Are there Slavonic features in the syntax of Romanian?
Two case studies[†]

Adina Dragomirescu[*]

"Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics, Calea 13 Septembrie 13, 050711 Bucharest, Romania
Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, Str. Edgar Quinet 5–7, Sector 1, 010017 Bucharest, Romania

Abstract

The present paper discusses the issue of the Old Church Slavonic influence on the syntax of (old) Romanian. The starting point is the hypothesis that many of the syntactic features of Romanian previously explained by postulating the influence of (Old Church) Slavonic (especially in studies strongly influenced by ideological issues, published during the Communist period) are actually either regular transformations which occurred in the transition from Latin to Romanian, common to the other Romance languages as well, or the output of more general tendencies manifested in the history of Indo-European languages. In order to check the role of the Slavonic influence in the syntax of Romanian, we have established a working algorithm, which is applied to two phenomena from old Romanian: (i) the position of relative adjectives, and (ii) scrambling in compound verbal forms in correlation with auxiliary inversion.

1. Introduction

This paper investigates a controversial issue in Romanian and Romance linguistics, i.e. the existence of elements of Slav(on)ic origin in the syntax of old Romanian, eventually also transmitted to modern Romanian. The influence of Slavonic syntax on old Romanian is relevant because, as is well known, many old Romanian texts (from the 16th century) are religious (and, to a smaller extent, legal) translations of Slavonic texts; moreover, in the relevant literature (histories of Romanian, philological studies preceding edited old texts, etc.) numerous syntactic features of old Romanian are considered to be of Slavonic origin. In the present paper, special attention is paid not to the syntactic features accidentally occurring in one old text/in a restricted number of texts but to the general features of the old language, present in many texts belonging—to the extent that this is possible—to different stylistic registers. Only two of these features (which will be accounted for in an extensive research) shall be discussed here: the position of relative adjectives and scrambling in compound verbal forms.

The subject dealt with here faces two distinct problems:
(i) a linguistic problem: is it possible for the syntax of a target language to be influenced by the source language, as it happens, obviously, in the vocabulary and in semantics? and
(ii) a historical and political problem: can the political/ideological context influence the interpretation of the data from a domain apparently independent of politics, such as linguistics?

Before analysing the linguistic data, several observations—related to the way in which history, and implicitly the oscillation of the political context, could influence the linguistic interpretation—are necessary.

Two opposite tendencies have manifested themselves in Romanian historiography; these tendencies have re-emerged cyclically, with each period bringing its own perspective on the past (Djuvara, 2006; Boia, 2011): on the one hand, the negation of the Slavic influence in history of Romania, especially in relation to the emergence of the Romanian language and of the Romanian population (e.g. "Școala Ardeleană" = *The Transylvanian School* with its exaggerated Latin "purism"), and, on the other hand, the rejection of this first tendency, manifested by claiming, in the spirit of historical objectivity, the overstatement of the role of the Slavs (e.g. the members of the "Junimea" = *The Youth* society, Gh. Panu, I. Bogdan, A.D. Xenopol, and "Noua Școală" = *The New School* in history, represented by P.P. Panaitescu and C.C. Giurescu).

The historical jigsaw is made complete by other positions: the adoption of a moderate Slavism (B. P. Hasdeu, N. Iorga), the amplification of the Dacian influence (V. Pârvan), or the granting of a privileged role to Western European influence (T. Maiorescu, E. Lovinescu). The peak of the Slavization of the Romanian history was reached at the beginning of the Communist period (P. Constantinescu-Iași, L. Pătrășcanu, M. Roller); at the end of the 1960s and later on, excessive nationalism cast shadow upon the Slavic component, and emphasis was thrown once more on the Dacian ingredient.

2. The Slavic influence on the Romanian language. Previous research

The same two opposite tendencies of historiography have operated in linguistics as well: as a reaction to the Latin purism in relation to the history of the Romanian language adopted by the *Transylvanian School* and its continuators, there appeared an exaggeration of the Slavic influence (at the end of the 19th century – the beginning of the 20th century, augmented in the early Communist period). The following issues have been emphasized: the Slavic-Romanian bilingualism (e.g. the "Daco-Slavic" language, Petrovici, 1943; see also Niculescu, 2007), the ethnic mix, including Dacian, Slavic and Latin population (Rosetti, 1968; Tagliavini, 1977), and the external Slavic influence (Cihac, 1870; Densusianu, 1961). As a reaction to Latin purism as well, the tendency to grant more weight to the influence of the Dacian language also emerged (e.g. V. Pârvan, at the beginning of the 20th century; this idea was then strengthened, for ideological reasons, in the nationalist period of Communism).

Given these contradictory tendencies, the reality of the Slavic influence on Romanian is superficially known: on the one hand, Romanians defended their origin and national specificity (see, for similar observations related to the situation in Greece, Mackridge, 2009) but, on the other hand, they have colluded with the grand Communist ideas, overstressing the Russian/Slavic influence on the "national language" (similarly to the former Soviet countries, see Sériot, 1995).

In Romanian and Romance linguistics, there are no special studies which ascertain the consequences of the overstatement of the Slavic influence and the opposite effect, i.e. its negation, in different periods, with the exception of Zafiu (2009), which approaches the Communist period and its effects for linguistic research in general.

