DOUBLE SUBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS IN ROMANIAN?

ANDRA VASILESCU[1]

Abstract. Grammars of old Romanian described various types of "double subject" constructions, explained from two sources: an internal one (spoken language structures, in the case of original texts), and an external one (imitations from original texts of various foreign origins). In a discourse analysis perspective, the present article challenges the "double subject" interpretation and argues that the subject is only *apparently* double. The constructions under scrutiny show a canonic subject and some additional discursive phenomena that result in an opaque linearization, which is misleading due to the lack of prosodic markers in written texts. The apparent "double subject" results from two interrelated phenomena: (a) the transfer of spoken language disfluencies to written texts (in a period when writers were not fully aware of register differences, and register differentiation was not the norm, especially in Romanian culture, but in other cultures too) and (b) various lexical-syntactic topic – focus management strategies (some of them specific to all discourse configurational languages, Latin included, others specific to Romanian, with some of them possibly emerging in the translation process from other languages). Hence, the syntactic subject is attracted in various discursive phenomena which result in the following categories: (i) *discontinuous subject*, a strategy of topic confirmation; (ii) *recurrent subject*, a focus confirmation strategy used as affective stance marker; (iii) *hanging topic*, anaphorically resumed as syntactic subject, which is a strategy of information structure management common to discourse configurational languages, as well as to spoken varieties of configurational languages; (iv) *verum focus operator*, a strategy specific to Romanian, which varies cross-linguistically; (v) *appositive subject* with clarification function; (vi) *additive focal adverbial*, a pronominal device alternative to the focal adverbial *și*; (vii) *continuity marking relator*, with a conjunction-like status, syntactically not integrated in the sentence it heads as *apparent subject*; (viii) *focal particle marking affective stance*. All these discursive configurations were transmitted to present-day Romanian. What makes the difference is the degree of tolerance for spoken language structures in the written register and speakers'/writers' higher degree of awareness regarding written language norms. They are all part of information packaging strategies in discourse.

Keywords: old Romanian, double subject constructions, grammar – discourse interface, information packaging.

1. THE BACKGROUND

It is a generally accepted view that syntactic sentences have an information structure (Halliday 1967; Féry and Ishihara 2016, among many others), explained in terms of two intersecting pairs: (i) old/given information (information already known/accessible by the

[1] University of Bucharest, Faculty of Letters and Romanian Academy, "Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest, vasilescu.andra@litere.unibuc.ro

interlocutors from common prior knowledge or discursively constructed and already mentioned) vs. new information (information newly introduced in discourse by the speaker), or in cognitive terms ground and figure (Talmy 1978, among others); (ii) topic/theme (what the sentence is about) vs focus/rheme (the most prominent element in the domain of new information). In some languages, English being the prototypical example, the syntactic subject of a sentence is placed first in the sentence and coincides with the old information and the topic. The domain of the comment/rheme is placed to the right of the subject-topic and has two partitions: new information and new information marked by informational or by contrastive focus. But this is not the case in all languages; particularly, in languages with free word order the syntactic structure does not coincide with its information structure (i.e. the linearization of the topic, comment, focus). Information packaging varies across languages.

