Nominalized structures in Old Romanian

Camelia Stan
University of Bucharest
camistan@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper provides a diachronic and descriptive view of the verb based nominalization in Romanian. The discussion brings together a few overall observations on the most salient syntactic features of *event* (understoodin a broad sense, denoting actions, states, etc.) and *agent* nouns in Old Romanian.

Keywords: argument, aspect, case, nominalization

1. Introduction

This paper takes into consideration the recent research on the syntax of Romanian deverbal nouns, and adds a diachronic perspective to it. Most studies have adopted a synchronic descriptive perspective (see, more recently, Nedelcu 2013a, 2013b) or theoretical perspective on Modern Romanian (henceforth, MR) (see Cornilescu 2001; Cornilescu, Dobrovie-Sorin, Giurgea & Soare 2013).

With respect to older stages of Romanian, the analyses have focused on two issues:

(i) the formal typology of deverbal nouns, with a special focus on the origin and evolution of nominalizing affixes (see SMFC 1: 51-64, 206; SMFC 2: 101-116, 129-139, 155-162, 207-208; SMFC 3: 129-141, 175-196; SMFC 4: 69-79; SMFC 5: 47-55; Caragiu Marioţeanu 1962: 34-35; Carabulea & Popescu-Marin 1967 and references therein; Brâncuş [1967] 2007: 173; Fischer 1989; Creţia 1999: 199, §6.8.4; Stan 2003: 56-69; Popescu-Marin (ed.) 2007: 11-247, 271-286; Stanciu-Istrate 2012; Dragomirescu 2013a: 20-24, 85-161; Dragomirescu 2013b, a.o.);

(ii) the syntax of Old Romanian (henceforth, OR) nominalizations (see especially Byck 1951; Diaconescu 1971: 151-156; Diaconescu 1977: 73-83; Stan 2003: 79-255; Stan 2012, §2.5).

In what follows, we will present several properties of nominalizations in OR, contrasting them with MR. Nominalizations are understood in a broad sense, including (event or agent) deverbal nouns, but also other types of nouns, which, irrespective of their origin, are syntactically and semantically compatible with inclusion under the umbrella of *verb based nominalization.* The corpus analyzed is representative for the language of the 16th to the 18th centuries; for the timeline, we adopt the boundaries established by Gheţie (ILRL: 52-53).

2. The typology of nominalized structures in Old Romanian

The main types of nominalized structures attested in OR are the following:

- the 'long' nominal infinitive, with the suffixes *-are, -eare, -ere, -ire, -âre* (1);

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

- the nominal supine, with the suffixes *-s, -t* (2);[26]
- the nominal participle, with the suffixes *-s, -t* (3);
- suffixal formations (4).

(1) această ucidere (*Braşov, [1587]; DÎ: 203)
this kill.INF
'this killing'

(2) a. acolo va fi *plâns* şi *scârcicatul* dinţilor (TS: 85r)
there will be cried.SUP and grinded.SUP.DEF teeth.DEF.GEN
'there will be *crying* and *grinding* of the teeth there'

b. *fapt* de ciudă (PO: 189)
done.SUP of wonder
'miracle'[27]

(3) a. *călcata* (PS^B: 449) // *necălcata* (PH: 117v, PV: 40v)
stepped.PPART.F.DEF // unstepped.PPART.F.DEF
'the step, the way'[28] // 'the lack of way'

b. a doao *venrită* (CS: 119r)
the second come.PPART.F
'the second *coming*'

(4) a. *botejune* (CC^2: 246)
baptism.SUFF
'baptism'

b. *apestează* (CÎIFS: 320r)
lateness.SUFF
'lateness'

The examples in (4) are part of the same class of nominalizations as those in (1)-(3) in as much as they contain a verbal basis.

In (5a), the participle is (exceptionally) active, and its nominalization[29] can be paraphrased by maintaining the verbal source *a se teme de* 'to be afraid of', as shown in (5b). Note that this verb in (5b) is reflexive, which means that the reflexive pronoun receives the Accusative Case of the verb. Thus, the theme DP is always preceded by a preposition, which is *de* in these examples. The nominalized form in (5a) preserves the *de*-DP theme, despite the lack of the reflexive pronoun, because nouns do not assign Accusative Case. The example in (5c) shows that the first stages of nominalization may preserve properties of the verbal inflection, such as the negation *nu* instead of the nominal *ne-*.