In the works devoted to the history of the Romanian language, there is a mild consensus on the Slavic influence in the following areas:

(i) phonology: the emergence/borrowing of the vowel *î* (*crîng* 'little forest') and of the consonant *j* (*jale* 'grief');

(ii) morphology: the preservation of two or three case forms in nominal inflection (Diaconescu, 1970, p. 198), the vocative inflexion –*o* (*soro!*), the internal structure of complex cardinal numerals from 11 *unsprezece* 'one-over-ten' to 19 *nouăsprezece* 'nine-over-ten';

(iii) syntax: the simple negation, sporadically attested in 16th century-texts (1) (Rizescu, 1963; Ciompec, 1969; Dragomirescu, 2008), the reflexive form of many verbs (*a se căi*, *a se griji*, etc.) (Densusianu, 1961, I, p. 163; Pană Dindelegan, 2014), the dative object used instead of the direct object from modern Romanian (*a crede* **cuiva** 'believe + dative', *a iubi* **cuiva** 'love + dative') (Densusianu, 1961, I, p. 252–253; Pană Dindelegan, 2014);

(iv) lexis: Slavic lexical influence in all domains, including the basic vocabulary (*drag* 'dear', *a iubi* 'to love', *a plăti* 'to pay', *prieten* 'friend', *a primi* 'to receive', *scump* 'dear, expensive');

(v) word formation: prefixes (*ne–, răs–, prea–*, etc.), suffixes (*–ac, –că, –eală, –ean*, etc.).

(1) *fără de agiutoriulu* *celuia*   *de susu* **niciu un** **lucru**
    without help.DEF that.GEN of up   no   thing
    în calea   *vieției*   *acestiia* **putemu**   **să facemu** (CC$_2$, 6)
    in way.DEF life.DEF.GEN this.GEN can.IND.PRES.1PL SĂ$_{SUBJ}$ make.SUBJ.1PL[‡]
    'without the help of God we are not able to do a thing in this life'

Despite the general tendency to exaggerate the Slavic influence, even during Communism certain prestigious linguists rejected the Slavic determinant in the case of certain phenomena which are best accounted for by Latin facts; see, for example, Rosetti's (1968, p. 303) account for the vocative inflexion *–e*. A similar approach, this time with respect to syntax, is the goal of the present study.

Although in studies dedicated to the history of Romanian and in introductory studies to philological editions of old texts there are cursory references to syntactic phenomena of Slavic origin, syntax is the least investigated domain, because it is not always easy to decide which features can be accounted for only through Slavic influence, which features have another origin but have been strengthened by the Slavonic/Slavic influence, and which features have been falsely accounted for as an effect of Slavic influence for ideological reasons (related to the cultural ideology, for example, in the case of *Transylvanian School*, or to the political one, for example, in the case of the mystifications from the Communist period).

3. Two case studies

Given that the literature contains vague information and that it is often difficult to tell apart linguistic reality from false interpretation determined by ideological reasons, our research will focus on the syntactic phenomena considered to be of Slavonic/Slavic origin and will answer the following questions:

1. Which are (actually) the Romanian syntactic features that are the effect of Slavic influence and to what extent are they limited to old Romanian?
2. What algorithm of analysis can one apply to tell apart genuine syntactic features of Slav(on)ic origin from ideological overstated influence?
3. Was the Slavic influence in the syntax of Romanian overstated for the same reasons as in history?
4. Is the study of language able to provide a more accurate historical picture for other periods than the mysterious emergence of the Romanian language and people (knowing that this period was "reconstructed" mainly using linguistic data)?

3.1. *Romanian syntactic features considered to have Slavic origins*

Before going a step further with the analysis, it is necessary to give a (provisional) inventory of the syntactic phenomena which have been considered to have Slavic origins. These data are taken from books dedicated to the history of Romanian (Densusianu, 1961; Rosetti, 1968; Gheție, 1997; Ivănescu, 2000), from special studies related to the Slavic influence in the syntax of Romanian (Seidel, 1958; Beneș, 1955; Copceac, 1998) and from the linguistic studies accompanying the philologically edited texts (Mareș, 1969; Rizescu, 1971; Costinescu, 1981; Teodorescu & Gheție, 1977; Chivu, 1993; Gheție & Teodorescu, 2005).

[‡]In glosses we use the following abbreviations: ACC = accusative, AUX = auxiliary, CL = clitic, COND = conditional, DAT = dative, DEF = definite, DOM = differential object marking, F = feminine, FUT = future, GEN = genitive, GER = gerund(ive), IMP = imperative, IND = indicative, INF = infinitive, M = masculine, NOM = nominative, PERF = perfective, PL = plural, POL = polite, POSS = possessive, PPLE = past participle, PRES = present, PS = simple past, REFL = reflexive, SG = singular, SUBJ = subjunctive. The following functional words, specific to Romanian, are also used: A$_{INF}$ = marker of infinitive, AL = freestanding syntactic marker of the genitive, CEL = freestanding definite determiner, SĂ$_{SUBJ}$ = freestanding subjunctive marker.

Beside the constructions mentioned above (see §2), the list of the syntactic phenomena having Slavic origins also contains: the subject position and the word order of constituents within the nominal phrase, the (non-)doubling of the direct and indirect objects, differential object marking with *pe* (< lexical *pe* 'on'), the ellipsis of the copula *a fi* 'be', the predicative usage of the infinitive and of the gerund, the emergence of the "short" infinitive (without the ending *–re*, inherited from Latin), the usage of the infinitive in subjunctive-specific contexts, auxiliary and pronominal clitic inversion, scrambling in compound verbal forms, etc. If all these features were really imitating Slavonic constructions, then one would be able to say that the entire syntactic specificity of Romanian (especially old Romanian but also modern Romanian) is modelled on the syntax of Slavic languages.

3.2. Working algorithm

In order to determine in a more precise way the extension of the Slavonic/Slavic influence on the syntax of Romanian we put forth the following algorithm: if a feature occurs in at least three of the four sources indicated below, then this feature cannot be considered to have Slavic origins. The sources taken as reference points are:

(i) (late) Latin (for which we use especially the information from Ledgeway, 2012 and Adams, 2013);

(ii) other old Romance languages or dialects (we refer to Company Company, 2006 for Old Spanish, to Rohlfs, 1969, Buridant, 2000, Lardon & Thomine, 2009 for Old French, to Salvi & Renzi, 2010 for Old Italian, to Ledgeway, 2009 for Old Neapolitan, etc.);

(iii) old Romanian original texts (from the 16th and the 17th centuries, which presumably have not been heavily influenced by Slavonic);

(iv) South-Danubian dialects (these varieties have not been in contact with Slav(on)ic varieties, this phenomenon being subsequent to the dialectal split); however, we will use the dialectal data with care, since, in certain situations, it is possible that these varieties have been influenced by the modern Slavic languages with which they have been in contact; if such an influence is at play, then the dialectal data are not relevant for our algorithm.

