THE SLAVIC–BALKAN CONTACT: THE CASE OF LIPOVAN ROMANIAN

ADNANA BOIOC APINTEI[1]

"Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics
Romanian Academy

Abstract

Despite having Romanian as an official language, Dobrudja represents rather a multilingual region within Romania. Within this peculiar linguistic context, Romanian – Russian language contact found in Lipovan communities is clearly of interest, inasmuch as here (a variety of) Daco-Romanian meets a particular dialect of Russian, i.e. Lipovan Russian; thus, the Romanian spoken in these communities, i.e. Lipovan Romanian, is expected to be quite different than the standard language, bearing the signs of a long-lasting contact. In this paper I will focus on the effects of this contact upon the morphosyntax of Lipovan Romanian. In doing so, I will bring new data gathered from different ethnographic and linguistic fieldwork I have conducted in Lipovan communities (i.e., certain villages from Tulcea county) since February 2018.

Keywords: *contact language; morphosyntactic consequences; Lipovan community; Romanian-Russian contact language.*

1. Aim of the Paper

This paper is devoted to the examination of the Romanian variety spoken in the Lipovan community from Dobrudja[2]. I analyse the

[1] **Adnana Boioc Apintei** is a PhD student in linguistics at the University of Bucharest (within the Doctoral School of the Faculty of Letters), and a junior researcher at the "Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics. Her research concentrates on the most visible effects of the influence of Lipovan Russian (the mother tongue of the inhabitants known as the *Lipovans*) on Romanian and focuses mainly on the morphological and syntactic consequences of the linguistic contact (between Romanian and Russian); e-mail: adnanaboioc@gmail.com.

morphological and syntactic effects of language contact and the subject is very interesting, especially with respect to language contact (Weinreich 2013 [1953]; Sala 1977; Windford 2003; Matras 2010, etc.), since Romance, Balkan, and Slavic features overlap in this variety.

The paper aims to offer: (i) a descriptive account of the Romanian variety spoken in the Lipovan community from Dobrudja; (ii) the presentation of a set of constructions found in the Romanian variety spoken in this area, which are different from standard Romanian; the data gathered and their analysis are based on a fieldwork study.

2. Linguistic Contact and its Consequences

When two (or more) languages are spoken at the same time by people living in a specific area, these languages are considered to be in contact. Consequently, linguistic material can be transferred from one language to the other (Kuteva 2017: 163), resulting in a range of possible linguistic innovations. The most straightforward cases, where the source and target languages are fairly easy to identify, involve lexical borrowings (Grenoble 2010: 581-582; Gardani 2018: 1). Thus, in the overwhelming part of the literature, two opposite points of view on linguistic contact have been expressed: one claims that linguistic contact cannot affect all the domains of a language (Weinreich 2013 [1953]: 41, among others), whereas the other states that there are no limitations on the influence of one linguistic system over the other (Sala 1997: 133, among others). Areas such as phonology, morphology, and syntax can also be affected (Matras 2010: 66; Heine/Kuteva 2010: 86; Kuteva 2017: 163), but in such cases contact should not be automatically seen as the only source of change (Thomason 2010: 32).

A more moderate approach, that I will adopt in the present paper, was put forward by Hickey (2010); in short, he considers that, although

[2] Romania has the following historical regions: Transylvania, Banat and Crișana, Moldova, Maramureș, Walachia, and Dobrudja. The map inserted in the paper (see below) presents the Dobrudja area, with its villages: Sarichioi, Jurilovca, Carcaliu, etc. where Lipovan are living today.

every linguistic level could be changed as a consequence of linguistic contact, there are notable differences in the rhythm of change, i.e. isolated words and discourse markers can be easily borrowed (Hickey 2010: 14), while syntactic changes are less frequent (McMahon 2010: 141).

In Lipovan communities the contact between Russian and Romanian can be recognized easily even today: although the official language is Romanian, Russian remains the language for 'interethnic communication', and continues to be seen as a prestigious language.

In this paper, I will consider the case of the Russian influence on Lipovan Romanian with an examination of the constructions found in the Romanian variety spoken in this area.

3. A Bird's Eye View on the Lipovan Community

In this section, I will present the main data regarding the history of Lipovans, along with the context in which they arrived and settled on the Romanian territory, especially in Dobrudja.

