# ON ADNOMINAL DATIVES IN OLD ROMANIAN

MIHAELA TĂNASE-DOGARU[1], CAMELIA UŞURELU[2]

**Abstract.** This paper investigates adnominal datives in Old Romanian. The focus of the paper is two-fold: first and foremost, it aims at building a comprehensive corpus of adnominal dative structures in Old Romanian. In doing so, we will mainly take a look at the head noun in adnominal dative structures and classify these nouns as either agent nominalizations or relational nouns. These nouns have one important thing in common: they are theta-assigners. Secondly, the paper will try to see how influential analyses of the Dative can accommodate adnominal dative structures and which insights these frameworks provide will benefit future research on the syntax of adnominal datives.

**Keywords:** adnominal dative, Old Romanian, theta-assigning nouns, applicative phrase, empty P.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper focuses on syntactic structures containing adnominal datives in Old Romanian of the type in (1). In Old Romanian, the adnominal dative is "the normal realization of complements of bare nouns in predicative positions and attributive positions" (Giurgea 2015: 74).

(1) a. *ca nişte prietini şi **fii** **lui Dumnădzău** ceartă ei*
As some friends and sons of.DAT God scold they
*pre creştini* (I. Cantacuzino, *Patruapologii:* 111)
DOM Christians
'They scold the Christians as friends and sons of God'

b. *carele era veche **slugă** **Porții** **turceşti***
Who-the was old servant Porte-the Dat Turkish
'Who was an old servant of the Sublime Porte'
(Anonimul Brâncovenesc: 320)

c. ***începători legii** aceştiia*
originators law.DAT this.DAT
'Originators of this law' (I. Cantacuzino, *Patruapologii*: 95)

[1] University of Bucharest, mihaela.dogaru@gmail.com. This work was generously supported by *UEFISCDI, PNII-IDPCE-2011-3-0959* for Mihaela Tănase-Dogaru.

[2] University of Bucharest, cameliausurelu20@gmail.com

RRL, **LXII**, *2*, p. 143–155, Bucureşti, 2017

**BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)**

d. *pre* ***cei supuşi*** ***căilor*** *sale*
DOM DEF followers ways.DAT he.DAT
'The ones that follow his ways.'(I. Cantacuzino, *Patru apologii*: 93)

The paper offers a comprehensive corpus of adnominal datives in Old Romanian and, capitalizing on important insights in Cornilescu (2015), Giurgea (2015), and Sigurdsson (2012), it attempts to establish whether the adnominal dative is part of the NP or the VP. This problem is of interest since in late Old Romanian (later than the 17th century) when cliticization of the clitic has a reason, dative arguments of adjective and nouns may appear in the VP. The investigation of the corpus will show that the adnominal dative is always theta-related, since it is always assigned by argument-taking nouns (relational nouns, deverbal nominalizations). A similar point if interest in the syntax of adnominal datives is determining whether their structure contains a null preposition (see Rezac 2008) or whether the need for the null preposition is overridden by the fact that nouns 'governing' adnominal datives are theta-assigning nouns. A very important first observation is that the vast majority of adnominal datives in Old Romanian are introduced in the structure by unaccusative verbs, and especially by the verb 'be'.

The paper is organized as follows: section 2 offers the Old Romanian corpus, investigating the types of nouns functioning as heads of the construction; section 3 discusses the syntactic structure of adnominal datives, focusing in turn on adnominal datives as part of the NP, adnominal datives as inherently case-marked phrases and adnominal datives as unaccusative structures; section 4 reiterates the main points and offers the conclusions.

## 2. ADNOMINAL DATIVES IN OLD ROMANIAN. THE CORPUS

While in Modern Romanian, as it is generally acknowledged, the adnominal dative marginally appears only in constructions involving kinship terms, as in (2), in Old Romanian, the adnominal dative appears in a variety of contexts, both in original texts and in translations from Old Slavic.

(2) *nepot* *surorii* *mele*
nephew sister.DAT my.DAT
'a nephew of my sister's'

The section is devoted to an investigation and classification of the contexts of occurrence of adnominal datives in Old Romanian. As it will become clear, all nouns heading adnominal datives are theta-assigning nouns, in that they are either agent nominalizations or relational nouns of various sub-types. A cursory look at the corpus identifies the main verb in the structure as an unaccusative verb (chiefly, 'be').