3.3. Case study I: the position of relative adjectives

In contrast with modern Romanian, in which relative adjectives (such as *omenesc* 'human-like', *dumnezeiesc* 'divine', *românesc* 'Romanian', *literar* 'literary', etc.) are obligatorily postnominal, in old Romanian (up to the 19th century) these adjectives could also occur prenominally (2); in the earliest surviving Romanian texts, the postnominal position was already more frequent (for a more detailed analysis, see Brăescu & Dragomirescu, 2014).

(2) a. *glăsi*   **evreiasca**   *limbă*   *și grăi* (CV, 18ᵛ)
         speak.PS.3SG   Jewish.DEF   language   and say.PS.3SG
         'he spoke Hebrew and he said'

     b. **Dumnezeiasca**   *slujba*   *ce*   *e întru sfinți* (CL, 7ᵛ)
         divine.DEF   service.DEF   which   is for saints
         'the divine service which is for the saints'

     c. *acesta,*   *deaca auzi*   *acea* **păgînească**   *poruncă* (SVI, 2ᵛ)
         this.one   if hear.PS.3SG   that pagan.F.SG   order
         'this one, if he heard that pagan order'

     d. *fãcîndu-i*   *obicnuită*   *și* **politicească**   *cinste* (CG, 304)
         make.GER=CL.DAT.3SG   usual.F.SG   and political.F.SG   consideration
         'giving to him usual and political consideration'

In Niculescu (1999, p. 189–196) it is shown that the postposition of the adjective with respect to the nominal head is a result of Slavonic influence. This observation is not surprising, since Old Church Slavonic also featured adjectives in prenominal position, but this position was stylistically marked (Gamanovich,

2001, p. 315–318; Gasparov, 2001, p. 98), in contrast to old Romanian, where the ordering of the adjectives seems to be unconstrained.

Applying the algorithm described above (§3.2), one can easily formulate the conclusion that the prenominal position of the relative adjectives can not be directly influenced by Slavonic.

(i) It is well known that in Latin adjectives had free word order (3), eventually correlated with differences in meaning. What is less clear is whether this word order variation was correlated with any information structure related/markedness differences. As Ledgeway (2012, p. 50–51) has shown, it is most probable that in Latin there were not (yet) dedicated positions for the contrastive reading of adjectives; this specialisation occurred later in the Romance varieties.

(3)   a. *prætor **urbanus*** (*apud* Ledgeway, 2012, p. 50)
        b. ***urbanus** prætor*
            'magistrate for Roman citizens', 'witty magistrate'

(ii) The prenominal position of adjectives was also possible in other old Romance varieties, i.e. Old Neapolitan (4a) (Ledgeway, 2012, p. 56), Old Italian (4b) (Giusti, 2010, p. 604–605), Old French (4c) (Buridant, 2000, p. 173), etc.

(4)   a. *...li **spagnoli** soldati* (*apud* Ledgeway, 2012, p. 56)
            'the Spanish soldiers'
        b. *Dice lo maestro, che la **citadina** maniera di dire* (...) (*apud* Giusti, 2010, p. 604–605)
            'The master says that the urban way of saying...'
        c. *le **feminin** courage*
            'a feminine courage'
            (Jeanne Baroin et Josiane Haffen, Boccace „Des cleres et nobles femmes", 1401)

(iii) The prenominal position of relative adjectives is also attested in old Romanian original documents:

(5)   a. *svinţitul*   ***împărătescul***   *scaun* (DÎ, XC, p. 182)
            holy.DEF.NOM   royal.DEF.NOM   chair
            'the holy royal chair'
        b. *sventei*   ***dumnezeieşti***   *mănăstire* (DÎ, XXXIX, p. 138)
            holy.DEF.DAT   divine.DAT   monastery
            'to the holy divine monastery'
        c. *Şi aceasta*   *împreună*   *cu celelalte*   *de lîngă ea*
            and this   together   with the.other.PL   of next her
            este   *a*   ***domneştii***   *şi **dumnezeieştii***   *mănăstiri*
            is   AL.F.SG   princely.F.SG.DEF.GEN   and divine.F.SG.DEF.GEN   monastery.GEN
            a   *celor*   *Trei Ierarhi din Iaşi* (ITM, p. 255)
            AL.F.SG   CEL.M.PL.GEN   Three Hierarchs from Iaşi
            'And this, together with the others next to it, belongs to the holy monastery Three Hierarchs from Iaşi'

(iv) In the South-Danubian varieties, the position of the relative adjectives is also free (Martin Maiden, p.c.). Zegrean (2012, p. 91–92) has noticed that, in Istro-Romanian, most probably under the influence of Croatian, the unmarked order of the adjectives, including relative adjectives, is prenominal (6); she has also identified the conditions for the postnominal positions. In Megleno-Romanian as well (Atanasov, 1984, p. 536–537) the adjective is ordered prenominally, probably as a result of Macedonian influence; the postnominal position is also frequent.

(6) *Io cunosc*   *ur **taljanski***   *fečor* (*apud* Zegrean, 2012, p. 93)
     I know.1SG   an Italian   boy
     'I know an Italian boy'.

3.4. Case study II: scrambling in compound verbal forms and auxiliary inversion

In this section two apparently independent syntactic phenomena, which set apart old Romanian from modern Romanian, are presented together: scrambling and auxiliary inversion (see, for details Dragomi-rescu, 2013 and 2014, where it is shown that the syntactic analysis of the two phenomena is unitary and a unique parametric change can account for the changes related to these phenomena).

