INTRODUCTION

GABRIELA ALBOIU[1]

1. INTRODUCTION

Volumes 1–2 of *RRL* 2023 co-edited by Alboiu and Mardale and entitled "Studies in Linguistics in Honour of Virginia Hill: Romance, Balkan and beyond", constitute a selection of papers written by students, friends, and research collaborators of Virginia (Motapanyane) Hill's and are dedicated to our friend and colleague who over the years has been a tireless contributor to Romanian linguistics and beyond. Her work, which is mainly couched in generative grammar but has also drawn extensively from more traditional approaches and sound philological studies, has covered almost every aspect imaginable related to the morphosyntax of Romanian in the larger Balkan Sprachbund, both synchronically and diachronically. She is an extremely hard worker, with an insatiable linguistic curiosity and a generosity of spirit that never fail to amaze as she continues to share her expertise with anyone caring to listen. Throughout her academic career, she has kept her head down and gotten on with it, despite the many vicissitudes that any life (in and out of academia) encounters. And she has gone about it unassumingly and with a lot of grace, offering a helping hand to many a budding linguist along the way – a rare gift in a very competitive field. Virginia, you are a true inspiration, and we need more linguists and decent human beings like you!

The remainder of this chapter provides a synopsis of both Virginia (Motapanyane) Hill's accomplishments and the linguistic delights to unfold in the papers gathered here in honour of Virginia's retirement.

2. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Dr. Virginia Hill (formerly Motapanyane) is a Professor of Linguistics at the University of New Brunswick in Saint John, Canada. She received her MA from the University of Bucharest, Romania (in Classics). From the University of Geneva, she received her second MA and her PhD in Linguistics (1991). She joined the Department of Humanities and Languages at UNBSJ in 1990 where she developed a Minor/Double Major in Linguistics program within the Department.

Dr. Hill was appointed in 2008 as an honorary Research Professor in the Department of Classics, Modern Languages and Linguistics at Concordia University (Canada). In 2012 she was awarded a Leverhulme Trust Professorship at the University of Kent (UK), and in

---

[1] York University, galboiu@yorku.ca.

2014 she received a UNB-University Research Scholar award. In November 2016, she was an invited professor at the Universidade Federal do Parana (Curitiba – Brazil).

Dr. Hill specializes in formal syntax, with a focus on Romance (and, in particular, Romanian) and Balkan languages. In this field she has single authored four books, co-authored two, edited two more and co-edited another three. She has written numerous articles published in prestigious peer reviewed journals and collections of papers, both as a solo author and in collaboration with others. Her research areas are too diverse to list here but a quick bibliographic check proves that she has left almost no stone unturned. She continues to be an invited speaker at various international conferences and workshops.

She was principal investigator on several SSHRCC grants and co-investigator on a Major Collaborative Research Initiative grant focused on biolinguistics (A.M. DiSciullo – principal investigator at UQAM, Canada), as well as international co-investigator on two Major Grants with colleagues from the Universities of Girona and York University (Agencia Estatal de Investigación, Gobierno de España Grants #FFI2017-87140-C4-2-P and #PID2021-123617NB-C42 on microparameters). With these funds, she created student jobs at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

2.1. Books

Hill, V. & A. Mardale. 2021. *The Diachrony of Differential Object Marking in Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hill, V. & G. Alboiu. 2016. *Verb movement and clause structure in Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hill, V. (ed). 2015. *Formal approaches to DPs in Old Romanian*. Leiden: Brill.
Hill, V. 2014. *Vocatives: How syntax meets with pragmatics*. Leiden: Brill. With the participation of Melita Stavrou.
Di Sciullo, A.M. & V. Hill (eds). 2010. *Interface properties: Edges, Heads and Projections*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Motapanyane, V. (ed). 2000. *Comparative studies in Romanian syntax*. Oxford: Elsevier.
Motapanyane, V. 1997. *Acadian French. A Grammatical Sketch*. München: Lincoln Europa. In collaboration with David Jory.
Black, J. & V. Motapanyane (eds). 1997. *Clitics, pronouns and movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Black, J. & V. Motapanyane (eds). 1996. *Micro-parametric syntax and dialect variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Motapanyane, V. 1995. *Theoretical Implications of Complementation in Romanian*. Padova: Unipress.