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

### 2.1. Adnominal datives headed by agentive nominalizations

The vast majority of constructions involving adnominal datives in Old Romanian contain an agent nominalization suffixed by "-tor", which is the equivalent of the English agentive suffix "-er". Unlike agent suffixes in other languages, "-tor" has a dual nature, deriving both adjectives with a present participle interpretation and agent nouns (ommuncitor 'man work.er' / un muncitor a work.er / 'man who works').

(3) a. *Începutul* *lu Dumnezeu* *ce* *fu* ***făcătoriu*** *desăvârşit*
Beginning-the of God who was **maker** flawless
***lumiei*** (*Cronicalui M. Moxa*: 31)
**world.DAT**
'The beginning of God, who was the flawless maker of the world'

b. *înzilele* *marelui* *de* *Dumnezeu* *luminatŭ*
in days-the great.GEN by God enlightened
*arhiepiscopului* *Ghenadie, ce-* *au* *fostŭ* ***cârmitoriu***
archbishop.GEN Ghenadie, who- has been **ruler**
***legiei*** *creştinească*
**law.DAT** Christian
'in the days of the great and enlightened Ghenadie, who was the ruler/originator of the Christian law' (Coresi, *Cazania a II-a:* 1)

c. ***înțelegătorilorŭ*** ***aceştiia****, tuturorŭ*
those-who-understand that.DAT all
'those who understand that' (Coresi, *Cazania a II-a:* 3)

d. *că* ***curățitoriu*** *iaste* *tuturorŭ* ***sufletelorŭ*** ***şi***
that**cleaner** is all **souls.DAT** and
***trupurilorŭ***
**bodies.DAT**
'that he is the cleaner of all souls and bodies' (Coresi, *Cazania a II-a:* 45)

As evident from the examples, all nouns heading adnominal datives in this section are deverbal agent nominalizations involving the agentive suffix -tor. Similarly, all examples have the same structure, represented by a copulative verb ('a fi' / to be and 'a se face' / to become) and an indefinite predicative noun phrase.

A sub-type of adnominal datives headed by agent nominalizations is represented by those constructions where the head noun is a deverbal noun. This is the case of the examples in (4):

(4) a. ***vindecăciune*** ***oaselor***
healing bones-the.DAT
'he healing of bones' (Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 149)

b. ***sfărâmare*** ***slabilor*** *sărăciia*
breaking weak-the.DAT (is) poverty
'poverty is the breaking of the weak' (Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 135)

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

c. *Legea lui Dumnădzău cea de mântuire şi*
Law-the of God the of salvation and
***adunare*** ***poroncilor*** *dumnădzăieşti*
gathering commands-the.DAT Godly
'The Law of God for salvation and the gathering of godly commandments' (I. Cantacuzino, *Patruapologii*: 90)

d. *îl opriia pre el Petru de la* ***lucrare***
him stopped DOM him Peter from at working
***mântuirii*** *noastre* (Antim Ivireanul, *Didahii*: 9)
salvation the.DAT our
'Peter stopped him from the working of our salvation'

As shown by the examples in (4), this type of noun heading the adnominal dative pattern represents a deverbal noun, derived by the suffix *-are* (yielding the so-called 'long infinitive' in Romanian), roughly corresponding to *-ing* nominalizations in English. It is well-known that the long infinitive in Romanian represents a type of event nominalization, therefore a theta-assigning noun having an internal argument, to which it assigns Dative case.

Generalizing over the two sub-types, the following two common properties emerge: the indefiniteness of the head noun and the fact that the Dative is the realization of the internal argument of the verb. This sharply contrasts with Modern Romanian, where it is substituted by a Genitive (OR călcător legii 'breaker law.DAT' / MR călcător al legii'breaker law.GEN).

The next subsection looks at adnominal datives headed by kinship terms.

### 2.2. Adnominal datives headed by kinship terms

This subsection presents a part of the Old Romanian corpus, where the noun heading the adnominal dative construction is a kinship term. Kinship terms are traditionally known as relational nouns, i.e. nouns taking an internal argument. In both Modern and Old Romanian, this internal argument is assigned dative case.