In modern Romanian, scrambling in compound verbal forms is only possible with adverbial clitics (known in the Romanian literature as "semiadverbs"—(7)), while in old Romanian scrambling was much more extended (8), with phrasal constituents displacing the verbal elements of the verbal cluster.

(7) a. *Am   cam   greșit.*
         AUX.PERF.1SG   rather   be.wrong.PPLE
         'I was rather wrong'

     b. *Vor   mai cîștiga.*
         AUX.FUT.3PL   again win.INF
         'They will win again'

(8) a. *de rroada   **voiu**   pîntecelui   tău   **punre***
         of fruit.DEF   AUX.FUT.1SG   belly.DEF.GEN   your   put.INF

         pre scaunul tău (PH, 113ᵛ)
         on chair.DEF your.POSS
         'I will put on your chair one of your children'

     b. *bogătatea   se **ară**   pre aproape   **curre**,*
         richness.DEF   if AUX.COND.3SG   on near.by   flow.INF

         nu punereți   înrima (PH, 51ᵛ)
         not put.IMP.2SG   heart.DEF
         'If the richness flows near by, do not pay attention to it'

     c. *ce te-**au**   tatăl tău   **tremis*** (CM, 240ᵛ)
         but CL.ACC.2SG=AUX.PERF.3SG   father.DEF your   send.PPLE
         'but your father has sent you'

     d. *de **va**   grăunțul de grîu   **cădea** la pămînt*
         if AUX.FUT.3SG   seed.DEF of wheat   fall.INF on ground

         și nu   va   muri (CC₁, 116ᵛ)
         and not   AUX.FUT.3SG   die.INF
         'if the wheat seed falls on ground and does not die'

     e. *nece să **ară**   cineva   den morți   **învie*** (CC₁, 120ᵛ)
         nor if AUX.COND.3SG   someone   from deaths   raise.INF
         'nor if someone raised from the dead'

     f. *Și cînd   featele aceaste îndărăptu   se   înturnară*
         and when   girls.DEF these back   CL.REFL   come.PS.3SG

         *la tatăl   său,   dzise   tată-său: cum **ați***
         at father.DEF   their.POSS   say.PS.3SG father=their.POSS how AUX.PERF.2PL

         *astădzi   așa curund   **venit**   acasă?* (PO, 184)
         today   so soon   come.PPLE   home
         'And when the girls came back to their father, their father said: how could you come back home so soon?'

     g. *cînd **va**   omul   **să**   **îmble**   pre toate voile* (FD, 593ᵛ)
         when AUX.FUT.3SG   man.DEF   SĂ_SUBJ   go   on all whishes
         'when the man will go as much as he whishes'

As for auxiliary inversion, in the present-day language it is strictly limited to imprecations, in the spoken language (9a), to direct questions, in certain dialectal areas (9b), and to religious speech, where it is an

archaic feature (9c). In old Romanian, auxiliary inversion seems to be a free phenomenon (10) (which is however preferred in main clauses, especially in initial position, see Zafiu, 2014).

(9) a. ***Lua-te-ar***   *dracu'!*
    take.INF=CL.ACC.2SG=AUX.COND.3SG   devil
    'Go to hell!'

b. ***Fost-ai***   *la tîrg?*
    be.PPLE=AUX.PERF.2SG   at market
    'Have you been to the market?'

c. ***Văzut-am***   *lumina*   *cea*   *adevărată.*
    see.PPLE=AUX.PERF.1SG   light.DEF   CEL.F.SG   true.F.SG
    'I have seen the true light'

(10) a. *Înțeles-ați*   *aceastea toate?* (CM, 249ᵛ)
    understand.PPLE=AUX.PERF.2PL   these all
    'Did you understand all these things?'

b. *însă acmu*   *asupră*   *de-aceastea*   ***tipăritu-se-au***
    but now   beside   of=these   print.PPLE=CL.REFL=AUX.PERF.3PL
    ceastea   *doo cărți* (PO, 4)
    these   two books
    'But now, beside these, two other books were printed'

c. *Vrajbă*   ***pune-voi***   *între tine*   *și între muiarea* (PO, 20)
    discord   put.INF=AUX.FUT.1SG   between you   and between wife.DEF
    'I will sow discord between you and your wife'

d. ***Feri-va***   *Dumnedzău*   *pre toți pre ceia*   *ce-l*
    take.care.INF=AUX.FUT.3SG   God   DOM all DOM these   who=CL.ACC.M.3SG
    iubăsc și pre toți nepocăiții   ***va***   ***piiarde*** (Prav., 239ᵛ)
    love and DOM all nonpenitents.DEF   AUX.FUT.3SG   kill.INF
    'God will take care of all the people who love him and will kill all the people who do not repent'

In previous research regarding scrambling and/or auxiliary inversion (Moldovanu, 1977–1978; Gheție & Zgraon, 1981; Zamfir, 2007; Frâncu, 2009), it is shown that this atypical word order is determined either by the preservation of an archaic syntactic rule, which was probably general in Romanian before the first attested texts (see Moldovanu, 1977–1978), or represents the result of the Slavonic influence, by means of translations. The second explanation is supported by the existence of auxiliary inversion in Old Church Slavonic (11); unfortunately, we did not find any relevant information in the literature with respect to scrambling in Old Church Slavonic.

(11) *ne srdoe li naju **gorę**₍part₎ **bě**₍aux₎ vъı naju*
    'Were not our hearts burning within?' (*Lk*, 24, 32, *apud* Pancheva, 2008)

Nevertheless, the application of the algorithm described in §3.2 leads to the conclusion that Slavonic influence is not a satisfactory explanation for the phenomena investigated here.