3.1. The history of Lipovan migration

The history of Lipovan migration is enormously diverse, as it goes back to the 17th century and needs a lot of background information. The mid-17th century Schism made the Old Believers leave Russia. The term "Old Belief" refers to the churches and religious communities that do not recognize the reforms launched in the Russian Orthodox Church in the 17th century by Patriarch Nikon (1652-1666) (see Chirilă 1993; Vascenco 2003; Tudose 2015).

It is important to mention that there are multiple countries in Europe (besides Romania and the Republic of Moldova) and even on different continents where Russian Lipovans found shelter after the church split. There are Russian Lipovan settlements in Ukraine, Bulgaria, Hungary, Turkey, and even USA, China, and Uruguay (Ipatiov 2001: 30-31; Tudose 2015: 129-130).

There are around 70 settlements with predominantly Lipovan population around Romanian territories. Most of them are located around the Northern- or South-Eastern part of the country (Bukovina, Dobrudja, and Wallachia). Moreover, besides rural, 100% Lipovan inhabited areas, it is important to mention that most of busy industrial cities include Lipovan neighbourhoods (Bucharest, Constanța, Brăila, Iași, Botoșani, etc.). In cities, Lipovans live in closed, religiously confined communities. However, urbanized Lipovans have less traditional roots and religious backgrounds than their village peers; unfortunately, Russian Lipovans in Romania no longer attend Russian schools.

According to Farisenkova and Izotov (2014), the migration of Russian Lipovans took place gradually, but the first Lipovans' attempts to come to Romania and the Republic of Moldova happened in the later part of the 17th century. The geographical point earliest inhabited (the oldest records) by Lipovans was a village named Lipoven', which is situated in Bukovina county. A decade and so later, in 1743, some Lipovan groups migrated further, to Moldova (close to Fălticeni), and they established a village of their own in a place that was a linden tree forest before. Finally, the most populated Lipovan Romanian area is Dobrudja, which was officially claimed by Russian Lipovans in the second half of the 18th century, and where the habitants built female and male monasteries at the beginning of the 19th century; these are still the hubs of Romanian-Russian Lipovan cultural lives.

3.2. The establishment of the Lipovan Russians in Dobrudja (Romania)

The immigration of Lipovans in Dobrudja took place in several stages, gradually making up a compact community in which traditions, language, and confessional character have been preserved and consolidated. They use Russian in the family, at home, and Romanian as the official language of the community. The Russian language has been an important means of maintaining the Lipovan identity and has served to separate members of the religious community from their non-Russian-speaking neighbours. Children are still learning Russian and it is still extensively used in the social life. A written tradition has

developed through the publication of *Zorile*, a bilingual Romanian-Russian newspaper, and through the writings of numerous Lipovans about their own history. There is no doubt that the Lipovans have preserved much of their cultural and linguistic identity. The oldest generation of Lipovans has lived through much of this complex group history.



Fig. 1. *The establishment of the Lipovans Russians in Romania* (Chirilă 1993: 44)

We can see in *Fig. 1*, one of the areas (Dobrudja, situated in South-Eastern Romania) where Lipovans have settled.

The history of Prigarin (2007) discusses the stages of the formation of this community:

1. From the end of the 17th century until 1740: the presence of Lipovan Russians is not massive.
2. 1740-1770: this period witnesses the beginning of the consolidation of the first stable communities of Lipovan Russians, due to massive immigration to this area. Generally, they settled in Sarichioi, Jurilovca, Slava, or Vâlcov (see also Tudose 2015: 158).

3. 1780-1812: the geographical area of the population of Lipovan Russians is progressively growing, and they occupy more and more villages in the South-Eastern part of Romania.
4. 1812-1829: the status of the Southern villages of Moldova is legalized, a moment distinguished by the arrival of a new group of Lipovans, but also by the immigration of a group of Lipovans to the Ottoman Empire.
5. After 1830-1831: a large part of the population of Lipovans moves out of Dobrudja, forming a Lipovan community in Bugeac (Tudose 2015: 163).

Currently, according to the estimations of Russian researchers, the overall number of Old Believers in Russia and elsewhere is of approximately two millions, although others consider it to be of more than three millions. Active communities can be found in Romania, Russia, Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, and other countries (Ipatiov 2001: 30-31; Tudose 2015: 129-130).