(5) a. *şi* ***soți*** ***taineei*** ***şi*** ***învățăturiei***
and spouses sacrament-the.DAT and teaching-the.DAT
'and companions of the sacrament and of the teachings'
(Coresi, *Cazania a II-a*: 209)

b. *te veichema cetate de direptate,* ***maică***
REFL will call city of justice, mother
***cetăților*** (Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 107)
cities-the.DAT
'You will be called the city of justice, the mother of cities'

c. *Acesta era* ***tată*** ***lăcuitorilor*** *în colibi*
This was father inhabitants-the.DAT in huts
'This was the father of the hut inhabitants' (Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 122)

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

d. *Iară **soră** **luiThovél**, Noemá*
And sister Thovel.DAT, Noema
'and Thovel's sister was Noema' (Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 122)

The pattern involving kinship terms assigning Dative case has survived in Modern Romanian, where it appears in structures involving clitic raising (*mi-e nepot* / 1SG.DAT.CL-is nephew 'he is my nephew').

### 2.3. Adnominal datives headed by relational nouns

A third category of nouns that head adnominal dative constructions in Old Romanian is represented by relational nouns, therefore a third category of theta-assigning nouns. Our corpus registers relational nouns proper, exemplified in (6) and 'derived' relational nouns, exemplified in (7). The examples in (7) feature nouns that are non-argument-taking. However, in these examples, these nouns are coerced into an argument-taking frame; moreover, they are used figuratively, i.e. their meaning gets extended metaphorically.

(6) a. *şi va fi Hanaán**şerb lui***
And will be Hanaan slave him.DAT
'And Hanaan will be his slave' (Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 143)
b. *Omul blînd – **inemii** **vraci***
man-the gentle – heart-the.DAT healer
'The gentle man (is) the healer of the heart' (Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 149)
c. *fiindupaşea**neprietin** **Ducăi-vodă***
being pasha enemy Duca.DAT-king
'pasha being an enemy of Duca, the king' (Neculce, *Letopiseţul*: 38)
d. *pentru învăţătura lui au fost **terziman***
for learning-the his (he) has been translator
***împăratului*** (Neculce, *O samă de cuvinte*: 27)
emperor-the.DAT
'because of his studies, he was the translator of the emperor'

The examples in (6) illustrate adnominal dative constructions involving relational nouns. Relational nouns are semantically unsaturated and are always used in combination with an argument; it is this argument that is assigned Dative case in Old Romanian.

The examples in (7) contain non-argument-taking nouns. By metaphorical extension, they become argument-taking, therefore justifying their inclusion in the category of nouns c-selecting the dative. All the previous examples featuring kinship terms and agent nominalizations have proved that the dative assigned by these categories of nouns bears the [+person] feature. Therefore, the c-selection operation first selects persons, getting extended (metaphorically) to abstract nouns and inanimate nouns.

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

(7) a. *aşétrupul* ***temniță*** *iaste* ***sufletului***
so body-the prison is soul-the.DAT
'Thus, the body is prison to the soul' (Cantemir, *Divanul*: 81)

b. *neaflînd* *porumbița* ***odihnă*** ***picioarilor*** *ei*
not-finding dove-the.FEM rest feet-the.DAT her
'the dove not being able to find rest for her feet'
(Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 137)

c. *Femeaia* *destoinică* *iaste* ***cunună*** ***bărbatului***
woman-the industrious is crown husband the.DAT
*ei*(Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 140)
her
'The industrious woman is a crown for her husband'

d. ***acoperemânt*** ***însătaților*** *şi* ***răcoreală***
cover thirsty-the.PL.DAT and coolness
***oamenilor*** *celor* *asupriți* (Dosoftei, *Parimiile*: 140)
people-the.DAT the oppressed
'a cover for the thirsty and coolness for the oppressed'

As said before, the examples in (7) illustrate common nouns that are not generally used as relational nouns. However, the identified nouns clearly have relational uses in the respective contexts, which they get by means of metaphorical extension. We will include this category in the category of c-selecting nouns.

Section 2 has presented the corpus of Old Romanian adnominal datives. It has been show that there are two major categories of nouns that head adnominal dative constructions: agentive nominalizations and relational nouns (kinship terms have been treated separately, although they qualify as relational nouns). What these nouns have in common is the ability to project an argument in the syntactic structure; it is this argument that is assigned Dative case.

The next section takes a few steps in the direction of a tentative syntactic analysis of adnominal datives in Old Romanian.