(i) It is known (Thielmann, 1885; Bauer, 2006; Adams, 2013) that in Latin the structures of the type *habeo* + object + past participle are attested since the archaic period, but, as extremely convincingly shown by Adams (2013, p. 646, *passim*), *habeo* was not an auxiliary, and, consequently, it did not have word order and adjacency constraints. For other forms containing an auxiliary, Latin is irrelevant, since periphrastic forms grammaticalized later in Romance, and implicitly in Romanian. The unmarked order of the *habeo*-structures in Latin was past participle + *habeo* ((12)—see Bauer, 2006, p. 293; Adams, 2013, p. 648). The possibility to insert different constituents, especially the direct

object, between the past participle and *habeo* is largely attested in Latin (see Bauer, 2006, p. 293; Adams, 2013, p. 649).

(12) *omnes*   *scaphas*   *ad litus* **appulsas**pple   **habeant**aux
      all.ACC   boats.ACC   to coast bring.to.land.PPLE.ACC.PL   have.SUBJ.3PL
      '(that) they have all boats brought to land' (Cæs., DBL.2.43.1, *apud* Bauer, 2006, p. 295)

(ii) In numerous old Romance varieties scrambling is permitted: Old Spanish (13a–b), Old Italian (13c–d), Old French (13e–f), etc.

(13) a. *Porque elle non* **avia** *las cartas* **resçebidas** (*apud* Mensching, 2012, p. 22)
          'Because she had not received the letters'
      b. **Eran** *sos fijos* **idos** *al canpo* (*apud* Company Company, 2006, p. 328)
          'His sons were gone in the field'
      c. **avrebbono** *a Alessandro e forse alla donna* **fatta** *villania* (*apud* Mensching, 2012, p. 22)
          'the would have affronted Alessandro and perhaps the lady, too'
      d. *Quali denari* **avea** *Baldovino* **lasciati** *loro* (*apud* Poletto, 2006)
          'Which money Baldovino had left them'
      e. *pour la grant amour* **ai** *je* **pourchacié** (*apud* Sitaridou, 2012, p. 588)
          'For the great love, I have pursued'
      f. *Un pou aprés eure de prime* **fu** *Mador* **venuz** (*apud* Mensching, 2012, p. 32)
          'And shortly after the first hour Mador had arrived'

Moreover, numerous old Romance varieties permit auxiliary inversion: Old Spanish (14a–c), Old Italian (14d), Old French (14e–f), etc.

(14) a. **Fecho as** *tú otro tal a los otros* (*apud* Mensching, 2012, p. 22)
          'You have done the same to the other ones'
      b. **passada han** *la sierra* (*apud* Company Company, 2006, p. 292)
          'they crossed the mountain'
      c. **cogida han** *la tienda* (*apud* Company Company, 2006, p. 292)
          'they pulled down the tent'
      d. *almeno quello che* **detto è** ___ *non è inutile a sapere* (*apud* Poletto, 2014)
          'At least what is said isn't useless to know'
      e. *por pooir que nos aïons,* **recovree ne sera,** *se par ceste genz non* (*apud* Frappier, 1976, p. 80)
          'no matter how poor we are, [the fortress] will not be conquest, at least not by these people'
      f. *Le voir* **reconeü** *vos* **ai** (*apud* Buridant, 2000, p. 377)
          'I have confessed the truth to you'

Similarly to Romanian (which lost scrambling and auxiliary inversion towards the end of the old period, conventionally delimited by the year 1780), the other Romance languages lost the scrambling option and the order participle–auxiliary as the unmarked word order at a certain point, most probably, in the 15th century in Spanish (Company Company, 2006, p. 287–299, 325–328) and in the 16th century in Italian (Poletto, 2006).

(iii) Both scrambling (15) and auxiliary inversion (16) are attested not only in translations but also in Romanian original documents:

(15) a. *Iar de-***ai**   **hi** *domiata* **sîrguit**   **să**   **fii** *pînă acmu*   **venit,**
          and if=AUX.COND.3SG   be you.POL   strive.PPLE   SĂSUBJ   be until now   come.PPLE
          avem   *nădeajde*   *pre Dumnedzeu*   *să*   *fi fost*
          have.IND.PRES.1PL   hope   in God   SĂSUBJ   be be.PPLE

pînă acmu și la moșie. (DÎ, XCIII, p. 184)
until now and at estate
'And if your highness had strived to have arrived by now, we hope in God, you would have been at estate until now'

b. *De va   veni   birdeni, **vor**   Nicorizi Nevrudul*
if AUX.FUT.3SG come.INF Birdeni AUX.FUT.3SG Nicorizi Nevrudul
***a čeri**   čeva ban* (DÎ, CI, p. 193)
A_INF ask.INF   some money
'If Birdeni comes, Nicorizi Nevrudul will ask for some money'

c. *aceaea care-**ară**   **fi**   înnapoi   **rămas*** (DÎ, XXXVI, p. 125)
that.F.SG who=AUX.COND.3SG be.INF behind   remain.PPLE
'the one that would have remained behind'

(16) a. ***Pusu-ne-am***   *și degetele mai jos* (DÎ, VI, p. 99)
put.PPLE=CL.REFL.ACC.1PL=AUX.PERF.1PL   and fingers more down
'We have put our fingers below'

b. *cum veri   zice,   **sta-vor**   au*
how AUX.FUT.2SG say.INF stay.INF=AUX.FUT.3PL   or
mearge-vor (DÎ, XXXII, p. 127)
go.INF=AUX.FUT.3PL
'as you will say, they will stay or they will go'

c. *Aceste sfinte cărți   ce   se   cheamă   Miniæ*
these holy books   which   CL.REFL call.IND.PRES.3PL Miniæ
datu-le-au   *Antiohie Jora* (ITM, p. 362)
give.PPLE=CL.ACC.F.3SG=AUX.PERF.3SG   Antiohie Jora
'These holy books called Miniæ were given by Antiohie Jora'

(iv) As for the South-Danubian varieties of Romanian, we only found relevant data for Istro-Romanian and Meglego-Romanian. In Istro-Romanian, scrambling is still possible (17), and postverbal placement of the auxiliary in the perfect and the future tenses is a frequent phenomenon (18) (Sandfeld, 1930, p. 149; Caragiu Marioțeanu, 1975, p. 205; Caragiu Marioțeanu et al., 1975, p. 225; Kovaček, 1984, p. 576; Zegrean, 2012).