4. The Slavic–Balkan Contact: The Case of Lipovan Romanian. Consequences of Russian-Romanian Linguistic Contact

My research is based on empirical data I collected from the Lipovan community in Dobrudja. The area was chosen due to its large concentration of Lipovans, and the data are based on ethnographic and linguistic fieldwork (examples from spontaneous conversations between native Lipovan Romanian speakers and direct questions answered by native Lipovan Romanian speakers). The participants[3] were interviewed as part of a larger project examining issues on language contact in syntax (cf. Hickey 2010: 14; Weinreich 2013 [1953]: 41) and language variation and change.

[3] The data were gathered within a linguistic fieldwork I have conducted in Lipovan communities (in 2018), where I talked with at least thirty Russian-Romanian bilinguals, aged 30-70, from the villages Sarichioi, Jurilovca, and Carcaliu. Over the last three years, I carried out four fieldwork trips in Lipovan communities, in Dobrudja, and Republic of Moldova, to analyse the linguistic behaviour of bilingual speakers; given the absence of the corpora for Lipovan communities, recording an oral corpus is essential for my research.

There are many features which distinguish Lipovan Romanian from standard Romanian. Therefore, in this paper, I will focus on a set of constructions found in the Romanian variety spoken in this area, which are different from standard Romanian, such as: the absence of the (in)definite article, *fake locatives*, variation involving the non-anaphoric reflexive morpheme, the absence of the present tense form of the verb *a fi* "to be" (with all its values: predicative, copulative or passive auxiliary), the preference for [Adv – v] order in neutral reading, the preference for preverbal overt subjects in unmarked sentences, etc.

It is worthwhile to mention that a not too dissimilar syntactic situation is to be found in Moldovan Romanian, where Romanian and Russian have been in contact for over 200 years. For the sake of the argument, i.e. to prove that some phenomena are due to linguistic contact, I will offer examples from Moldovan Romanian alongside those from Lipovan Romanian.

4.1. Absence of the (in)definite article

In Lipovan Romanian (1a), a noun stripped of articles is preferred in contexts in which in standard Romanian a definite noun is usually employed. Ștefănescu (2016: 91-93) and Costea (2018), who analysed this phenomenon (also found in Moldovan Romanian (1b)), considered that this situation is the result of the intense linguistic contact between Romanian and Russian (i.e. in Russian articles are not to be found; hence, the bilinguals can be tempted to drop them in Romanian too) (for the cases in which the article may be dropped in standard Romanian, see Nicolae 2012: 474).

(1) a.	Uite,	**soț**	a	botezat	pe	o
	look	husband	AUX.PF.3SG	baptize.PPLE	DOM	a
	țigancă	în	Dunăre.			
	gipsy	in	Danube			

"Look, my husband baptized a gipsy in the Danube."

(RLRo 2018)

b. S- duce la piață, cumpără
CL.REFL go.IND.PRES.3SG to market buy
produs... Și-i trebuie.
product what=CL.3SG need.IND.PRES.3SG
"She is going to the market and buy the product she needs."
(MRo, *apud* Costea 2018)

4.2. Fake locatives

Given the Russian influence, whereby the possession is expressed through the preposition *u* "at" and a pronoun bearing genitive case, the Lipovans tend to frequently employ what Popușoi (2013: 106) names "fake locative" (2a). Hence, the relation between the possessor and the possessee is expressed through the structure ["at" *la* + pronoun (+ verb "to be" *a fi*)] (see also Mătcaș 1995: 106; Popușoi 2013: 106-107). A similar situation is also present in Moldovan Romanian (2b) (Costea 2018).

(2) a. **La** **noi** ș-acuma port avem.
to us even.now suit have.IND.PRES.1PL
"We have a tradition suit even at the moment."
(RLRo 2018)

b. Este alt drum **la** **noi**. Îi drum de țară.
is another road at us is country.road
"We have a different type of road. It is a country road."
(MRo, *apud* Costea 2018)

4.3. Variation involving the non-anaphoric reflexive morpheme

Variation involving the non-anaphoric reflexive morpheme is also typical of Lipovan Romanian (3a). As in the cases mentioned above, this phenomenon can also be identified in Moldovan Romanian (3b); Popușoi (2013) and Ștefănescu (2016: 231) have claimed that the presence of the reflexive morpheme in Moldovan Romanian is justified by the Russian-Romanian contact (see also Hickey 2010: 15; Thomason 2010: 36-37).