## 3. ON THE SYNTAX OF ADNOMINAL DATIVES IN OLD ROMANIAN

### 3.1. The adnominal dative as part of the NP

When discussing the syntax of adnominal datives, one of the most relevant issues is to determine whether the dative if part of the noun phrase or the verb phrase. This problem is relevant because in late Old Romanian (later than the 17$^{th}$ century) dative arguments of adjective and nouns may appear in the VP (*mi-e nepot*'1SG.DAT.CL-is nephew').

A very recent analysis of the emergence of the adnominal Dative in Romanian calls the adnominal Dative a non-agreeing genitive, concluding that

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

adnominal Datives are actually instances of 'adnominal structural case' (Giurgea 2015: 80).

Gathering proof that the dative complement of predicative bare nouns are really adnominal.

Giurgea (2015) lists several tests that show the dative complement occupies an NP-internal position.

First, the fact that they appear in attributive positions, in the absence of overt verbal material, is indicative of their adnominal nature:

(8) *Grecii* *îi* *dedese* *muere* *greacă,* *fată*
Greeks.DEF him.DAT give.PLUPERF woman Greek daughter
*unui* *boiar* *mare, nepoată* *împăratului* *grecescu*
a.OBL nobleman great niece emperor.DEF.OBL Greek
'The Greeks had given him (as a wife) a Greek woman, daughter of a great nobleman, niece of the Greek emperor' (Giurgea 2015: 75)

Second, adnominal datives can be coordinated with an [N+Gen/Agreeing Possessor] constituent, which shows that, had the dative been in the VP, it would be the possessor of both coordinated DPs and thus, it would violate the coordinate structure constraint:

(9) *fiind* *ales* *gubernatoriul* *Țărâi* *Ungureşti* *şi*
Being chosen governor.DEF land.DEF.OBL Hungarian and
*prințep* *Ardealului*
prince Transylvania.DEF.OBL
'Having been chosen as governor of Hungary and prince of Transylvania' (Giurgea 2015: 76)

Third, if the dative had been in the VP, it could not be repeated with coordinated NPs:

(10) *Acel* *e* *frate* *mie* *şi* *soru* *mie*
That one is brother me.DAT and sister me.DAT
şi *mumă-mi* *este*
and mother-me.CL.DAT is
'That one is my brother and my sister and my mother' (Giurgea 2015: 76)

Fourth, the dative can be placed between the head noun and an adnominal adjective:

(11) *părinte tuturor milostiv*
parent all.OBL merciful
'a merciful father to them all' (Giurgea 2015: 76)

Fifth, the sequence dative + head noun can appear in a dislocation position:

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

(12) *şi* *ei* *lăcuitori* *pământurilor* *acestora*
And they inhabitants lands.DEF.OBL these.OBL
*făcându-se*
doing -CL.REFL
'as they became inhabitants of these lands' (Giurgea 2015:77)

Finally, in translations from Slavonic, adnominal datives often correspond to Slavonic genitives and agreeing possessors. Giurgea (2015) found 43 such cases in Coresi's bilingual edition of the Psalms (Giurgea 2015: 77).

Having amassed pieces of evidence in favour of projecting the adnominal dative complement inside the NP, Giurgea (2015) goes on to explain cases of separation between the head noun and the complement (13) as cases of movement from the structure where the dative is adnominal.

(13) a. *ţărâi îi* *era* *apărătoriu*
land.DEF.OBL was.3.SG defender
'He was a defender of the land'

b. *Soţu* *se* *feace* *lu* *Vartasar*
Companion CL.REFL made.3.SG DEF.OBL Vartasar
'He joined Vartasar'

Because of the special status of predicative bare nouns, they are seen as completely transparent for extraction. The author concludes that, because there is syncretism between the dative and the genitive, the adnominal dative can be described as a non-agreeing genitive. Old Romanian had two types of inflectional genitives: the agreeing and the non-agreeing genitive, the latter being restricted to predicative bare nouns.

The examples we have analyzed, however, cast a doubt on the view that the Dative is a structural case. Unlike the genitive, which is assigned by the definite article (Grosu 1988) or by the genitival article (Dobrovie-Sorin and Giurgea), the dative is not assigned by a functional head and is selected only by nouns that have internal arguments and which obviously assign theta-roles.