Studies in the typology of languages distinguish between configurational languages and discourse configurational languages: the former organize information around grammatical relations defined in terms of phrase-structure configurations, i.e. subject [NP, S], object [NP, VP] (Chomsky 1970), the latter organize information around the functional/discourse categories of topic and focus (Li and Thompson 1976). Configurational languages are subject-oriented while discourse configurational languages are topic-oriented. Subject-oriented languages have a hierarchical organization of the external (subject) – internal arguments (objects) and show the obligatory dichotomy NP, subject – VP (English being the prototype); topic-oriented languages have a flat constituent structure and display information highlighting the topic (old information) – comment (new information) information structure of sentences (Asian languages are the most cited examples, but also Hungarian, Turkish, Swedish, Dutch, Catalan, Basque, Navajo, Warlpiri, etc.) (Hale 1982; Kiss 1995). There are several systemic characteristics that support this distinction. On the one hand, configurational/subject-oriented languages obligatorily lexicalize the syntactic subject at the beginning of the sentence − as a pronoun or as a (modified) DP −, excluding null subjects (unless some special conditions are met); they have expletive subjects, show a strict word-order and poor verbal inflections to differentiate among grammatical persons; the syntactic subject coincides with the topic. On the other hand, discourse configurational/topic-oriented languages display a cluster of specific characteristics, not obligatorily all of them: null subjects and zero anaphora across discourse, which is the unmarked option for topical continuity; a rich system of verbal inflections; the topic does not necessarily coincide with the syntactic subject; there is not a fix word order to identify external vs. internal arguments (subject vs. object); morphological cases encode thematic roles rather than being structurally assigned; there are not expletive subjects; discontinuous structures (i.e. scrambling, like split auxiliary – lexical verb) are allowed; the active/passive opposition is not the result of movement; there are specific means of encoding topics, like topic particles; there are special means of encoding presentatives, etc. Topic-oriented languages have various syntactic and prosodic strategies to mark constituents as topic – comment – focus.

Latin was a discourse-configurational language like old Romance languages (Vincent 1988; Kiss 1995; cf. Ledgeway 2012); old Romanian inherited this typological feature too (Alboiu, Hill, Sitaridou, 2015, for example). There are several features that qualify old Romanian as a discourse-configurational language: the null subject; zero anaphora; relatively free word order; quirky subjects (dative and accusative clitic subjects); scrambling phenomena in the DP and the VP, etc. For recent overviews of old Romanian syntax, see Avram 2007, Stan 2013; Dindelegan and Maiden 2016, among others.

There is a continuum on which languages can be placed closer to the discourse configurational end or to the configurational end (Latrouite and VanValin Jr. 2019). For example, Romanian shares some features with configurational languages (as mentioned above), while others with discourse-configurational ones (the presence of the article that projects the DP, case syncretisms, differential object marking, etc.), so it is less discourse configurational than Japanese, Chinese, Mandarin, Hungarian, etc., and less configurational than English or French. At the same time, languages change over time: starting from the discourse configurationality of Latin, Romance languages developed towards configurationality (Ledgeway 2012). Romanian appears to be more discourse configurational during the old period, but it seems to have developed into a more configurational language, especially in the standard (written) register; for a comparison that might hint to this evolution see Dindelegan and Maiden 2016: 629−637.

Assuming that old Romanian is a discourse configurational language, the present article challenges the interpretation of "double subject constructions" as syntactic configurations and interprets them as the epiphenomenon of information packaging strategies, most of them specific to spoken language, when verbalization is simultaneous with the process of planning the massage.

2. GRAMMARS ON "DOUBLE SUBJECT"

Densusianu (1901: 389–390) identified a frequent construction in old Romanian texts, labelled "subject doubling", which was extensively described later by Carabulea (1965: 103−109; 2007: 36−39), and, more recently, by Stan (2013: 153−158), Corbeanu (2014), and Dindelegan (2016: 101−103). The authors presented several syntactic types with various lexical and morphological realizations. In order to emphasize the diversity of instantiations, Carabulea (2007: 34−40) focused on an analytical taxonomy with 2 categories of double subject constructions, i.e. (i) repetitions, with 2 subcategories and a so-called special case, and (ii) resumptions, with 4 subcategories and several subclasses each. Stan's taxonomy (2013: 153−158) starts as synthetical by identifying three categories, i.e., (i) resumption of the pro(nominal) subject, (ii) resumption of the subjective clause, and (iii) repetition, and continues as a thorough description of the rich variety of the morphological and lexical variants under each of the three categories. Corbeanu (2014) confirms the classes previously presented and provides additional examples from a 16th century corpus. Dindelegan (2016: 101−103) proposes a syntax-centered taxonomy, partly including a generative view on constituents' internal structure, and presents six patterns which underlie subject doubling: (i) relative subject clause … *acela/acesta/el*; (ii) NP incorporating a relative modifier …. *acesta/acela*; (iii) Subject DP (…) *el*; (iv) pronominal subject (…) lexical nominal; (v) summarizing doubling (*eu…eu…, noi*); (vi) repetition of the subject, i.e. NP/pro (…) NP/pro. The differences between the three taxonomies reflect a different hierarchy of criteria and different descriptive principles, but all of them point out the wide range of subject doubling instantiations in old Romanian.