2.2. Selected journal articles and book chapters[2]

Hill, V. 2022. "The syntactization of kinship in vocative phrases". *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics*, 7(1). DOI:10.16995/glossa.6557.

---

[2] The list here is but a sample as Virginia has (co-)authored over 70 journal articles and book chapters.

Hill, V. & M. Irimia. 2022. "Differential Subject Marking through SE". *The Linguistic Review*, 39(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2021-2081.

Hill, V. & G. Alboiu. 2021. "Diachronic Change and Feature-al Instability: The Cycles of Fin in Romanian OC". In Thórhallur Eythórsson and Jóhannes Gísli Jónsson (eds.), *Syntactic Features and the Limits of Syntactic Change*, 64–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Akkus, F. & V. Hill. 2021. "Overt speakers in syntax". *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics,* 6(1), 1–33. DOI: *https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1286.*

Irimia, M. & V. Hill. 2021. "Personal SE with unergatives in Romanian". In Grant Armstrong & J. E. MacDonald (eds), *Unravelling the Complexities of SE*, 161–184. NY: Springer. SNLLT Series.

Hill, V. & A. Mardale. 2019. "The internal structure of a differentially marked DP in Romanian". *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics*, 21(1), 87–107.

Alboiu, G. & V. Hill. 2017. "Grammaticalization of Auxiliaries and Parametric Change". *The Linguistic Review*, 34 (3), 1–23.

Hill, V. 2017. "Early Modern Romanian infinitives". In Lukasz Jedrzejowski, Ulrike Demske (eds), *Infinitives at the Syntax-Semantics Interface. A Diachronic Perspective*, 147–168. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hill, V. & A. Mardale. 2017. "On the Interaction of Differential Object Marking and Clitic Doubling in Romanian". *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 62(4), 393–409.

Alboiu, G & V. Hill. 2016. "Raising to Object as A-bar Movement: A Romanian case Study". *Syntax*, 19(3), 256–285. DOI: 10.1111/synt.12123.

Alboiu, G., V. Hill, & I. Sitaridou. 2015. "Discourse driven V-to-Focus in Early Modern Romanian". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 33 (4), 1057–1088. DOI 10.1007/s11049-014-9270-8

Hill, V. 2013. "The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive". *The Linguistic Review*, 30(4), 1–37.

Hill, V. 2013. "The direct object marker in Romanian: a historical perspective". *Journal of Australian Linguistics*. 33(2), 140–151.

Hill, V. 2013. "The emergence of the Romanian supine". *Journal of Historical Linguistics*, 3(2), 230–271.

Haegeman, L. & V. Hill. 2013. "The syntacticization of discourse". In Folli, R., R. Truswell, & C. Sevdali (eds), *Syntax and its Limits,* 370–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alboiu, G. & V. Hill. 2013. "The Case of A-bar ECM: Evidence from Romanian". In S. Keine & S. Sloggett (eds), *Proceedings of the 42nd Meeting of the NELS*. Amherst: GLSA Publisher (University of Massachusetts), 25–39.

Hill, V. 2012. "Romanian 'can': change in parametric settings". In Galves, C. et al. (eds), *Parameter Theory and Language Change*, 264–279. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hill, V. & O. Mladenova. 2011. "Mapping the information structure in Early Modern Bulgarian clauses with the particle *ta*". *Lingua*, 121(15), 2103–2119.

Pirvulescu, M. & V. Hill. 2011. "Feature syncretism in the pragmatic field in L1 acquisition of French". *Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 73–81.

Hill, V. 2011. "Modal grammaticalization and the pragmatic field: a case study". *Diachronica*, 28(1), 25–53.

Hill, V. & L. Tasmowski. 2008. "Romanian Clitic Doubling: a view from pragmatics-semantics and diachrony". In Kallulli, Dalina and Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, 133–163. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hill, V. 2007. "Romanian adverbs and the pragmatic field". *The Linguistic Review*, 24(1), 61–86.

Hill, V. 2007. "Vocatives and the Pragmatics-Syntax Interface". *Lingua*, 117(12), 2077–2105.