(17) a. *Mâre   **voi**   io   **učide*** (*apud* Zegrean, 2012, taken from Sârbu, 1992)
tomorrow AUX.FUT.1SG I   kill.INF
'Tomorrow I'll kill'

b. *Ân cârca cu brenta   **am**   apa   **purtat***
in back with bucket.DEF AUX.PERF.1SG water.DEF brought.PPLE
'I carried the water on my back with the bucket'
(*apud* Zegrean, 2012, taken from Sârbu, 1992)

c. *Ier-**am**   mušat   **cantat*** (*apud* Zegrean, 2012)
yesterday=AUX.PERF.1SG beautifully sing.PPLE
'Yesterday I sang beautifully'

(18) a. *Ier   **citeit-nu-am**   nič* (*apud* Zegrean, 2012)
yesterday read.PPLE=not=AUX.PERF.1SG nothing
'I didn't read anything yesterday'

b. ***Datu-mi-a***   *regalu, ne boca   de vir*
give.PPLE=CL.DAT.1SG=AUX.PERF.3SG gift.DEF not bottle.DEF of wine
'(S)he gave me the gift, not the bottle of wine' (*apud* Zegrean, 2012)

In Meglego-Romanian, the past auxiliary is also frequently postverbal in certain varieties (19) (see Sandfeld, 1930, p. 149; Caragiu Marioțeanu, 1975, p. 282; Caragiu Marioțeanu et al., 1975, p. 207; Atanasov,

1984, p. 523–527); the future has only synthetic forms, and thus it is not relevant for the phenomenon investigated here. Atanasov (1984, p. 527) shows that the participle + auxiliary ordering is used in Megleno-Romanian when speakers report an event to which they did not take part (see 19c–d, where the context is larger), in other words auxiliary inversion marks evidentiality. This is also the case in Macedonian, a Slavic language that might have influenced Megleno-Romanian; if Megleno-Romanian was indeed influenced by Macedonia, then the data from this dialect are not relevant for our demonstration.

(19) a. *rugat-åm* (*apud* Caragiu Marioțeanu et al., 1975, p. 225)
         asked=AUX.PERF.1SG
         'I have asked'

      b. *țirút-ai* (*apud* Caragiu Marioțeanu et al., 1975, p. 225)
         asked=AUX.PERF.2SG
         'You have asked'

      c. *ier*   ***fóst-ăi***   *la lúcru* (*apud* Atanasov, 1984, p. 527)
         yesterday   be.PPLE=AUX.PERF.2SG   at work
         'I have heard that you have been to work yesterday'

      d. ***țirút-ău***   *si*   *vină*   *la noi*
         want.PPLE=AUX.PERF.3PL   SĂ_SUBJ   come.SUBJ.3PL   at us
         'I have heard that they wanted to come to our place' (*apud* Atanasov, 1984, p. 527)

4. Conclusions

In this final section we try to answer, at least partially, the questions raised at the beginning of §3.

The data briefly presented here show that, before considering that a syntactic feature (of Romanian) is the outcome of a foreign language influence (Slav(on)ic), one should take into account other possible scenarios, which can prove more appropriate. For (Daco-)Romanian, it is without doubt that the Latin heritage, the comparison with other old Romance languages, and the comparison with the South-Danubian varieties can be more useful than the claim—more often not supported by data and influenced by ideological considerations—that certain phenomena are due to Old Church Slavonic influence.

The algorithm we have put forth and applied to two phenomena considered in the literature to have Slavonic origins, rather explained as tendencies common to the Romance languages (eventually subordinated to certain general tendencies of the Indo-European languages, hence the similarities with Old Church Slavonic and with modern Slavic languages) can be applied to the entire list of phenomena presented in section §3.1, possibly augmented with other syntactic data.

If this algorithm is not entirely satisfactory, one can also resort to a syntactic formal analysis which, independently of the data from Latin or other Romance languages, explains the diachronic differences; for example, one can invoke the generative concept *parametric change* (where *parameter* means a formal feature of a functional category, while *parametric change* is related to the distribution of features, which, in diachrony, can be subject to certain transformations—Roberts, 2012). In this framework, the obligatorily postnominal position of relative adjectives from modern Romanian is the result of a parametric change taking place in Romanian: the loss of a specific type of movement (*phrasal movement*, precisely *A(djectival)P(hrase)-movement*) in the nominal domain (see, for details, Brăescu & Dragomirescu, 2014). In a similar manner, the loss of scrambling and auxiliary inversion can be accounted for by a unique parametric change: the loss of a feature responsible for movement in the Complementizer domain—correlated with the loss of auxiliary inversion—and in the little *v* domain (responsible for licensing Accusative case)—correlated with the loss of scrambling (see, for details and references, Dragomirescu, 2013 and 2014).

Applying this algorithm and finding formal explanations for the phenomena inventoried under §3.1 will allow us to give a more coherent description of the syntactic features of (old) Romanian, in relation

to Latin and Romance languages, on the one hand, and with Old Church Slavonic and modern Slavic languages, on the other hand. The expected result of this research is undoubtedly a list of syntactic features borrowed form Slavonic much more limited than it is actually shown in the existing literature.

Coming back to the grounds which determined the overstatement of the Slavonic/Slavic influence in the Romanian syntax, one can claim that the reasons for "falsification" are mainly ideological, but one can also add the lack—up until recently—of the relevant syntactic information about (Late) Latin, Romance languages (especially their old stages), and even about the South-Danubian varieties, as well as the perpetuation, without checking, of information from works which have been ideologically corrupt.

While the role of ideology in the mystification and the interpretation of certain linguistic data in its own benefit is clear enough, the opposite direction is less evident: to a certain extent, the linguistic data as well (controversial or obviously falsified) have been used to support certain historical mystifications, related not only to the old history (the emergence of the Romanian language and people, more or less subject to the Slavic influence, depending on the ideological necessities of the moment) but also to the more recent history (in the Communist period, the Slavic influence has been highlighted and exaggerated not only in linguistics but also in other domains).