(3) a. Lumea **se** **sărbătorește**, se adună,
people.DEF SE.REFL.3SG celebrate SE.REFL.3SG get.together
cântă…
sing.IND.PRES.3SG
"People use to celebrate, get together, sing…"
(RLRo 2018)

b. vreau să **mă** **împart**
want.IND.PRES.1SG SA.SUBJ CL.REFL.1SG share.SUBJ.1SG
cu o istorioară
with a little.story
"I want to share with you a story of mine"
(MRo, facebook.com[4], 20.04.2017)

4.4. The absence of the present tense form of the verb **a fi** *"to be" (with all its values: predicative, copulative or passive auxiliary)*

In Lipovan Romanian, I found many contexts where *a fi* "to be" is absent (see (4) below); this can also be considered a consequence of Russian-Romanian contact.

(4) Unde **Ø** copiii mei blonzi, la Paște,
where children.DEF my blond at Easter
când venea…
when come.IND.IMPF.3PL
"Where my blond children **are**, at Easter, when they were coming…"
(RLRo 2018)

4.5. Low verb movement

In the Romance languages there is evidence that the IP domain is split into three fields (i.e., MoodP, TenseP, and Asp(ect)P) (on the basis of the formal approach proposed by Giorgi/Pianesi 1997, Ledgeway/ Lombardi 2005, and Schifano 2015, which keeps a balance between

[4] The page from where I selected this example is a public one and the text was written by a speaker from Republic of Moldova.

Cinque's (1999) cartographic approach and the minimalist approach); the Romance languages show different options with respect to verb raising along the clausal spine: to the MOOD-field in French (5a) and Romanian (Nicolae 2015); to the TENSE-field in Northern regional Italian (5b); to the ASPECT-field in European Portuguese (5c) or just outside of *v*-VP in Spanish (5d), as briefly shown below.

(5) a. Antoine confond probablement (*confond) le poème.
Antoine confound probably counfound the poem
"Antoine probably confounds the poem."
(French, *apud* Schifano 2015: 59)

b. Nonna conosce già (*conosce) la ricetta.
Nonna knows already knows the recipe
"Nonna already knows the recipe."
(Northern regional Italian, *apud* Schifano 2015: 12)

c. O João vê sempre (*vê) este tipo de films.
João sees always sees this kind of movies
"João always watches this kind of movie."
(European Portuguese, *apud* Schifano 2015: 68)

d. Sergio contesta bien (*contesta) las preguntas.
Sergio answers well answers the questions
"Sergio is answering well to the questions."
(Spanish, *apud* Schifano 2015: 63)

In contrast to other Romance languages, in Lipovan Romanian the verb apparently does not raise out of the *v*-VP domain, surfacing to the right of both high and low adverbs from Cinque's (1999) hierarchy, and even to the right of *bine* "well" in neutral readings (6) (a situation which is also found in Moldovan Romanian). However, the preference for the [Adv – V] word order is not always a reliable diagnostic for verb movement (Costea 2019: 11-16 put forward this hypothesis for Moldovan Romanian, too; (7))[5]; instead, it would make more sense to claim that, as in Russian (8) (Koeneman/Zeijlistra 2014: 584; Gribanova 2013: 92-95; Harizanov/

[5] For a discussion regarding *The Rich Agreement Hypothesis*, which should also be taken into account when discussing this phenomenon, see Pollock 1989; Bobaljik 1995; Koeneman 2000; Koeneman/Zeijlistra 2014.

Gribanova 2019: 471; Roberts 2019), with which Lipovan Romanian is in contact, the Lipovan Romanian verb raises to a very low position within the ASPECT field[6].