[26] We have adopted the largely accepted interpretation of the Romanian supine as a deverbal noun (see, among many, Graur 1968: 185-200, Coteanu 1981: 53, Reinheimer Rîpeanu 1989: 82, Gherman 2007: 279-286 a. o.); this interpretation correlates with the old hypothesis (defended by C. H. Grandgent, É. Bourciez a.o.), according to which Romanian has inherited the Latin supine. For a recent synthesis of this controversial problem, see Dragomirescu (2013b and references therein).

[27] The glossing is done by reference to the Hungarian original version, see Pamfil in PO: 383; *fapt* 'making', in DA/DLR s.v.

[28] DA/DLR s.v. *călca.*

[29] Cf. Nicolae (2013: 152-154).

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

(5) a. blagosloviţi sâmtu *temuţii* *de Domnul* (PV: 25v)
blessed.PPART.M.PL are fearful.PPART.M.PL.DEF of God.DEF
'blessed are those who fear God'
b. cei ce se tem de Dumnedzeu (PH: 99v)[30]
those that REFL fear.3 of God
'those who fear God'
c. *nufaptul* (PV: 41v)
not.done.PPART.M.SG.DEF
'the has-not-been-done'

Other forms of nominalizations may involve a zero suffix (6a), prefixed forms (6b), loan translations with a compound structure (6c) and non-analyzable words, related to nominalizations due to their syntactic behavior, determined by the abstract verbal significance (6d-e).

(6) a. lucrul nostru-i de *căştigă*[31] (FT: 1r)
mission our is of worry
'our mission is worrying / our mission is to worry'
b. *nepaza*[32] (Prav. 1646: 107)
non-guard.DEF
'(the) non-guard / carelessness'
c. *giosculcări* (Dosoftei in DA s.v. *jos;* FC I: 126)
down-sleep.INF.PL
'sleeping down (on the floor)'
d. *andelogos* a[33] dobânzii şi a roadelor[34] (Pr. C: 183)
compensation a.GEN interest.F.SG.DEF.GEN and a.GEN crops.F.DEF.GEN
'compensation of the interest and of the crops'
e. *iureş* (BVS: 34v; also with the form *iuruş,* BVS 32r)
assault
'assault'

The most important process has been the nominalization of the long infinitive. The oldest Daco-Romanian texts of the 16th century testify to the coexistence of the long verbal infinitive (with the Latin suffix *-re: ucidere* 'kill') with the long nominal infinitive (*ucidere* 'killing', see (1)) and the 'short' infinitive, without the suffix *-re* (*ucide* 'kill') (Densusianu 1938:

[30] See also: (i) *cei ce temu-se* *de Domnulŭ* (PS[B]: 382; cf. Candrea in PS[C]: 244)
those that fear=CL.REFL of God.DEF
'those who fear God'

[31] *Căştigă* < *a câştiga* 'to worry' (FT: 325).
[32] With the prefix *ne-.*
[33] *A* is a grammaticalized functional element, a syntactic marker of the Genitive. It is used in the invariable form *a* or in the variable forms *al*M.SG, *a*F.SG, *ai*M.PL, *ale*F.PL.
[34] See also: (i) *să compenseze dobânda şi roadele* (Pr. C, *ib.*)
SUBJ compensate interest.DEF and crops.DEF
'to compensate the interest and crops'

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

236-238, 302-308; Rosetti 1986: 508; Nedelcu 2013c: 26-27).[35] The old texts attest to the existence of certain transitional interfering stages of the nominalization process, closed off in OR by the end of the 18th century (Stan 2013). Certain realizations of the arguments of the infinitive have been recorded preponderantly or exclusively in the bridging structures, from long verbal infinitive to long nominal infinitive (see section 3.vi below).

