, N., 1938, "Recensii", *Dacoromania*, 9, 257–315.
Frâncu, C., 2000, *Conjunctivul românesc şi raporturile lui cu alte moduri*, Iaşi, Casa Editorială Demiurg.
Gheorghe, M., 2016, "9.1 Complementizers and complement clauses" and "9.2 Relative clauses", in: Pană Dindelegan (coord.), 463–491.
Gheorghe, M., C. Mîrzea Vasile, 2013, "Ipostaze ale subordonării cu *de* în limba română veche (sec. al XVI-lea)", talk given at the XIII[th] International Conference of the Department of Linguistics, University of Bucharest, December 13-14.
Gheţie, I. (coord,), G. Chivu, M. Costinescu, C. Frâncu, A. Roman-Moraru, M. Teodorescu, 1997, *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche (1532–1780)*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
GLR = *Gramatica limbii române*, coord. by A. Graur, M. Avram, L. Vasiliu, București, Editura Academiei, 1963.
Hill, V., G. Alboiu, 2016, *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
ILR II = *Istoria Limbii române*, coord. Al. Rosetti, B. Cazacu, I. Coteanu, vol. II, București, Editura Academiei, 1969.
Iordan, I., 1954, *Limba română contemporană*, București, Editura Ministerului Învăţământului.
Jordan, M., 2009, *Loss of Infinitival Complementation in Romanian. Diachronic Syntax*, PhD dissertation, University of Florida.
Landau, I.,1999, *Elements of Control*, PhD dissertation, MIT.
Manoliu, M., 2006, "Innovations within isolation. Regrammation and/or subjectivization: lat. *de* in Romanian", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 51, 143–158.
Meyer-Lübke, W., 1899, *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, III: *Syntax*, Leipzig, Reisland.
Nedelcu, I., 2008, "Conjuncţia", in V. Guţu-Romalo (coord.), *Gramatica limbii române*, I, București, Editura Academiei, 631–656.
Orël, V., 1998, *Albanian Etymological Dictionary,* Leiden, Boston, Köln, Brill.
Pană Dindelegan, G. (coord.), 2016, *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Petrovici, E., 1930, *De la nasalité en roumain. Recherches expérimentales*, Cluj, Institutul de Arte Grafice Ardealul.
Philippide, A., 1894, *Istoria limbii române. I. Principii de istorie a limbii*, Iaşi, Tipografia Naţională.
Procopovici, A., 1948, "Pe drumurile dicţionarului. Probleme de sintaxă: conjuncţiile şi interjecţiile *de*, *ca* şi *că*, *dacă* şi *dec*", *Dacoromania*, 11, 1–50.
Puşcariu, S., 1928, "Pe marginea cărţilor", *Dacoromania*, 6, 714–800.
Repina, T., 2006, "Conjuncţia *de* după verbele de mişcare în textele din secolul al XVII-lea – începutul celui de-al XVIII-lea", in: M. Sala (ed.), *Studii de gramatică şi de formare a cuvintelor. În memoria Mioarei Avram*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 375–380.
REW = W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg, Carl Winters, 1936.
RJHSJ = *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, ed. by Jugolsavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti, Zagreb. Vol. 74: 1962.
Roques, M., 1907, "Recherches sur les conjonctions conditionnelles *să*, *de*, *dacă* en ancien roumain", *Romanische Forschungen*, 23, 825–839.
Rosetti, A., 1986, *Istoria limbii române de la origini până la începutul secolului al XVII-lea*, București, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.
Sava, C., 2012, *Complementizatorii în româna veche*, PhD dissertation, University of Bucharest.
Sandfeld, K., 1904, "Die Konjunktion *de* im Rumänischen", *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 28, 11–35.
Sandfeld, K., 1930, *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*, Paris, Champion.
Schuchardt, H., 1892, *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie...*
Scriban, A., 1939, *Dicţionaru limbii româneşti (Etimologii, înţelesuri, exemple, citaţiuni, arhaizme, neologizme, provincializme)*, Iaşi, Institutul de Arte Grafice "Presa Bună".
Skok, P., 1973, *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, III (poni[2]-Ž): Zagreb, Jugoslavenska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)

TDRG = H. Tiktin, *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, 1st edition, București, Imprimeria Statului, 1903–1924; 3rd edition, Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 2001-2005.
Tomić, M., 1998–1999, *Srpsko-rumunski rečnik / Dicţionar sârb-român*, Timişoara, Savez Srba u Rumuniji.
Väänänen, V., 1967, *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, nouvelle édition revue et complétée d'une anthologie avec commentaires, Paris, Klincksieck.
Vaillant, A., 1958, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. II Morphologie*, Lyon, IAC.
Vaillant, A., 1977, *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves. V Syntaxe*, Paris, Klincksieck.
Vasilescu, A., 2008, Pronumele, in: V. Guţu-Romalo (coord.), *Gramatica limbii române*, I, București, Editura Academiei Române, 181–288.
de Vos, M., 2005, *The syntax of verbal pseudo-coordination in English and Afrikaans*, PhD dissertation, Universiteit Leiden.
Vrabie, E., 2000, "Încercare asupra etimologiei pronumelui relativ *de*", *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice*, 60, 1, 257–260.
Vulpe, M., 1980, *Subordonarea în frază în dacoromâna vorbită*, București, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.
Zafiu, R., 2016, "Purpose and result clauses", in Pană Dindelegan (coord.), 517–526.

BDD-A29181 © 2019 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.75 (2026-10-30 18:57:09 UTC)