Hill, V. 2006. "Stylistic inversion in Romanian". *Studia Linguistica*, 60(2), 156–18.

3. PART 1: THE CP SPHERE

In Part 1, we have gathered papers that focus on issues related to the clausal domain, from finiteness to restructuring, subject omission in non-pro-drop contexts to the semantic type of CP arguments, and dialectal variation in relativization.

Following work on the diachrony of Romanian by Virginia Hill and collaborators Alboiu and Tomić, **Cardinaletti and Giusti** discuss the microvariation found in the untensed finite clauses of two varieties of Romance: Romanian, on the one hand, and southern Calabrian and north-eastern Sicilian dialects on the other. The authors argue that in both varieties of Romance, the feature [–T] is shared across the clausal architecture of the left periphery (Rizzi 1997) in Force and Fin, and a dedicated head of the inflectional field (Mood). The authors conclude that the distinct first-merge position of the relevant particles (Fin in Romanian, Mood in the dialects) explains why clustering with the clausal negation is possible in the southern Italian dialects but not in Romanian, among other things. The observations made in this paper open the way to further comparative studies between Romanian and southern Italian dialects.

Ledgeway discusses Romanian and the Romance and Greek varieties of the extreme south of Italy with a focus on the loss versus preservation of the (bare) infinitive. It is pointed out that, while these language varieties show various degrees of diachronic and diatopic microvariation in the loss and retreat of the infinitive, they all uniformly preserve it in the following three contexts: (1) restructuring, (2) infinitival relatives (and, often, indirect interrogatives), and (3) negative imperatives. While, at first glance, these three contexts may seem randomly selected, their uniformity across varieties begs further investigation. The author argues that viewing the infinitive as a reduced clausal constituent (viz. v-VP) generated in a monoclausal structure selected in all cases by a(n) (c)overt modal, temporal or aspectual auxiliary, provides the structural underpinning for explaining the preservation of the (bare) infinitive in exactly these contexts. This unified restructuring analysis which captures the distribution of (bare) infinitival complementation in all the relevant varieties is in line with Hill's (2013a,b, 2017) intuition that the Romanian and Balkan bare infinitive instantiate a monoclausal structure selected by a T-related auxiliary.

Bailey, Haegeman, and Hornsby examine the distribution and interpretation of non-overt subjects in second conjuncts in abbreviated written English. Their paper investigates an apparent exception to the coreferentiality constraint on second conjunct subject ellipsis in finite clauses in English. The authors show that the pattern is restricted to registers which independently allow for non-overt subjects in specific written registers such as diary writing and global topic texts. It is argued that instances of omission of non-coreferential subjects of second conjuncts arise from full clausal coordination in which the second conjunct allows for subject omission in such registers. Consequently, it is

concluded that register specific subject omission in English finite clauses should not be equated to a version of pro-drop or to an instantiation of Germanic style topic drop.

Cornilescu sets out to map the syntax and interpretation of the Romanian adverb *aşa* 'so' used as a CP substitute. Semantically, *aşa* 'so' expresses a relation of similarity between two entities, one of which is supplied contextually. The author provides evidence for the morphosyntactic multifunctionality of *aşa* 'so' (i.e. degree head, adjective, adverb, CP), whose content as a predicate of similarity remains stable across categories. Following assumptions in Kratzer (2006) and Moulton (2015) that CPs are predicates that combine with verbs via predicate modification, the apparent contradiction between the fact that an adjunct like *aşa* 'so' may substitute for a CP argument dissolves. Cornilescu also convincingly shows that, with all types of *aşa*-phrases, there is a distinction between a simple mono-phrasal configuration and a complex small-clause-like phrase, headed by a similarity predicate and whose semantic arguments are *aşa* 'so' in the specifier position and some ZP, which is the phrase matching the property expressed by *aşa* 'so'. The complex pattern is systematically available in Romanian, producing iconicity between syntax and interpretation.