3. The syntax of nominalized phrases in Old Romanian

3.1. Typical constructions

Typically, the argument of a noun in OR surfaces with inflection for Genitive Case. This is also the typical situation in MR. The pattern is attested as early as *Neacşu's Letter,* the oldest Romanian original text:

(7) *lucrul* *turcilor* (…) *lucrul* *lu*[36] *Mahamet-beg*
deed.DEF Turks.DEF.GEN deed.DEF lu.GEN Mahamet-beg
(*Neacşu's Letter,* *Câmpulung, Argeş, 1521 cca; DÎ: 95, 1r)
'the deeds of the Turks (…) the deeds of Mahamet-beg'

A few nominalized structures preserve the ancient analytic Genitive introduced by the functional preposition *de*, modelled on a possessive pattern, which continues the Latin DE-structure, out of which the Romance Genitive is derived (Meyer-Lübke 1900: 285; Bourciez [1910] 1956: 588; Densusianu 1938: 143-144; Guţu Romalo 1996: 78; Iliescu 2007: 233; Iliescu [1965] 2008a: 62-65; Iliescu [2006] 2008a: 317-318; Iliescu 2008b: 3268; on the Romanian Genitive, compared to the Romance Genitive, see, more recently, Salvi 2011: 335-326). The pattern of *de*-Genitives is dependent on agent nouns, originating in substantivized deverbal adjectives with the suffix *-tor*. The structures date back to the16th (8a) and 17th (8b-c) centuries. The preposition *de* selects a definite referential expression, i.e. a definite DP (8a-b) or a proper name (8c). The structures in (8a-b) are ambiguous. In (8c), *de*-Genitive corresponds to some Latin Dative constructions.

(8) a. *ispăsitoriul* *de* ***păcatele*** *noastre* (CC[1]: 167, 217r)
forgiver.M.SG.DEF of sins.DEF our
'Jesus Christ is the only forgiver of our sins for Christians'
b. galeōtae, g.m.pl. *spuitori* *de* *ceale* *viitoare* (CDicţ. 215)
galeōtae, g.m.pl. tellers.M of those future
'galeōtae, g.m.pl. tellers of the future ones'
c. *rugător* *de* *Dumnedzeu.* Devotus. Precibus addictus
the one who prays of God Devotus. Precibus addictus
'the one who prays to God. Devotus. Precibus addictus'
(AC: 3833)

[35] On the nominalization of the infinitive as a typological feature of Romanian, see Meyer-Lübke (1900: 26-27); and, more recently, Gauger (1996: 14).
[36] *Lu/lui* is a free proclitic morpheme which introduces a Genitive.

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

The patterns in (8) are bookish; since it is absent from old original documents (e.g. letters, notes, administrative papers), we can infer that *de*-Genitives were probably no longer used in speech in the 16th century and in the following period. In (8a) *de păcatele* is an objective genitive: *ispăşeşte păcatele* ('forgives the sins') or a prepositional object: *ispăşeşte de* ('sets free from; forgives of'). In (8b) *spuitori de ceale viitoare* is an adjectival phrase or a nominalized phrase; in the nominal phrase interpretation, the structure *de cele viitoare* 'of the future ones' is an analytic objective Genitive, corresponding to a direct object: *spun ceale viitoare* ('they tell the future ones'); the phrase *de cele viitoare* is also interpretable as a prepositional object *spun de ceale viitoare* ('they speak about the future ones'); the phrase selected by the preposition *de* includes the definite determiner *cel*, used as a pronoun). In (8c) Lat. DEVŌTUS 'faithful' was both a noun and an adjective; as an adjective, it took a Dative complement in Latin (Theil s.v.); Lat. PRECIBUS ADDĪCTUS 'the one who brings prayers' features a perfect participle and a dative (Theil s.v. ADDĪCO).

3.2. Morphological and structural Case patterns

3.2.1. Possessive adjectives

The possessive adjective was, in general, the equivalent of the Genitive (see 3.1 above), like in the contemporary language. The structures are attested since *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki*, the oldest translation into Romanian preserved to the present day. In (9), the possessive has an agentive interpretation.

(9) *scoaterea* *ta* (PH: 8v)
take.out.INF.DEF your
'your salvation (i.e. you save me)'

Exceptionally, the possessive adjective appears as an equivalent of the Dative indirect object. The structure has been preserved to the present day in the prayer *Our father*:

(10) *greşiţilor* ***noştri***
mistaken.M.PL.DEF.DAT our
'those who trespass against us'
(CCat.: 8v; CL: 36r; CT: 10; CC^2: 561; CM: 194, 256r)[37]

3.2.2. Direct objects DP select *de*-phrases

The PP in which *de* selects a non-referential expression, a bare NP, corresponds in nominalized structures to a direct object (example (2b), repeated below as (11a)); in rare cases, the non-referential *de*-phrase corresponds to a subject (11b):

(11) a. pre un *fapt* ***de ciudă*** (PO: 189)
on a done.SUP of wonder
'on performing a miracle // when you will perform a miracle'
b. ca *răsărirea* *de chiedru* (CÎIFS: 334r)
like sprout.INF.DEF of cedar

[37] The form *greschicilor*, with a German orthography also appears in (TNG: 114).