### 3.2. Adnominal datives as inherently case-marked NPs

In discussing morphological case variation, Sigurdsson (2013) argues that individual cases are not syntactic objects or features but PF interpretations of a wide range of different underlying syntactic relations.

In his view, a case system begins as a two-case system, with a marked or oblique one and an unmarked one, which is generally referred to as 'nominative'. Some systems then develop or grow by adding further cases over time (Sigurdsson 2013: 5). Syntactically, the nominative is a non-case (Sigurdsson 2013: 8), meaning that whenever grammar gives no specific case instructions to the

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

morphological case component, the NP in question will show up in Nom, regardless of the overt shape of the nominative elements expressed.

According to Sigurdsson (2013), three-case languages (such as Romanian), that is languages with two marked cases, generally have adnominal genitives or benefactive / recipient datives. The canonical Genitive is adnominal and indirect object Datives is introduced by an applicative head (see also Marantz 1993, Pylkkanen 2008). The markedness of the dative depends on whether it is aAppl-case, i.e. unmarked in comparison to the Accusative or a v-case, i.e. more marked than the Accusative.

A large part of the literature on case suggests that inherently case-marked NPs are embedded in larger structures, taken to be either PPs with an empty P head, or KPs with a silent K(ase) head, these empty heads being responsible for case assignment (Emonds 1987, McFadden 2004, Asbury 2010 a.o.). According to Sigurdsson (2013), it not helpful to analyze inherently case-marked NPs as always being PPs or KPs, since this would force one to assume an empty P or K even in the presence of an overt P, as in (14):

(14) *floskur af vatni*
bottles of water.DAT
'bottles of water' (Icelandic, Sigurdsson 2013: 21)

Moreover, Sigurdsson (2011) shows that an overt preposition blocks T from probing prepositional objects in Icelandic, which means that prepositions introduce structural and semantic information that is otherwise absent.

According to Sigurdsson (2013), typological research contradicts the general PP or KP analysis of inherently case-marked NPs. Most languages have case-marked complements of adpositions, while the reverse is also true: non-case-marked complements of adpositions are highly exceptional, which is not what one would expect under the analysis of inherently case-marked NPs as embedded in a larger PP / KP.

In the framework of analysis proposed by Sigurdsson (2013), the dative and the genitive begin life in case-systems as non-v cases (Sigurdsson 2013: 24). The genitive starts out as an adnominal N*-case, while the dative starts out as an Appl*-case. Both the dative and the genitive were then introduced into the verbal system as a result of what Sigurdsson (2013: 24) calls 'virus invasions' or 'star attacks'. The genitive is more peripheral than the dative within the verbal system, which suggests that it is licensed by a more marked v type head than the other v-cases and therefore, the dative invaded the verbal system before the genitive.

On the other hand, when the dative invaded the nominal system, it yielded adnominal datives (Sigurdsson 2013: 25). Adnominal datives are more marked than genitives within the nominal system and are thus licensed by n*.

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

### 3.3. Adnominal datives as unaccusative structures

Cornilescu (2013) analyzes constructions such as those in (15) as applicative constructions, where the dative is case-licensed by an expletive applicative head:

(15) a. *Mi-* *este* *dor* *de cireşe*
I.DAT.CL is.3.SG longing of cherries
'I long for cherries'
b. *Mi* *se* *face* *dor* *de cireşe*
I.DAT se.REFL.ACC.CL makes longing of cherries
'I become / grow desirous of cherries'

These unaccusative constructions containing datives show similarities with adnominal datives, such as those in (16):

(16) a. *Mi-* *e* *nepot*
I.DAT.CL is.3SG nephew
'He is my nephew'
b. *Îi* *e* *nepot* *(regelui)*.
he.DAT.CL is.3SG nephew (king.DEF.DAT)
'He is the king's nephew / He is a nephew to the king'

The similarities are, however, only superficial. In (16a), the noun *somn*'sleep' is not an argumental noun, the relation between *somn* and the Dative clitic being one of the type Theme – Location. In (16b), the noun *nepot* 'nephew' is a relational noun, therefore an argumental noun, assigning Dative inherently.