The authors of grammar-centered approaches agreed on the following aspects: (i) the distinction between subject repetition (the subject expressed several times across discourse as the same lexical unit) and resumption (distinct lexical units which form the "double subject" configuration, one of them being an anaphor); (ii) adjacent vs. at-a-distance

realizations of the double subject; (iii) the various morpho-syntactic realizations of each term of the "double subject"; (iv) the relative order of the two interdependent instantiations of the subject (lexical item – anaphoric item or the reverse).

The examples in (1-6) illustrate the rich diversity of these constructions, presented in an order which is convenient to the discussion that follows.

(1) a. Iar **tu** din ceas ce ver vede carte me, iar **tu** să purcez
and **you** from moment that will see letter my and **you** set off
cu toate oștile la mine (A.1620: 31ʳ)
with all troops_DEF at me
'And you, the very moment you read my letter, set off to me with all your troops'

b. de ar hi făcut **ei** așa la domneavostră cum au facut
if woud have done **they** like that at you as have done
ei la noi, **ei** ar hi putredzit în neste temnite (…) si încă
they at us, **they** would have rotted in some dungeons and also
apoi **ei** au scris si carte (…) cum **ei** sânt vinovati, si ce au facut
then **they** have written also letter (…) how **they** are guilty and what have done
rău **ei** (…) (ISN, XL, Bistrita, 1638–1643: 72–73)
evil **they**
'And if they had done the same to you as they had done to us, they would have died imprisoned, and they have also written a letter that they are guilty and what evil they have commited'

(2) a. **Moașa și vraciul, aceia** pot să mărturisească (Prav.1652: 306)
midwife_DEF and doctor_DEF, those can SUBJ confess
'The midwife and the doctor, they can confess'

b. **Al patrul[a] riu, acela** iaste Evfratis (PO.1582: 2/14)
the fourth river_MASC **that**_MASC is Evfratis
'The fourth river, that is the Euphrates'

c. **Acești boieri, ei** au venit cu carte de la Miclăuș (DÎ.1578: CXI)
these boyars they have come_PPL with letter from Miclăuș
'These boyars came with a letter from Miclăuș'

d. Iară mai apoi **cel fecior curvariu el** o mânca (CD 31/28)
and then **that manwhore he** it eat_IMPERF
'And then, that manwhore used to eat it'

e. Și **feciorii lui Mediam: Ghefar și Afer și Enoh și Avitha și Eldaga**
and sons_DEF of Mediam Ghefar and Afer and Enoh and Avitha and Eldaga
toți aceștea era feciorii Heturii (BB.1688: XXV, 17)
all these were sons_DEF of Hetura
'And Mediam's sons: Ghefar and Afer and Enoh and Avitha and Eldaga, all these were Hetura's sons'

f. **Eu**, Potlogar Toader, **și cu eu**, Burzeu, cu **popa**
I, Potlogar Toader and with **I** Burzeu, with **priest**_DEF
și **tot satul**, (…), **noi** dăm îrai<n>tea Domniilor voastre
and **all the village we** stand before Highness your
(CLRV.1608: 162)
'I, Potlogar Toader, and I Burzeu, and the priest, and all the village, we stand before Your Highness'

g. **Ceia ce   vor   tăia pomii și   mai vârtos   viia**:
    those that   will   cut trees_{DEF} and   especially   vineyard_{DEF}
    aceștia   să   să   cearte ca   nește tălhari
    these   SUBJ   CL.REFL.PAS   punish like   some thieves
                                                                (Prav.1646: p. 62/73)
    'Those who will cut trees and especially vineyards to be punished like thieves'