(6) a. Eu bine lucrez aici.
I well work.IND.PRES.1SG here
"I work well here."
(RLRo 2018)

b. Ea mereu povestește despre asta.
she always tell.IND.PRES.3SG about this
"She always talks about this."
(RLRo 2018)

c. Noi deja am mâncat.
we already AUX.PF.1PL eat.PPLE
"We have already eaten."
(RLRo 2018)

(7) Combinația asta bine s- a potrivit.
combination.DEF this well CL.REFL.3SG AUX.PF.3SG match.PPLE
"This combination went through well."
(MRo, *apud* Costea 2017)

(8) Gosti bystro vosli v dom.
guests quickly came-in into house
"The guests quickly came into the house."
(SRu, *apud* Harves 2002: 113)

4.6. Use of the first person plural instead of the first person singular

Under the pressure of Russian, in Lipovan Romanian the expression "me and you" (*eu și cu tine* (lit. I.NOM and with you.ACC) in standard Romanian) is translated as "we with you" ***noi*** *cu tine* (lit. **we.NOM** with

[6] The same level of verb movement was previously claimed by Costea (2019) for Moldovan Romanian. This situation makes sense given that both Lipovan Romanian and Moldovan Romanian are in contact with Russian.

you.ACC) (9). Russian Lipovans from Dobrudja employ the first person plural with the meaning of first person singular in these contexts, showing the same syntactic preference as Moldovan Romanian speakers (10) (Costea 2018).

(9) a. Și **noi**, aicea, la școală, cu bunicii
and we here at school with grandparents.DEF
am fost.[7]
were
"And I was here at school with my grandparents."
(RLRo 2018)

b. Nu ne duceam **să** **milogim**
NEG CL.REFL.1.PL go.IND.IMPF.1PL SĂ.SUBJ beg
la cineva să ne aducă,
to someone SĂ.SUBJ CL.DAT.1PL bring
aveam de toate.
have.IND.IMPF.1PL everything.
"We didn't go to beg people to bring us something, we had everything."
(RLRo 2018)

(10) **Noi** cu Marina am trăit la
we with Marina AUX.PF.1PL live.PPLE at
cămin, împreună.
dorm, together
"I shared the dorm with Marina."
(MRo, *apud* Costea 2018)

4.7. Atypical use of the adverb **tot** *"also"*

In Lipovan Romanian, the lexeme *tot* "everything/anything" has also the meaning "also", under the pressure of Russian term *тоже* "also" (11a). Marin *et al.* (2000 [1988]: 88) and Costea (2018) observed the same tendency in Moldovan Romanian (11b), mentioning the fact that this element typically occupies a preverbal position.

[7] The equivalent utterance in Standard Romanian is: „Și **eu** am fost cu bunicii aici, la școală." / "And **I** was with my grandparents here, at school."; the form of the subject is the first person singular.

(11) a. - Deci sunteți și dumneavoastră în cor?
so are.IND.PRES.2PL too you in choir
- Da. Și sora ei **tot**.
yes and sister.DEF her too
"- So are you a part of the choir, too?
- Yes. And her sister, too."

(RLRo 2018)

b. Eu **tot** am sperat să fie
I too AUX.PF.1SG hope.PPLE SĂ.SUBJ be
mai cald.
warmer
"I hoped that it will be warmer, too."

(MRo, *apud* Costea 2018)

4.8. Use of (pseudo)negation in nonspecific free relatives and unconditionals

Negation without a negative meaning, found in sentences like the ones under (12a) – in Lipovan Romanian – and (12b) – in Moldovan Romanian, was signalled in the literature concerning Moldovan Romanian, and it was explained through the speakers' tendency to copy the Russian pattern, for example: *Kogda by ty* ***ni*** *uezjal, ja by tebja soprovojdala* "Whenever you left, I would have come with you" (Marin *et al.* 2000 [1998]: 84; Crijanovschi 2000: 275-276; Condrea 2001: 81-82; Popușoi 2013: 108-110, among others).

A difference between Russian and Lipovan Romanian is represented by the fact that in the contexts selected from Lipovan and Moldovan Romanian the negation does not necessarily appear with a verb in the conditional (for a formal semantic approach of the phenomenon in Russian and Hebrew, see Citko 2003: 5).

(12) a. Unde **nu** ne ducem noi și acolo
Where NEG CL.REFL.1PL go.IND.PRES.1PL we too there
vorbește limba rusă în coruri.
speak.IND.PRES.3SG language.DEF Russian in choirs
"Everywhere we go, (people) use Russian in choirs too."