Boioc Apintei, Dragomirescu, and Nicolae discuss the use of Romanian *cine* 'who' as a relative pronoun from a diachronic and dialectal perspective. In particular, the authors point out that, while in Old Romanian *cine* (< Latin QUI(S)+NE 'who') could be used as a relativizer in both free and headed relative clauses, in standard Modern Romanian, *cine* is solely used with an interrogative value or in free relative clauses, having been replaced by *care* 'which' when headedness is at play. This situation contrasts with its current use in Lipovan Romanian (spoken by the Lipovan community in Dobrodja) where *cine* is still used to introduce headed relative clauses. Interestingly, the authors point out that the grammaticalization source from interrogative *cine* to relative *cine* is due to contact with two distinct Slavonic varieties (i.e. Old Church Slavonic for Old Romanian, and Russian for Lipovan Romanian), which in turn sets the path for distinct properties and survival rates of the construction with *cine* in headed relatives.

4. PART 2: THE DP SPHERE

Part 2 brings together papers that focus on issues related to the DP, either internally, within the noun phrase, or externally, in terms of the interaction of nominals with the rest of the clause. Here we find papers discussing the syntax and acquisition of Differential Object Marking (i.e. DOM, Bossong 1991, 1998), DP properties and clitic doubling, triggers in diachronic changes of clitic positions, derivationally formed adjectives, and interfaces between derivation and inflection as it relates to the nominal system.

In her paper, **Irimia** engages with the topical issue of DOM in four unrelated languages (Uzbek, Afrikaans, Mandarin Chinese, and Finnish) with the aim of uncovering what theoretical account can best explain this ubiquitous cross-linguistic phenomenon. The author points out that while DOM encodes splits in the morphosyntactic marking of direct objects, the languages addressed in the paper provide support for the fact that DOM involves a structural licensing strategy beyond that triggered by syntactic Case. In particular, the special marking seen on highly referential direct objects involves the presence of discourse-linking features which are generated separately from Case and need

to be licensed independently. This is in line with previous findings by the author (i.e. Irimia 2019, 2020) for Basque, Romance, and Indo-Aryan languages, and has also been proposed by Hill and Mardale (2019, 2021) for the diachrony of Romanian. The findings have important consequences for nominal licensing more generally.

Avram, Mardale, and Soare explore whether specific phenomena undergoing language change in contemporary Romanian trigger 'diachronic incrementation' (Labov 2007, Cournane 2019) in the process of heritage child language acquisition, with changes occurring beyond that in the input. In particular, the authors investigate the acquisition of optional DOM in child heritage speakers (HS) of Romanian with French as the dominant language (so, in the presence of language contact and reduced input). In contemporary Romanian, with (animate) lexical DPs, two DOM grammars (with *pe* + accusative clitic or simply with *pe* and no clitic doubling) find themselves in competition, with a categorical direction of shift in the direction of the grammar requiring clitic doubling. From a syntactic perspective, these contexts present optionally with DOM, the optionality nonetheless having an impact on discourse (Hill and Mardale 2019, 2021). Several important findings emerge, among which the fact that (i) adult first generation immigrants do not show erosion of optional DOM, (ii) child heritage Romanian correctly follows the input, but (iii) there is significant decrease in the use of DOM in optional contexts between the ages of 7–10. The latter finding is expected given the vulnerability attested with discourse phenomena in bilingual acquisition but also points in the opposite direction of incrementation.

Tomić examines the specificities in object clitic doubling in two Balkan Romance languages, Romanian and Aromanian, and two Balkan Slavic languages, Macedonian and Bulgarian. It is argued that the conditions on clitic doubling in Romanian and Bulgarian differ substantially from the conditions on clitic doubling in the Balkan languages they are in close genetic relationships with. In both Romanian and Bulgarian clitic doubling depends on discourse factors, but the types and usage of these factors differ. Conversely, clitic doubling in Macedonian and Aromanian occurs under almost identical conditions. The author accounts for this asymmetry in terms of the presence versus absence of close socio-linguistic proximity where direct inter-translatability is required (i.e. Macedonian and Aromanian, but not Romanian and Bulgarian).