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

'like the cedar sprouting // as the cedar sprouts'

The pattern has been attested since the 16th century (e.g., 11a). Quite often, the non-referential *de*-phrase is semantically akin to a restrictive modifier: the *de*-phrase and the noun make up a denotational unit. This notional (referential) unity is clearer in the case of nominalizations with a concrete referent:

(12) *prăjitoarea de cafea* (Braşov, 1740; ISBD: 105)
toaster.DEF of coffee
'the coffee toaster'

The non-referential *de*-structure, corresponding to a direct object or to a subject, had a relatively low frequency, up to the end of the 18th century. In the following period its usage extended. The preposition *de* was not fully functional in old structures of this type; this status has been preserved in the contemporary language (see Pană Dindelegan 2008 for the values of Romanian DP-internal *de*).

The pattern of juridical jargon in OR codes of law (13) underlies the modern juridical, administrative or scientific terminology.

(13) *(a)mestecare(a)* *de sânge* (Prav. 1646: 126, 145, 146 etc.)
mix.INF.(DEF) of blood
'mixture of blood (a fact for which the code of law prescribes penalties)'

3.2.3 Definite article?

The prepositional realization of certain arguments in nominalized structures raises the problem of the ancient meanings of certain prepositions and the problem of the post-prepositional presence of the definite article. For example, in (14), the noun bears article, and contextually has the status of a proper name; subsequently, the usage of articleless nouns has prevailed.

(14) *biruire* *spre* *diavolul* (Caz. G: 582)
triumph.INF against devil.DEF
'triumph against the devil'

3.2.4. Dative objects

The Dative occurred more frequently in the old language nominalizations, and the types of constructions were more varied than in the contemporary language (for situations other than the ones presented here, see Stan 2003: 114-123).

In certain contexts, the Dative is interpretable both as adverbal, and as adnominal. In (15), the Dative *învierei* 'resurrection' may be explained by the ancient Case selection features of *a crede* 'to believe' (e.g., *a crede cuiva* 'to believe someone(DAT)'; DA/DLR s.v.).

(15) *să* nu cumva *facem necredinţă* *învierei* (TF: 3v)
SUBJ not somehow make unfaith resurrection.DEF.DAT
'that we shouldn't not believe resurrection'

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

In (16), the co-occurrence of the clitic *ne* indicates that the Dative *sufletului* is, most probably, only adnominal, not adverbal.

(16) *ne* *stă* *spăsenie* *sufletului* (CC[1]: 39, A4v)
we.CL.DAT stays salvation soul.DEF.DAT
'it is salvation to our soul'

3.2.5. PP with other preposition than *de*

Sometimes, in the 16th century texts, the direct object of the noun lacks the inflectional Genitive marking or the inclusion in a *de*-phrase; it is, instead, instantiated as a PP of other type, where the Case of the noun argument is Accusative, as shown in (17). PP with *pe*-DP will turn out to be a typical option for instantiating the direct objects of verbs, when *differential object marking* applies.

(17) a. feace *arătătură* *pre sine* (CC[1]: 38, 8v)[38]
does show DOM himself
'he shows himself'

b. *purtătoriul* *pre noi* în viiaţa de veac (CC[1]: 167, 217r)
carrier.M.SG.DEF DOM us in life.F.SG.DEF of eternity
'the one who takes (bears) us in the afterlife'

An interesting example is (18).

(18) întrebară-ne *prădătorii-ne* cuvente de cântare (PV: 39r)
asked.3PL=CL.us robers.M.PL.DEF=CL.us words of praise
'our robbers asked us for words of praise'

In (18), the adnominal clitic pronoun *ne* is ambiguous, being interpretable both as a possessive Dative 'our robbers', or as an Accusative direct object '(they) rob us', visible from the comparison with the corresponding passage from *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki*, where its counterpart is a direct object construction. That is, *cei ce ne prădară* (PH: 116v) 'those who robbed us'; also, *ceia ce ne prădară pre noi* (D, *ap.* Candrea, în PS[C]: 285) 'those who robbed us'.