h. **Cei ce   să vor dovedi** (…), **unii ca aceia**   să   se
    those that   will be proved   some like those   SUBJ   CL.REFL.PAS
    înfrunteze (Prav.1780: 53)
    admonish
    'Those who will be proved (...), someone like those to be admonished'

i. Că   **cela ce-l**   va ținea postul   cum se cade (…),
    because **that that**-CL.ACC   will keep fast_{DEF}   as it should
    mare folos   va   avea **acela**   de la Dumnezeu (CC².1581: 44)
    big benefit will   have **that**   from God
    'Because he who will fast as it should, will have great benefit from God'

j. **Cine va   cinsti fiiul,   acela**   iaste   de cinsteaște și   părintele
    who will   respect son_{DEF},   that   is   that respects also parent_{DEF}
                                                                (CC².1581: 189)
    'He who will pay respect to the son will pay respect to the Father as well'

k. **Care judecătoriu   face dreptate,   acela**   easte   judecătoriu drept la
    which judge   makes justice,   that   is   judge   fair for
    Dumnezeu (Prav.1652:74/10–11, ap. Carabulea 2007: 39)
    God
    'That judge who makes justice, that one is a fair judge before God'

l. **cine au făcut acele cuvinte,   el** nu va   dovădi, că   acel cal
    who has made those words   he not will   prove   that   that horse
    este de la popa   Dumitru (SB 25: 6–7)
    is   from priest_{DEF}   Dumitru
    'he who wrote those words, he will not prove that that horse is from priest
    Dumitru'

m. **Câți   vor îndrăzni să-și   bage   râmători lor,**
    how many   will dare   SUBJ−CL.REFL.DAT   hire   diggers for them
    făr de tocmeală,   unii   ca aceia să   plătească stăpânului
    without haggling   some   like those SUBJ   pay   to the owner
    moșiei   prețul   acela […]. (Prav.1780: 85)
    of the land   price_{DEF} that
    'Those who will dare to hire diggers for them without haggling, those shall pay
    the price to the landlord'

(3) a. **ea   să   margă   aceaea soacră**   se   se   tunză   la
        she SUBJ   go   that   mother-in-law   SUBJ CL.REFL cut.hair   at
        o mănăstire (Prav.1581: 228ʳ)
        a convent
        'And that mother-in-law should go and have her hair cut at a convent/join a
        convent'

    b.   **Acesta cuvânt** nu-i al mieu   **acesta**   **cuvânt,** frate (DVS.1682– 6 : 11^r)
       this   **word** not is mine   **this**   **word**   brother
      'This word, this word is not mine, brother'

(4)   iarră **ea,**   **nunta,**   să se   despartă (Prav.1581: 222^v)
       and **she,**   **the marriage**$_{FEM}$ SUBJ CL.REFL.PAS break off
      'and the marriage to be broken up'

(5)   a.   Iată născu   **Melha și**   **ea**   fii   lui Nahor (BB.1688: 15^a)
          look gave birth **Melha and** **she**   sons   to Nahor
          'Melha too bore sons to Nahor'

    b.   **Pană** să   fi oprit   **și**   **el** (ISN 1728: 111)
          Pană CL.REFL be stopped **and** **he**
          'Pană must have stopped too'

    c.   Au să urmeze numiți   judecători   pravilelor   celor orânduite
          will follow   appointed judges   the laws.DAT   those made
          pentru   plugari,   **care**   **și**   **acestea** (…) s-au
          for   plowghmen   **which** **and**   **these**   CL.RFL.PAS.-have
          tălmăcit   pe limba   rumânească (Prav.1780: 76)
          translated   on language$_{DEF}$ Romanian
          'And there will be appointed judges of the laws made for plowghmen, which
          have also been translated into Romanian'

(6)   a.   Iară aprozi, armășăi   și   lefegii, **carii** **aceștiia**
          and ushers$_{DEF}$, supervisors$_{DEF}$ and   clerks$_{DEF}$ **which** **these**
          slujitori   să   numesc să ia pe jumătate (Prav.1780: 71)
          servants   CL.REFL.PAS   call   SUBJ take on half
          'And the ushers, the supervisors and the clerks, who are called servants, will take
          half'

    b.   într-alt   chip   au născut   Hristos, în mare curăție,
          in another   way   was born   Christ   in great purity
          care Hristos […]   pofteaște,   dzicând (PO.1582: 3)
          which   **Christ** desires, saying
          'And Christ was born in a different way, in great purity, and Christ said…'

    Examples in (1) show subject repetition within a clause (1a) or in several subsequent clauses (1b), where the second subject would be expected to be null (a zero anaphora).