Di Sciullo and Somesfalean discuss the pattern change from Old Romanian (OR) to Modern Romanian (MR) in pronominal objects as a consequence of DAP (i.e. Di Sciullo's 2011 *Directional Asymmetry Principle*), a complexity-reduction mechanism sensitive to both derivational and representational complexity. In particular, their study argues that shifts in pronominal object constructions from OR to MR are the result of two phenomena, one derivational, the other representational. From a derivational perspective, the optional, discourse-related verb movement to a position higher than the tense-bearing node (cf. Alboiu and Hill 2012, Alboiu et al. 2014) is internally complex so is lost in the transition from OR to MR. From a representational perspective, choice in OR between strong versus clitic forms of the object pronoun, presents an instance of sensori-motor (SM)/ external complexity, so the diachronic push is towards favouring the clitic option as in MR.

Mladenova discusses the results of a corpus-based study of *ne*-adjectives in standard Bulgarian. These derivational adjectives are formed using the negative *ne*- prefixed to the source adjective, for example *nevisok* 'neither tall, nor short' stemming from *visok* 'tall'. These types of adjectives, which initially had an antonymic value with respect to the source adjective, developed non-extreme, "mid-range" readings (see previous example) which appear to have been available in Bulgarian texts alongside their contradictory semantics

since the 19th century. The author establishes the inventory of these adjectives, groups them into three categories and engages with their semantic and prosodic properties. It is speculated that these *ne*-adjectives arise out of a contact situation with Russian, as Slavic languages (unlike the non-Slavic Balkan counterparts) seem to allow for their productive use, and it is concluded that their rise in standard Bulgarian has allowed formal registers to make reference to mid-scale properties.

Finally, **Croitor** discusses several cases of Romanian morphemes that straddle the border between inflectional and derivational morphology. In particular, the author looks at cases of grammaticalization of the derivational suffix *-et(e)* into an inflectional plural marker, at uses of the plural desinence with a derivational value, at the use of the definite article, an inflectional suffix, as a derivational morpheme, and at the double nature, at once inflectional and derivational, of some nominal and verbal suffixes. The author provides various examples from both standard and regional dialects of Romanian to highlight the functional fluidity of some aspects of Romanian affixation.

REFERENCES

Alboiu, G., V. Hill. 2012. "Early Modern Romanian and Wackernagel's law", *Journal of the Linguistic Association of Finland* 25: 7–28.

Alboiu, G., V. Hill, I. Sitaridou. 2014. "Discourse Driven V-to-C in Early Modern Romanian", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 32 (4)*, DOI 10.1007/s11049-014-9270-8 (online); (paper) 2015, 33(4), 1057–1088.

Bossong, G., 1991, "Differential Object Marking in Romance and beyond", in: D. Wanner, D. Kibbee (eds), *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, Urbana-Champaign, April 7-9, 1988, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 143–170.

Bossong, G., 1998, "Le marquage différentiel de l'objet dans les langues d'Europe", in: J. Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe,* Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 259–294.

Cournane, A., 2019, "A developmental view on incrementation in language change", *Theoretical Linguistics*, 45, 3–4, 127–150.

Di Sciullo, A.M. 2011. "A Biolinguistic Approach to Variation", in: A.M. Di Sciullo & C. Boeckx (eds.), *The Biolinguisitic Entreprise. New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hill, V., 2013a, "Romanian 'can'. Change in parametric settings", in C. Galves, S. Cyrino, R. Lopes, F. Sandalo, J. Avelar (eds), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Pres, 265–280.

Hill, V., 2013b, "The emergence of the Romanian subjunctive", *The Linguistic Review*, 30, 1–37.

Hill, V., 2017, "Early modern Romanian infinitives: origin and replacement", in L. Jederzejowski, U. Demske (eds), *Infinitives at the Syntax-Semantics Interface: A Diachronic Perspective*, Tübingen, de Gruyter, 147–168.

Hill, V., A. Mardale, 2019, "Patterns for differential object marking in the history of Romanian", *Journal of Historical Syntax*, 3, 5, 1–47.

Hill, V., A. Mardale, 2021, *The Diachrony of Differential Object Marking in Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Kratzer A. 2006. *Decomposing Attitude verbs*. Unpublished ms. U Mass, Amherst.

Labov, W., 2007, "Transmission and diffusion", *Language*, 83, 2, 344–387.

Moulton, K. 2015. "CPs: Copies and Compositionality", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 305–342.

Rizzi, L., 1997, "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in: L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 281–337.