(RLRo 2018)

b. La Monalisa, unde **nu** te- ai
At Monalisa where NEG CL.2SG AUX.COND.2SG
mișca, ochii te urmăresc.
move eyes CL.2SG follow.IND.PRES.3PL
"At Monalisa, everywhere you go, her eyes will follow you."
(MRo, *apud* Costea 2018)

4.9. Absence of clitic doubling

In Lipovan Romanian, I noticed a situation of variation regarding clitic doubling. In contrast to standard Romanian, where clitic doubling is compulsory in certain contexts, in Lipovan Romanian I found many examples in which clitic doubling is absent (see 13).

(13) La noi se botează cum
at us CL.REFL.3SG baptize.IND.PRES.3SG when
cade buricu, ducem la
fall.IND.PRES.3SG navel.DEF bring.IND.PRES.1PL to
botez.
baptism
"We baptize (the child) when the navel falls off, we take him to get baptized."
(RLRo 2018)

A possible explanation for these situations can be the contact with Russian; given that the phenomenon of direct object doubling is completely absent from Russian (14), native speakers of Lipovan Romanian tend to also employ this syntactic pattern in their variety of Romanian.

(14) Ivan ljubit ego.
Ivan love.IND.PRES.3SG him.ACC
"Ivan loves him" (*Ivan = him)
(SRu, *apud* Dyakonova 2009: 6)

4.10. Preference of overt subjects in unmarked sentences

The use of overt subjects in Lipovan Romanian (see (15) and (16) below) is also a result of longstanding Romanian-Russian contact, given the fact that in Russian preverbal overt subjects are often used. To account for this, I will follow Costea's (2019) analysis (proposed for Moldovan Romanian); in short, it states that, given that the lexical verb raises to a low position within the ASPECT field, when the subject raises to SpecTP, it raises above the lexical verb as well, i.e. above the ASPECT field, rendering a preverbal placement of the subject; in other words, low verb movement ensures that SpecTP (preverbal) is free to accommodate the subject (hence preverbal).

(15) **Noi** foarte, foarte încurcat vorbim.
we very very convoluted speak.IND.PRES.1PL
"We speak in a very, very convoluted way."
(RLRo 2018)

(16) Acolo unde **el** stă,
there where he live.IND.PRES.3SG
cea mai frumoasă casă a făcut.
the.most.beautiful house AUX.PF.3SG make.PPLE
"He made the most beautiful house where he lives."
(RLRo 2018)

4.11. Use of headed relative clauses introduced by **cine** *"who" instead of the relative pronoun* **care** *"which"*

In standard Romanian, the relative pronoun *care* "which" is employed in both headed and headless relative clauses, and can refer to both animate and inanimate entities ([±Animate]). It also anaphorically conveys the morphological information of the antecedent. Unlike the relative pronoun *care* "which", the relative pronoun *cine* "who" only refers to animate entities, occurs exclusively in headless relative clauses (SOR 2016: 482), and the verb which undergoes subject-predicate agreement with *cine* "who" can only be in the singular; unlike *care* "which", *cine* "who" is a default singular, which does not convey the phi-features of its antecedent.

The situation is entirely different in Lipovan Romanian: in contrast to standard Romanian (17), the Lipovans use headed relative clauses introduced by *cine* "who" (18), under the influence of Russian (19), where the invariable pronoun *kto* "who" is employed, and also display plural agreement on the embedded verb when the antecedent is in the plural. Examples (17) and (18) show the different word choice for the relative pronoun.

(17) Familia cheamă părinții, nașii
family invites.IND.PRES.3SG parents.DEF godparents.DEF
care sunt mai apropiați.
which are.IND.PRES.3PL more close
"Family invites the parents (and) godparents who are closer to them."
(SRo counterpart)

(18) a. Familia cheamă părinți, nași
family invites.IND.PRES.3SG parents godparents
cine sunt mai apropiați.
who are.IND.PRES.3PL more close
"Family invites the parents (and) godparents who are closer to them."
(RLRo 2018)

b. Ei cântă cântece de Maslenița,
they sing.IND.PRES.3PL songs on Maslenița
toți **cine** sunt lipoveni asta fac.
all who are.IND.PRES.3PL lipovans this do
"They sing songs on the occasion of Maslenița (= pre-Christian holiday), all who are Lipovans do this."
(RLRo 2018)

(19) Te iz nas, **kto** čitali stihotvorenija,
those of us who read.PAST.3PL poem
byli v vostorge.
were. delighted
"Those of us who read the poem were delighted."
(SRu, *apud* Wade 2011: 122)

5. Conclusions

In this paper, I focused on the morphosyntax of the Lipovan Romanian spoken in Dobrudja, a variety which has remained largely unexplored.