    Examples in (2) are typical cases of what has been called "double subject" constructions, i.e., a sentence appears to have the syntactic subject realized twice by two different coreferential expressions. The first subject is a referential DP realized as coordinated nouns (2a), DPs (2b–d), a DP plus its apposition (2e), a DP based on coordination and lexicalized as personal pronouns (2f), a DP embedding a relative sentence (2g–i), a relative subject clause (2j–m). The second subject is instantiated as an anaphor: either a proximal/distal demonstrative (2a,b,g,i,j,k), possibly quantified (2e), or part of a comparative phrase (2h,m), or a personal pronoun (2c,d,f,l); the subject anaphor copies the gender and number features from its antecedent. The punctuation mark, often present, suggests a pause between the first and the second instantiation of the subject.

The instantiations in (3) appear to be a combination of (1) and (2), slightly altered: in (3a) the order is reversed (first the cataphoric personal pronoun, then the DP, which does not precede the verb but follows it); (3b) is structurally similar with (3a), with the second subject in postposition, but based on a lexical repetition.

The example in (4) is structurally different, as the two subject candidates appear to be in a typical appositive relation.

Examples in (5), structurally different from the previous ones, show a pronominal constituent marked by the clitic adverbial *și* ('too', 'also'), which introduces a presupposition ('not only X but also Y') that implies a comparison between two terms: the pronominal term presuppositionally supplements the referential subject noun whose anaphor it is.

The structures in (6) are both relative clauses, and the two terms interpreted as subjects are the relative pronoun and an anaphoric (6a) or a noun repeated from the previous sentence (6b).

Leaving aside the cases of subject repetition in (1), all the other examples (2)–(6) are structurally different, but they share one feature: they include two coreferential terms, both competing for the subject position in a sentence.

The so-called "double subject" constructions herein exemplified occur in old Romanian documents from the 16th century to the 17th century, both in original texts and in translations (with some preferences for one category or another; some specific uses occur in administrative texts). Some structures have been interpreted as spoken language specific, others as borrowings from the original language (Slavonic) of translations. A decreasing cline is noted in the 18th century texts (Carabulea 2007: 36–39; Stan 2013: 153–158; Dindelegan 2016: 101–103), which actually corresponds to the emergence of register differentiations.

3. A PRAGMADISCURSIVE APPROACH

In what follows, I challenge the grammatical interpretation of the so-called "double subject" constructions. In a discursive approach the phenomenon under scrutiny appears to be the by-product of information packaging. The structures presented above correlate with different topic – comment – focus management strategies. This interpretation is consistent with the discourse configurationality of old Romanian (as presented in **1.**).

The analysis relies on three assumptions: (a) two structures conveying the same semantic meaning can be grammatically synonymous but have different pragmatic meanings (Weil 1844/1887: 29; Meillet 1908: 330; Marouzeau: 1922: 1, to refer to the forefathers of this now widely-accepted view); (b) the unmarked/by-default option is neuter, while the marked option is pragmatically loaded (conveying additional information via presuppositions or conventional implicatures) and feature contextualization cues; (c) in old Romanian, the null subject and zero anaphora were the unmarked options.

One inconvenience for a pragmadiscursive analysis of old Romanian texts is, on the one hand, linguists' lack of access to prosodic patterns and, on the other hand, very incipient punctuation norms, if any, which produced inconsistencies across manuscripts and within the same manuscript. It is probably the lack of prosodic features that led to the hypothesis of "double subjects", by assigning neuter intonation to discourse segments. Once we add prosodic marks (similar to present-day spoken Romanian), the interpretation as "double subject constructions" becomes problematic.