After the 16th century, the PP with Accusative Case is attested in a few structures as the realization of the direct object of a long nominal infinitive, as in (19).

(19) *mărturisirea* *pre Hristos* (NT: 135, 12v)
confess.INF.DEF DOM Christ
'confessing Christ'

The existence of direct objects with *pre*-DP, albeit accidental, indicates that the nominalization of the long infinitive was still syntactically incomplete, since the long infinitive preserves, up to the beginning of the 18th century, its transitivity, a typically verbal property. The nominal construction, with the direct object marked by the Genitive (the objective Genitive), was not generalized.

[38] Cf. *fece* ***arătând*** *pre sine* 'he did it showing himself'= 'he showed himself' (CC[1]: 38, A4v).

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

3.3. Adjectives and adverbs in relation to nominalized phrases

Argumental adjectives (e.g., *unguresc* 'Hungarian') rarely appear in nominalized structures, with deverbal nouns (e.g., *ajutor* 'help'), as in (20). A few relatively late examples (the 17th and the 18th centuries) have been recorded.

(20) *ajutoriul ungurescu* (ULM: 9)
help.DEF Hungarian
'the Hungarian help' (i.e. 'the Hungarians help'; Agent)

The adjectives in these configurations are postnominal. The pattern extended and diversified after the 18th century (Stan 2003: 186-190).

Adverbs directly adjoined to a nominalized phrase with a verb basis (i.e. without the aid of the preposition *de*, which introduces DP-internal modifiers) are attested in all three centuries of OR (see also Vasiliu, in SLR: 100-101):

(21) a. *ducerea* domnului viei ***acasă*** (CC[2]: 298)
depart.INF.DEF owner.M.SG.DEF.GEN vineyard.DEF.GEN home
'the departure home of the owner of the vineyard'[39]
b. *vărsare* ***pre denafară*** (Prav. 1646: 142)
spill.INF on the outside / out of…
'spilling on the outside / out of…'[40]
c. *pază* *de departe* (PIst.: 450)
guard.F.SG from faraway
'faraway guard'[41]

The adverb in (22) points to the presence of an aspectual structure, characteristic of advanced stages of nominalization (Sleeman & Brito 2010: 210):

(22) *sfada* *totdeauna* (SA: 81)
quarrel.F.SG.DEF always
'the never-ending quarrel'

3.4. "Cognate" constituents

The nominalizations also appear in structures with so-called "cognate" constituents (i.e. from the same root or from the same semantic class), specific to OR; see (23).

(23) a. cu *audzit audziră,* şi nu vor înţeleage (TS: 42v)
with sound hear.PS. and not will understand
'with voice / sound they heard, and they will not understand'
b. să vază *muncile* *munciţilor,* unde *să* *muncesc* păcătoşii
SUBJ see labours.DEF labourers.DEF.GEN where REFL labor.3.PL sinners.DEF

[39] Cf. 'the owner of the vineyard departs home'.
[40] Cf. *a vărsa pre denafară* 'to spill on the outside / out of'.
[41] Cf. *a păzi de departe, de la distanţă* 'to guard from faraway, from a distance'.

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

(AMD, III: 528r)
'to see the labours of the labourers, where sinners are put to labour'

c. *datul* *daniei* (1779; Doc. Athos[2]: 102)
given.SUP give.DEF.GEN
'giving the give (i.e. giving what is ought to be given)'

4. Conclusions

The analysis we have undertaken allows us to formulate two important conclusions: (i) the syntactic structures that have been preserved are attested as early as the 16th century; (ii) throughout the OR timeline, the dynamics of the nominalized structures show a tendency towards the growth of the nominal features.

The data we provided can be used for formal analyses that focus on the recategorization in language, as they document intermediate stages, when the learner computes both categorial features (i.e., [V] and [N]) instead of alternating between one and another. It is also obvious that the nominalization arises only on the basis of non-finite verb forms, which confirms the current cause-and-effect relation between the nominal analysis of selected non-finite clauses and the nominalization of the relevant verb forms. For example, none of the nominalization structures is based on gerunds, which were mostly adjunct (i.e., non-selected) in OR.