While in the unaccusative structures discussed in Cornilescu (2013), the dative is mostly interpreted as an Experiencer / Possessor, in adnominal dative structures, the dative can be interpreted or approximated as showing a Relation (see Giurgea 2015). The origin of the adnominal dative is taken to be the Latin dative of relation, illustrated in (17), which was equivalent to 'with respect to' (Giurgea 2015: 90):

(17) *Mihi* *ille nepos* *est*
I.DAT this nephew is.3SG
'To me he is a nephew'

We can refine the interpretation of the dative as showing Relation into an interpretation of the dative structure as one encoding a relation of Possession. In this respect, (18a) shows the same kind of relation as (18b), namely one of Possession, which serves to prove the point that Datives are theta-marked.

(18) a. *Mi-* *e* *nepot*
I.DAT.CL is.3SG nephew
'He is my nephew'

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

b. *E nepotul meu.*
Is nephew.DEF my
'He is my nephew'

Landau (2010) shows that Experiencers / Possessors are personal locations. Dative experiencers / posessors start out as locative arguments in small clauses and raise to value a grammatical person feature incorporated by the applicative head, a feature which turns Goals / Locations into Experiencers / Possessors, that is personal locations (see Cornilescu 2013).

According to Pylkkänen (2002), languages are similar regarding their core arguments but they differ with respect to the non-core arguments they allow. Non-core arguments are not part of the theta-structure of the verb, but they may be licensed as event participants by special applicative heads. Dative DPs are applied arguments, rather than core ones. Pylkkänen (2002) distinguishes between high applicative heads, which merge above the VP and denote a thematic relation between an individual and the event denoted by the verb phrase, and are therefore typical for unergative verbs:

(19) *Sol omnibus lucet*
Sun.NOM everybody.DAT shine.3.SG
'The shines shines for everybody'
(Latin *DativusCommodi/Incommodi*–Cornilescu 2013)

Low applied arguments bear no semantic relation to the verb; they only bear a transfer of possession relation to the direct object (see also Cuervo 2003). The low applicative head is the head of a small clause, introducing the extra argument.

In trying to see whether adnominal datives in Old Romanian can be analyzed as unaccusative dative structures, one notices a second point of dissimilarity, namely the obligatoriness vs. non-obligatoriness of the clitic.

With datives appearing in unaccusative structures, the clitic is obligatory (20), while adnominal datives optionally take clitics:

(20) a. *Mi- e somn / * E somn*
I.DAT.CL is.3SG sleep / is sleep
'I am sleepy'
b. *Mi se face somn / *Se*
I.DAT.CL se.REFL.CL makes sleep / se.REFL.CL
*facesomn*(Cornilescu 2013)
makes sleep
'I feel like sleeping'

(21) *(Îi) e nepot regelui.*
he.DAT is.3.SG nephew king.DEF.DAT
'He is the king's nephew / He is a nephew to the king'

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

The obligatoriness of the clitic is interpreted in Cornilescu (2013) as an indication that these unaccusative configurations are applicative constructions, with the Dative licensed by an expletive applicative head. The Dative merges as a Goal/Location in a position where it cannot value case. The clitic is required to pull the Dative out of the *v*P, to a position where case may be valued.

On the other hand, the fact that the clitic is not obligatory with the adnominal dative and that, moreover, in our Old Romanian corpus, the adnominal dative is rarely accompanied by clitics can be explained by the fact that, in the 17thcnetury, when clitics are rare, the Dative stays inside the NP. When clitics become manifest in Romanian (in late Old Romanian), the Dative climbs to the VP, mirroring the clitics' movement to the T domain.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

The paper has focused on adnominal dative structures in Old Romanian. One of the primary aims of the paper has been gathering sufficient data from Old Romanian in order to establish a comprehensive corpus for further reference. The corpus contains adnominal dative structures dating as far back as the 16th century, both in translated and original texts. The investigation of the corpus has revealed that the head noun is either an agentive nominalization or a relational noun of various sub-types. In turn, this shows that nouns heading adnominal datives are theta-assigning nouns. The second part of the paper has looked at various proposals for the syntactic analysis of adnominal datives. It has shown that, according to the tests proposed in Giurgea (2015), the adnominal dative is part of the NP. Along the lines of Sigurdsson (2013), the paper has also shown that a syntactic analysis of the adnominal dative would benefit from assuming that the adnominal dative is not embedded in a larger PP or K(ase)P, but is inherently case-marked by the head noun, largely as a PF phenomenon. Thirdly, by looking at the contrast between adnominal datives and unaccusative dative structures, the paper has shown that the adnominal dative is interpreted as showing Possession.