What clearly distinguishes the people who speak Lipovan Romanian from those who speak standard Romanian is the fact that Lipovans are bilinguals and they use both Romanian and Russian in their speech.

Romanian-Russian linguistic contact is extremely interesting per se, given that it can trigger multiple and diverse morphosyntactic phenomena, such are those identified in Lipovan's discourse: the absence of the (in)definite article, fake locatives, variation involving the non-anaphoric reflexive morpheme, the absence of the present form of the verb *a fi* "to be" (with all its values: predicative, copulative or passive auxiliary), the preference for [Adv – v] order in neutral reading or the preference for overt subjects in unmarked sentences. Thus, a detailed exploration of the linguistic situation characterizing LRo can throw much-needed light on the degree to which the morphosyntax of a given language can be (re)shaped through contact.

CORPUS

Facebook.com, https://www.facebook.com/1535933136682721/posts/vreau-sa-ma-impart-si-eu-cu-o-istorioara-cu-vreo-4-5-ani-in-urma-trebuia-sa-ma-d/2278796432396384/, 20.04.2017

RLRo 2018 = records from Lipovan Romanian (fieldwork study in Lipovan communities from Dobrudja, Romania), 2018

REFERENCES

Bobaljik, J.D., 1995, *Morphosyntax: The Syntax of Verbal Inflection*, MIT, PhD Thesis.

Chirilă, F., A. Ivanov, Th. Olteanu, 1993, *Probleme de dialectologie. Graiurile ruseşti lipoveneşti din România*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Cinque, G., 1999, *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Citko, B., 2003, "On the Syntax and Semantics of English and Polish Concessive Conditionals", in *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, XI, no. 1, pp. 37-54.

Condrea, I., 2001, *Norma literară şi uzul local*, Chişinău, Firma Editorială Poligrafică „Tipografia Centrală".

Costea, Ş., 2017, "Verb Movement in Moldovan Daco-Romanian: Romance Heritage or Russian Influence?", paper presentation within *The 17th International Conference of the Department of Linguistics: Variation in Romanian and Romance* (24-25 November 2017, Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest).