Sources

AC — Chivu, Gheorghe (ed.). 2008. *Dictionarium valachico-latinum* [*Anonymus Caransebesiensis,* 1650]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

AMD — Dima, Cristina-Ioana (ed.). 2012. *Apocalipsul Maicii Domnului. Versiuni româneşti din secolele al XVI-lea – al XIX-lea.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

BVS — Timotin, Emanuela (ed.). 2013. Vlad Boţulescu de Mălăieşti, 1763, *Viaţa lui Scanderbeg* [Wallachia, Milano]. In Id., *Scrieri,* Vol. 1. Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic Gold.

Caz. G — Gherman, Alin-Mihai (ed.). 2011. *Evanghelie învăţătoare (Govora, 1642).* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

CC[1] — Drimba, Vladimir (ed.). 1998. Coresi, [1567-1568 cca.], *Tâlcul Evangheliilor* [Braşov]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

CC[2] — Puşcariu, Sextil & Alexie Procopovici (eds.). 1914. Coresi, popa Iane, popa Mihai, 1581, *Evanghelia cu învăţătură.* Braşov. Bucharest: Socec.

CCat. — Roman Moraru, Alexandra (ed.). 1982. Coresi, 1560 cca, *Catehism* [Braşov]. In TR: 19-128.

CDicţ. — Gherman, Alin-Mihai (ed.). 2001. Teodor Corbea, [1691-1697], *Dictiones latinae cum valachica interpretatione* [Braşov]. [Cluj-Napoca]: Clusium.

CÎIFS — Bălan-Mihailovici, Aurelia (ed.). 2005. *Cartea înţelepciunii lui Iisus, feciorul lui Sirah* [Câmpulung Muscel, 1665-1672 cca.]. Câmpulung Muscel: Sinergii.

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

CL	Mareş, Alexandru (ed.). 1969. Coresi, [1570], *Liturghier* [Braşov]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
CLRV I	Mareş, Alexandru (ed.). 1994. *Crestomaţia limbii române vechi,* Vol. 1. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
CM	Drimba, Vladimir (ed.). 1998. Coresi, 1567-1568, *Molitvenic rumânesc* [Braşov]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
CS	Chivu, Gheorghe (ed.). 1993. *Codex Sturdzanus* [1583-1619 cca.]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
DÎ	Mareş, Alexandru *et al.* (eds.). 1979. *Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
Doc. Athos[2]	Zahariuc, Petronel & Florin Marinescu (eds.). 2010. *Documente româneşti din arhiva Mănăstirii Xenofon de la Muntele Athos,* 51-103. Iassy: Editura Universităţii Alexandru Ioan Cuza.
FT	Gheţie, Ion (ed.). 1982. *Fragmentul Todorescu* [Cluj, 1571-1575 cca.]. In TR: 259-364.
ISBD	Iorga, N. (ed.). 1925. *Scrisori de boieri, scrisori de domni,* 2nd edn. Vălenii de Munte: Datina Românească.
NT	*Noul Testament* [Bălgrad, 1648]. Edn.: 1988. Alba Iulia: Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe Române.
PH	Gheţie, Ion & Mirela Teodorescu (eds.). 2005. *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki* [Moldavia, 1490-1516 cca.]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
PIst.	Mazilu, Dan Horia (ed.). 2004. Radu Popescu [18 c.], *Istoriile domnilor Ţării Rumâneşti*, 755-867. Bucharest: Academia Română, Editura Fundaţiei Naţionale pentru Ştiinţă şi Artă, Univers Enciclopedic.
PO	Pamfil, Viorica (ed.). 1968. *Palia* (Orăştie, 1582). Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
Prav. 1646	Rădulescu, Andrei *et al.* (eds.). 1961. *Carte românească de învăţătură* (Iassy, 1646). Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
Pr. C	Rădulescu, Andrei *et al* (eds.). 1957. *Pravilniceasca condică* (1780). Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
PS^B	Bianu, I. (ed.). 1889. *Psaltirea Scheiană* [Moldavia, 1573-1578], Vol. 1. Bucharest: Carol Göbl.
PS^C	Candrea, I.-A. (ed.). 1916. *Psaltirea Scheiană* [Moldavia, 1573-1578], Vol. 2. Bucharest: Socec.
PV	Georgescu, Magdalena (ed.). 1994. *Psaltirea Voroneţeană* [*Moldavia, 1551-1558]. In CLRV I: 59-62.
SA	Goţia, Anton (ed.). 1984. Ioan Zoba din Vinţ, 1683, *Sicriul de aur* (Sas-Sebeş). Bucharest: Minerva.
TF	Mareş, Alexandru (ed.). 1994. Toader din Feldru, 1639, [*Cuvântare la înmormântarea Sofroniei Ciogolea* (Suceava)]. In CLRV I: 207-210.
TNG	Ciocîltan, Alexandru (ed.). 2011. *Tatăl nostru* [Martin Gruneweg, 1601-1606]. In Ştefan Andreescu *et al.* (eds.), *Călători străini despre ţările române. Supliment,* Vol. 1, 65-69, 114. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
TR	Gheţie, Ion *et al.* (eds.). 1982. *Texte româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