Bibliography

A. Corpora

CC₁ = Coresi, *Tîlcul evangheliilor*, in Coresi, *Tîlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc (1567–1568)*, ed. V. Drimba, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1998, p. 31–187.

CC₂ = Coresi, *Carte cu învățătură (1581)*, ed. S. Pușcariu, Al. Procopovici, Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co., București, 1914.

CG = *Literatura românească de ceremonial. Condica lui Gheorgachi (1762)*, ed. Dan Simonescu, Fundația Regele Carol I, București, 1939.

CL = Coresi, *Liturghier (1570)*, ed. Al. Mareș, Editura Academiei, București, 1969.

CM = Coresi, *Molitvenic*, in Coresi, *Tîlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc (1567–1568)*, ed. V. Drimba, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1998, p. 189–211.

CV = *Codicele Voronețean (1563–1583)*, ed. M. Costinescu, Editura Academiei, București, 1981.

DÎ = *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, ed. Gh. Chivu, M. Georgescu, M. Ioniță, Al. Mareș, A. Roman-Moraru, Editura Academiei, București, 1979.

FD = *Floarea darurilor (1592–1604)*, ed. A. Roman Moraru, Minerva, București, 1996 (*Cele mai vechi cărți populare*, I), p. 119–182.

ITM = *Însemnări pe de pe manuscrise și cărți vechi din Țara Moldovei*, un corpus editat de I. Caproșu și E. Chiaburu, Demiurg, Iași, 2008, vol. I, *(1429–1750)*, p. 130–582.

PH = *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki (1500–1510)*, ed. I. Gheție și M. Teodorescu, Editura Academiei Române, București, 2005.

PO = *Palia de la Orăștie (1582)*, ed. V. Pamfil, Editura Academiei, București, 1968.

Prav. = *Pravila ritorului Lucaci (1581)*, ed. I. Rizescu, Editura Academiei, București, 1971.

SVI = *Varlaam și Ioasaf (1670)*, ed.: M. Stanciu Istrate, *Reflexe ale medievalității europene în cultura română veche:* ***Varlaam și Ioasaf** în cea mai veche versiune a traducerii lui Udriște Năsturel*, Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române, București, 2013.

B. References

Adams, J. (2013). *Social Variation and the Latin Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, CrossRef.

Atanasov, P. (1984). *Meglenoromâna*, in: V. Rusu (ed.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Scrisul Românesc, Craiova, p. 476–550.

Bauer, B.L.M. (2006). *'Synthetic' vs. 'analytic' in Romance. The importance of varieties*, in: R. Gess, D. Arteaga (eds), *Historical Romance Linguistics. Retrospective and Perspectives*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, p. 287–304.

Beneš, P. (1955). *Încrucișarea slavo-română în forma infinitivului românesc*, in „Studii și cercetări lingvistice", VI, 3–4, p. 255–263.

Boia, L. (2011). *Istorie și mit în conștiința românească*, 3rd ed., Humanitas, București.

Brăescu, R. & Dragomirescu, A. (2014). *Sintaxa adjectivelor relaționale în limba română veche*, in „Limba română", LXIII, 1, p. 27–47.

Buridant, C. (2000). *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français*, SEDES, Paris.

Caragiu Marioțeanu, M. (1975). *Compendiu de dialectologie română (nord- și sud-dunăreană)*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.

Caragiu Marioțeanu, M., Giosu, Ș., Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, L. & Todoran, R. (1977). *Dialectologie română*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București.

Chivu, G. (1993). *Studiu lingvistic*, in *Codex Sturdzanus*, Editura Academiei Române, București, p. 142–230.

Cihac, Al. (1870). *Dictionnaire d'étymologie daco-romane*, Francfurt am Main/Berlin/Bucarest.

Ciompec, G. (1969), *Observații asupra exprimării negației în limba română din secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea*, in „Studii și cercetări lingvistice", XX, 2, p. 197–209.

Company Company, C. (ed.). (2006). *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española*, FCE, UNAM, Mexico.

Copceac, D. (1998). *Paralele slavo-române în sintaxa prepozițiilor*, in *Tipologia limbilor romanice*, 2nd ed., Clusium, Cluj, p. 198–229.

Costinescu, M. (1981). *Studiu lingvistic*, in *Codicele Voronețean*, Editura Minerva, București, p. 89–213.

Densusianu, O. (1961). *Istoria limbii române* I, II, Editura Științifică, București.

Diaconescu, P. (1970). *Structură și evoluție în morfologia substantivului românesc*, Editura Academiei, București.

Djuvara, N. (2006). *Există istorie adevărată? Despre „relativitatea generală" a istoriei. Eseu despre epistemologie*, 2nd ed., Humanitas, București.

Dragomirescu, A. (2008). *Concordanța negației în limba română veche*, in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *Limba română. Dinamica limbii, dinamica interpretării*, Editura Universității din București, p. 219–226.

Dragomirescu, A. (2013). *O schimbare parametrică de la româna veche la româna modernă în sintaxa formelor verbale compuse cu auxiliar*, in „Limba română", LXII, 2, p. 225–239.

Dragomirescu, A. (2014). *The syntax of compound tenses and scrambling in old Romanian*, talk given at *SyntaxLab*, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, February 11, 2014.

Frappier, J. (1976). *Le style de Villehardouin dans les discours de sa chronique*, in: *Histoire, mythes et symbols. Études de literature française*, Librairie Droz, Genève, p. 73–83.

Frâncu, C. (2009). *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1581–1780)*, Casa Editorială Demiurg, Iași.

Gamanovich, (Archbishop Alypy). (2001). *Grammar of the Church Slavonic language*, English edition translated from Russian, Holy Trinity Monastery, Jordanville, New York.

Gasparov, B. (2001). *Old Church Slavonic*, LICOM Europa, Munchen.