Costea, Ș., 2018, *Particularități morfosintactice ale limbii române vorbite în Republica Moldova*, University of Bucharest, MPhil Dissertation.
Costea, Ș., 2019, *When Romanian meets Russian. The Effects of Contact on Moldovan Daco-Romanian Syntax*, University of Cambridge, MPhil Dissertation.
Crijanovschi, A., 2000, *Dicționar de dificultăți al limbii române*, Chișinău, Editura ARC.
Dyakonova, M., 2009, *A Phase-Based Approach to Russian Free Word Order*, Utrecht, LOT Publications.
Farisenkova, L.V., K. Izotov, 2014, "Language and Culture of the Russians-Lipovans: Synchronistic and Diachronistic Aspects", in *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, no. 1, pp. 67-70.
Gardani, F., 2018, "On Morphological Borrowing", in *Language and Linguistics Compass*, XII, no. 10, pp. 1-17.
Giorgi, A., F. Pianesi, 1997, *Tense and Aspect: from Semantics to Morphosyntax*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Grenoble, L. A., 2010, "Contact and the Development of the Slavic Languages", in R. Hickey (ed.) 2010: 581-597.
Gribanova, V., 2013, "Verb-Stranding Verb Phrase Ellipsis and the Structure of the Russian Verbal Complex", in *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, XXXI, pp. 91-136.
Harizanov, B., V. Gribanova, 2019, "Whither Head Movement?", in *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, XXXVII, pp. 461-522.
Harves, S. A., 2002, *Unaccusative Syntax in Russian*, Princeton University, PhD Thesis.
Heine, B., T. Kuteva, 2010, "Contact and Grammaticalization", in R. Hickey (ed.) 2010: 86-105.
Hickey, R., 2010, "Language Contact: Reconsideration and Reassessment", in R. Hickey (ed.) 2010: 1-28.
Hickey, R. (ed.), 2010, *The Handbook of Language Contact*, Malden, MA, Wiley Blackwell.
Ipatiov, F., 2001, *Rușii-lipoveni din România. Studiu de geografie umană*, Cluj, Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană.
Koeneman, O., 2000, *The Flexible Nature of Verb Movement*, Utrecht University, PhD Thesis.
Koeneman, O., H. Zeijlstra, 2014, "The Rich Agreement Hypothesis Rehabilitated", in *Linguistic Inquiry*, XLV, no. 4, pp. 571-615.
Kuteva, T., 2017, "Contact and Borrowing", in A. Ledgeway, I. Roberts (eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Historical Syntax*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp. 163-186.
Ledgeway, A., A. Lombardi, 2005, "Verb Movement, Adverbs and Clitic Positions in Romance", in *Probus*, XVII, no. 1, pp. 79-13.
Marin, M., I. Mărgărit, V. Neagoe, 2000 [1998], „Graiuri românești din Ucraina și Republica Moldova", in M. Marin, I. Mărgărit, V. Neagoe, V. Pavel (eds.), *Cercetări asupra graiurilor românești de peste hotare*, Bucharest, [s.n.], pp. 42-119.
Mătcaș, N., 1995, *De la grotesc la sublim*, Chișinău, Editura Revistei „Limba română".
Matras, Y., 2010, "Contact, Convergence, and Typology", in R. Hickey (ed.) 2010: 66-85.
McMahon, A., 2010, "Computational Models and Language Contact", in R. Hickey (ed.) 2010: 128-147.
Nicolae, A., 2012, „Articolul", in Gh. Chivu, G. Pană Dindelegan, A. Dragomirescu, I. Nedelcu, I. Nicula (eds.), *Studii de istorie a limbii române. Morfosintaxa limbii literare în secolele al XIX-lea și al XX-lea*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, pp. 469-478.

Nicolae, A., 2015, *Ordinea constituenților în limba română: o perspectivă diacronică*, Bucureşti, Editura Universității din București.
Pollock, J. Y., 1989, "Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP", in *Linguistic Inquiry*, XX, no. 3, pp. 365–424.
Popușoi, C., 2013, *Limba română actuală din Basarabia. Particularități morfosintactice și lexico-semantice*, Bucureşti, Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.
Prigarin, A. A., 2007, "Staroobrjadcheskoje naselenie Pridunavia v konce XVIII nachale XIX vv", in *Lipovane*, no. 3-4, Odessa, pp. 3-15.
Roberts, I., 2019, *Parameter Hierarchies & Universal Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Sala, M., 1997, *Limbi în contact*, București, Editura Enciclopedică.
Schifano, N., 2015, *Verb Movement: A Pan-Romance Investigation*, University of Cambridge, PhD Thesis.
SOR – Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.), 2016, *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Ștefănescu, A., 2016, *Variație și unitate în limba română standard din Basarabia*, Bucureşti, Editura Universității din București.
Thomason, S., 2010, "Contact Explanations in Linguistics", in R. Hickey (ed.) 2010: 31-47.
Tudose, P., 2015, *Rușii lipoveni din România – istorie și actualitate (Comunitatea rușilor lipoveni din Brăila – model de conviețuire multietnică în context național și european)*, Bucureşti, Editura CRLR.
Vascenco, V., 2003, *Lipovenii. Studii lingvistice*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei.
Wade, T., 2011, *A Comprehensive Russian Grammar*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.
Weinreich, U., 2013, *Limbi în contact. Constatări și probleme,* Brașov, Editura Universității „Transilvania" din Brașov.
Winford, D., 2003, *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*, Oxford, Blackwell.

ABBREVIATIONS

1 = first person
2 = second person
3 = third person
ACC = accusative
AUX = auxiliary
CL = clitic
COND = conditional
DAT = dative
DEF = definite
DOM = differential object marking
IMPF = imperfect
IND = indicative
LRo = Lipovan Romanian
MRo = Moldovan Romanian

NEG = negation
PAST = past tense
PF = perfect
PL = plural
PPLE = past participle
PRES = present tense
REFL = reflexive
SG = singular
SpecTP = specifier of the tense phrase
SRo = standard Romanian
SRu = standard Russian
SUBJ = subjunctive