TS	Petrovici, Emil & L. Demény (eds.). 1971. *Tetraevanghel* (Sibiu, [1551-1553]). Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române. Alexandru Mareş (ed.), in CLRV I: 53-56.
ULM	Ştrempel, Gabriel (ed.). 2003. Grigore Ureche, 17 c., *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei*, 1-169. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, Univers Enciclopedic.

References

Bourciez, É. [1910] 1956. *Éléments de linguistique romane,* 4e édition [1re éd.: 1910]. Paris: Klincksieck.

Brâncuş, Gr. [1967] 2007. O concordanţă gramaticală româno-albaneză: modul supin. *Limbă şi literatură,* XIII, 1967. Reprinted in Id., 2007, *Studii de istorie a limbii române,* 167-173. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Byck, J. 1951. Derivaţie şi sintaxă. *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* 2: 125-129.

Carabulea, Elena & Magdalena Popescu-Marin. 1967. Exprimarea numelui de acţiune prin substantive cu formă de infinitiv lung şi de supin. SMFC 4: 277-320.

Caragiu Marioţeanu, M. 1962. Moduri nepersonale. *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* 13(1): 29-42.

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2001. Romanian nominalizations: Case and aspectual structure. *Journal of Linguistics* 37(3): 467-501.

Cornilescu, Alexandra, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin, Ion Giurgea & Elena Soare. 2013. Deverbal nouns. In Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin & Ion Giurgea (eds.), *A Reference Grammar of Romanian,* Vol. 1, *The noun phrase,* 663-708. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Coteanu, Ion. 1981. *Structura şi evoluţia limbii române (de la origini până la 1860).* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Creţia, Gabriela. 1999. *Morfologia istorică a verbului latin.* Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

DA/DLR. Academia Română. 1913-1948. *Dicţionarul limbii române.* Bucharest: Socec, Universul, Monitorul Oficial şi Imprimeriile Statului, Imprimeria Naţională. 1965-2010 (serie nouă). Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Densusianu, Ovide. 1901, 1938. *Histoire de la langue roumaine,* Vol. 1-2. Paris: Leroux.

Diaconescu, Ion. 1971. Supinul în limba română din secolele al XVI-lea, al XVII-lea şi al XVIII-lea. *Analele Universităţii Bucureşti. Limba şi literatura română* 20(1-2): 151-163.

Diaconescu, Ion. 1977. *Infinitivul în limba română.* Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Dragomirescu, Adina. 2013a. *Particularităţi sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Supinul*. Bucharest: Editura Muzeului Naţional al Literaturii Române.

Dragomirescu, Adina. 2013b. Du latin au roumain: une nouvelle hypothèse sur l'origine du supin roumain. *Revue de linguistique romane* 77(305-306): 51-85.

FC I. Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică din Bucureşti. Ciobanu, Fulvia & Finuţa Hasan. 1970. *Formarea cuvintelor în limba română,* Vol. 1, *Compunerea.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Fischer, Iancu. 1989. Rumänisch Wortbildungslehre. Formation des mots. In Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin & Christian Schmitt (eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik,* Vol. 3, 33-55. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