## SOURCES

Antim Ivireanul, *Didahii*, in *Opere*, ed. byG.Ștrempel, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1972.

Cantacuzino, Ioan, *Patru apologii pentru religia creştină şi patru oraţii traduse în limba română la mijlocul secolului al XVII-lea de Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu)*, ed. by E. Dima, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Al. I. Cuza" din Iaşi, 2011.

Cantemir, Dimitrie, *Divanul sau Gâlceava înţeleptului cu lumea*, ed. by V. Cândea, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1990.

*Cronica lui Mihail Moxa (Oltenia, 1620)*, in Bogdan Petriceicu Hasdeu, *Cuvente den bătrâni. Limba română vorbită între 1550–1600*, ed. by G. Mihăilă, Bucureşti, Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1983, 299–425.

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)

Diaconul Coresi, *Carte cu învățătură (1581)*, ed. by S. Puşcariu, A. Procopovici, Bucureşti, Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co., 1914. (=*Cazania a II-a*)
Dosoftei, *Parimiile preste an (Iaşi, 1683)*, ed. by M. Ungureanu, Iaşi, Editura Universității "Al. I. Cuza", 2012.
Dosoftei, *Psaltirea de-nțăles [1680]*, ed. by M. Cobzaru, Casa Editorială "Demiug", Iaşi, 2007.
*Evangheliеînvățătoare (Govora, 1642)*, ed. by A.-M.Gherman, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2011.
*Istoriia a Alexandrului celui Mare din Machedoniia şi a lui Darie din Persida împăraților [1619–1620]*, in *Cărțile populare în literature românească*, ed by I. C. Chițimia, D. Simonescu, vol. I, Bucureşti, Editura pentru Literatură, 1963, p. 3–84.
*Istoria Țării Româneşti de la octombrie 1688 până la martie 1717 (Cronica Anonimă despre Brâncoveanu),* in *Cronicari munteni*, II, ed by M. Gregorian, Bucureşti, Editura pentru Literatură, 1961.
*Manuscrisul de la Ieud*, ed. by M. Teodorescu, I. Gheție, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1977.
Neculce, Ion, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei şi O samă de cuvinte*, ed. by I. Iordan, Bucureşti, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură şi Artă, 1959.
*Palia de la Orăştie (1581–1582)*, ed. by V. Pamfil, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1968.
*Pravila ritorului Lucaci (1581)*, ed. by I. Rizescu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1971.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Asbury, A., 2010, *The Morphosyntax of Case and Adpositions*, PHD Dissertation, Utrecht University.
Cornilescu, A., 2015, "On the Syntax of Datives in Unaccusative Configurations, in: E. O. Aboh, J. Schaeffer, P. Sleeman (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory*, *8*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 119–158.
Cuervo, M. C., 2003, *Datives at Large*, PhD Dissertation, MIT.
Dobrovie-Sorin, C., I. Giurgea, 2005, "Romanian Genitives and Determiners", *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 7, 1, 89–101.
Emonds, J., 1987, "The Invisible Category Principle", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 18, 613–632.
Giurgea, I., 2015, "On the Reanalysis of the Article AL into a Genitive Marker and the Emergence of the Adnominal Dative in Romanian", in: G. Pană Dindelegan *et al.* (eds), *Diachronic Variation in Romanian*, New castle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 67–97.
Grosu, A., 1988, "On the Distribution of Genitive Phrases in Romanian", *Linguistics*, 26, 931–949.
Marantz, A., 1993, "Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions", in: S. Mchombo (ed.), *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*, Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 113–150.
McFadden, T., 2004, *The Position of Morphological Case in the derivation: A study on the Syntax-Morphology Interface*, PhD Dissertation, Upenn.
Pylkkänen, L., 2008, *Introducing Arguments*, Cambridge MA, The MIT Press.
Rezac, M., 2008, "Phi-agree and Theta-Related Case", in: D. Harbor, D. Adger, S. Bejar (eds), *Phi Theory. Phi-Features across Modules and Interfaces*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 83–130.
Sigurdsson, H. A., 2011, "On the New Passive", *Syntax*, 14, 148–178.
Sigurdsson, H. A., 2013, "Case variation: viruses and star wars", lingbuzz/001458.

**BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)**

BDD-A26032 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-19 07:52:34 UTC)