Gheție, I. (coord.) (1997). *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche (1532–1780)*, Editura Academiei Române, București.

Gheție, I. & Zgraon, F. (1981). *Despre așa-numitele formații premorfologice din limba română veche*, in „Studii și cercetări lingvistice", XXXII, 2, p. 179–181.

Gheție, I. & Teodorescu, M. (2005). *Studiu lingvistic*, in *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki* I, Editura Academiei Române, București, p. 23–83.

Giusti, G. (2010). *Il sintagma aggetivale*, in: G. Salvi, L. Renzi (eds), *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, Il Mulino, Bologna, p. 593–616.

Ivănescu, G. (2000). *Istoria limbii române*, 2nd ed., Editura Junimea, Iași.

Kovaček, A. (1984). *Istroromâna*, in: V. Rusu (ed.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Scrisul Românesc, Craiova, p. 550–590.

Lardon, S. & Thomine, M.-C. (2009). *Grammaire du français de la Renaissance. Étude morphosyntaxique*, Editions Classiques Garnier, Paris.

Ledgeway, A. (2009). *Grammatica diacronica del dialetto napoletano*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, CrossRef.

Ledgeway, A. (2012). *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, CrossRef.

Mackridge, P. (2009). *Language and National Identity in Greece 1766–1976*, Oxford University Press, Oxford/New York, CrossRef.

Mareș, Al. (1969). *Studiu de limbă*, in *Liturghierul lui Coresi*, Editura Academiei, București, p. 47–118.

Mensching, G. (2012). *Parameters in Old Romance word order*, in: C. Galves, S. Cyrino, R. Lopes, F. Sandalo, and J. Avelar (eds.), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, p. 21–42.

Moldovanu, D. (1977–1978). *Formațiile premorfologice din limba română veche*, in „Anuarul de lingvistică și istorie literară", XXVI, p. 45–69.

Niculescu, Al. (1999). *Individualitatea limbii române între limbile romanice*, vol. 3, Clusium, Cluj-Napoca.

Niculescu, Al. (2007). *România slavica*, in *L'altra latinità. Storia linguistica del romeno tra Oriente e Occidente*, Edizioni Fiorini, Verona, p. 95–104.

Pană Dindelegan, G. (2014). *Variație în construcția verbului în limba veche*, in R. Zafiu, A. Dragomirescu, A. Nicolae (eds.), *Diacronie și sincronie în studiul limbii române*, vol. I, Editura Universității din București, București (sub tipar).

Pancheva, R. (2008). *Head-Directionality of TP in Old Church Slavonic*, in: A. Antonenko, J. F. Bailyn, C. Y. Bethin (eds), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Languages. The Stony Brook Meeting 2007*, Michigan Slavic Publications, Ann Arbor, p. 313–332.

Petrovici, E. (1943). *Daco-slava*, in „Dacoromania", X, II, p. 233–277.

Poletto, C. (2006). *Parallel phases: a study on the hight and low left periphery of Old Italian*, in: M. Frascarelli (ed.), *Studies in Generative Grammar*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, p. 261–294.

Poletto, C. (2014). *Word order in Old Italian*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, CrossRef.

Rizescu, I. (1963). *Cu privire la dubla negație în limba română*, in „Studii şi cercetări lingvistice", XIV, 4, p. 471–478.

Rizescu, I. (1971). *Studiu de limbă*, în *Pravila ritorului Lucaci*, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, p. 35–145.

Roberts, I. (2012). *Macroparameters and Minimalism*, in: C. Galves, S. Cyrino, R. Lopes, F. Sandalo, and J. Avelar (eds), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, p. 320–335.

Rohlfs, G. (1969). *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana et dei suoi dialetti*, vol. III, *Sintassi e formazione delle parole*, Turin.

Rosetti, Al. (1968). *Istoria limbii române de la origini pînă în secolul al XVII-lea*, Editura pentru Literatură, Bucureşti.

Salvi, G. & Renzi, L. (eds). (2010). *Grammatica dell'italiano antico*, Il Mulino, Bologna.

Sandfeld, Kr. (1930). *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et resultants*, Champion, Paris.

Sârbu, R. (1992). *Texte istroromâne cu un studiu introductiv „Istroromâna – azi" şi un glosar*, 2nd ed., Editura Universităţii din Timişoara, Timişoara.

Seidel, E. (1958). *Elemente sintactice slave în limba română*, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti.

Sériot, P. (1995). *Changements de paradigmes dans la linguistique soviétique des années 1920–1930*, în *Histoire epistémologie langage*, XVII, 2, p. 235–251.

Sitaridou, I. (2012). *A comparative study of word order in Old Romance*, in „Folia linguistica", 46, 2, p. 553–604, CrossRef.

Tagliavini, C. (1977). *Originile limbilor neolatine – introducere în fiologia romanică*, 2nd ed., Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti.

Teodorescu, M. & Gheție, I. (1977). *Studiu de limbă*, in *Manuscrisul de la Ieud*, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, p. 59–141.

Thielmann, Ph. (1885). ***Habere** mit dem Infinitiv und die Entstehung des romanischen Futurums*, in „Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik", 2, 372–423, 509–549.

Zafiu, R. (2009). *Ideologie și mit în lingvistica românească*, in „Communication interculturelle et littérature", 2, 6, p. 313–324.

Zafiu, R. (2014). *Auxiliary encliticization în 16th century Romanian: restrictions and regularities*, în „Linguistica Atlantica", 33, 2, p. 71–86.

Zamfir, D.-M. (2007). *Morfologia verbului în dacoromâna veche (secolele al XVI-lea – al XVII-lea)*, Partea a II-a, *Timpurile din sfera trecutului. Viitorul. Condiționalul*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti.

Zegrean, I.-G. (2012). *Balkan Romance: Aspects of the Syntax of Istro-Romanian*, PhD Thesis, Università Ca'Foscari Venezia.