Gauger, Hans-Martin. 1996. Les particularités de la langue roumaine. In Iliescu & Sora (Hrsg.), 1-17.
Gherman, Cristina. 2007. Substantivarea. In Popescu-Marin (ed.), 271-296.
Graur, Al. 1968. *Tendinţele actuale ale limbii române.* Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică.
Guţu Romalo, Valeria. 1996. Le roumain – évolution et typologie. In Iliescu & Sora (Hrsg.), 77-83.
Iliescu, Maria. 2006. La grammaticalisation de l'expression du déterminant d'appartenance en ancien français et en roumain. *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 51(2): 211-222. Reprinted in Id., 2008a, *Miscellanea Romanica (1956-2007),* 311-322. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium/Scriptor.
Iliescu, Maria. 2007. *Româna din perspectivă romanică.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
Iliescu, Maria. 2008b. Phénomènes de convergence et de divergence dans la Romania: morphosyntaxe et syntaxe. In Gerhard Ernst, Martin-Dietrich Gleβgen, Christian Schmitt & Wolfgang Schweickard (eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte. Histoire linguistique de la Romania*, 3266-3281. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter.
Iliescu, Maria & Liliana Macarie. 1965. Schiţă de evoluţie a declinării în latina târzie. *Studii şi cercetări lingvistice* 16(4): 469-498. Reprinted in Id., 2008a, *Miscellanea Romanica (1956-2007),* 39-75. Cluj-Napoca: Clusium/Scriptor.
Iliescu, Maria & Sanda Sora (Hrsg.). 1996. *Rumänisch: Typologie, Klassifikation, Sprachcharakteristik. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums der Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft und des Instituts für Romanische Philologie der Universität München, Tutzing, 30.3.-2.4.1993. Balkan-Archiv*, neue Folge, Beiheft, 11, Südosteuropa-Schriften, 14, Veitshöchheim bei Würzburg.
ILRL. Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică "Iorgu Iordan" Bucureşti. Gheţie, Ion (ed.). 1997. *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche (1532–1780).* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
Meyer-Lübke, W. 1900. *Grammaire des langues romanes,* Vol. 3. Paris: Welter.
Nedelcu, Isabela. 2013a. Deverbal and deadjectival nouns. In Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 283-284.
Nedelcu, Isabela. 2013b. The arguments of deverbal and deadjectival nouns. In Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 349-353.
Nedelcu, Isabela. 2013c. *Particularităţi sintactice ale limbii române în context romanic. Infinitivul.* Bucharest: Editura Muzeul Naţional al Literaturii Române.
Nicolae, Alexandru-Cosmin. 2013. *Types of Ellipsis in Romanian.* PhD dissertation. University of Bucharest, University of Cambridge.
Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2008. Tipuri de gramaticalizare. Pe marginea utilizărilor gramaticalizate ale prepoziţiilor *de* şi *la*. In Id. (ed.), *Limba română. Dinamica limbii, dinamica interpretării,* 227-239. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.
Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.). 2013. *The Grammar of Romanian.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Popescu-Marin, Magdalena (ed.). 2007. *Formarea cuvintelor în limba română din secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea.* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
Reinheimer Rîpeanu, Sanda. 1989. Conversiune. In Marius Sala (ed.), *Enciclopedia limbilor romanice,* 81-82. Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.
Rosetti, Al. 1986. *Istoria limbii române,* Vol. 1, *De la origini până la începutul secolului al XVII-lea* [1st edn.: 1938]. [Bucharest]: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2011. Morphosyntactic persistence. In Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith & Adam Ledgeway (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages,* Vol. 1, *Structures,* 318-381. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Sleeman, Petra & Ana Maria Brito. 2010. Aspect and argument structure of deverbal nominalizations: A split vP analysis. In Artemis Alexiadou & Monika Rathert (eds.), *The Syntax of Nominalizations across Languages and Frameworks,* 199-217. Berlin/New York: W. de Gruyter Mouton.
SLR. Avram, Mioara (ed.). 2007. *Sintaxa limbii române în secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea* [1st edn.: 1967, ms.]. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române,.
SMFC. 1959-1972. *Studii şi materiale privitoare la formarea cuvintelor în limba română,* Vol. 1-6. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
Stan, Camelia. 2003. *Gramatica numelor de acţiune din limba română.* Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.
Stan, Camelia. 2012. *O sintaxă diacronică a limbii române vechi.* Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti (to appear).
Stan, Camelia. 2013. La nominalizzazione dell'infinito in rumeno – osservazioni diacronico-tipologiche. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 58(1): 31-40.
Stanciu-Istrate, Maria. 2012. Derivate neobişnuite într-un text românesc din a doua jumătate a secolului al XVII-lea. *Limba română* 61(1): 37-43.
Theil, M. 1887. *Dictionnaire latin-français.* Paris: Firmin-Didot.

BDD-A20999 © 2014 Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.34 (2026-11-14 00:05:26 UTC)