The apparently "double subject" configuration confers discursive prominence to a subject entity via three blended operations: (i) a lexico-syntactic operation, i.e. subject lexicalization (instead of the null subject, which is the unmarked option); (ii) a semantic-syntactic operation that leads to a referential chain of two terms in an antecedent – anaphor relation, one of which (most often the anaphor) is the syntactic subject of the sentence {term 1 (…) term 2}; (iii) placement of a term in an asyntactic position, i.e. the left periphery, the right periphery, or as a parenthetical term (apposition).

3.1. Discontinuous subject: topic confirmation as discourse continuity marker

The example in (1a) shows a disfluency specific to the emergent structure of oral discourse, when the message is almost simultaneously planned and uttered. Orality is a pervasive feature of all writings in old Romanian, when writers' awareness of register differences (oral/written) was low and register appropriateness was not the norm yet in the traditionally oral Romanian culture. The speaker-writer starts the message as planned (*and you set off….*) but quickly abandons it in order to insert the most informationally relevant item (encoded in the time adverbial, which bears the informational focus: *the very moment you read my letter*). After the speaker-writer introduced the most discursively prominent information, the focused constituent, he resumes the initially planned form of delivering the message, by repeating the abandoned discourse chunk, here the subject, in order to confirm the topic: a self-correction of the form in which he delivers the message. The lexically repeated subject is a *discontinuous subject* (*el…el*), the by-product of a verbalization disfluency of cognitive source: the most salient information takes precedence over the syntactic structure of the sentence, a phenomenon favored by the free word order in Romanian, as a discourse configurational language. The discontinuous subject functions as a discourse continuity marker.

3.2. Recurrent subject as affective stance marker

The example in (1b) shows three interrelated marked options: the pronominal lexicalization of the subject (instead of the unmarked option of null subject), the repetition of the pronominal subject in each sentence (instead of zero subject anaphora), and the alternation of the preverbal – postverbal position of the pronominal subject. The subject repetition can be a token of poor writing skills, maybe an unwitty strategy of marking discourse continuity. As soon as we add prosodic markers, we can notice that the *recurrent* pronominal *subject* places the denoted entity in focus and reconfirms the focus position across discourse. In relation to the content of the message, this strategy suggests speaker-writer's affective stance: he conveys strong negative emotions like disapproval, indignation, negative surprise. Hence, the recurrent subject functions as a rhetorical device used to persuade the reader through appeal to pathos, making up for the absence of prosodic markers, in a period when the display of emotions appears to extend freely from oral to written communication. More examples of subject repetition in Corbeanu (2014: 2) seem to confirm this hypothesis.

3.3. Hanging topic

Examples in (2), analyzed in grammars as "double subject" constructions, are typical cases of hanging topics: the leftmost string introduces the topic, while the second part is a

proposition referring to that topic. The topic is an extrasentential element (adjunct-like, syntactically unintegrated), and the syntactic subject of the sentence is an anaphor of the extrasentential element; the hanging topic introduces the reference, while the sentence gives an information about the hanging topic. The syntactic subject of the sentence resumes the topic, thus functioning as a cohesive-coherence device. Between the hanging topic and the sentence there is a pause that signals structural disfluency, marked in written texts most often by a comma as in 2(a–d,f,h–m) or by a colon as in 2(g), sometimes graphically not marked, as in 2(e).

$$[\text{hanging topic}]_i \ \# \ [\text{subject } \overbrace{DP_i \ VP}]$$

These structures contrast with the regular ones, whose form is:

$$[\text{Subject } \overbrace{DP \ VP}] \text{ or } [\text{Null } \overbrace{\text{subject } VP}]$$

Hanging topics give discourse prominence to the syntactic subject, since they make it become a figure against the background of emerging information. The informational and structural complexity of the hanging topic depends on its function: (i) it merely identifies the discourse topic − as in 2(a–c,e,f) or (ii) it identifies and describes the discourse topic − as in 2(d, g–m).

The anaphoric subject is regularly a personal pronoun or a demonstrative. The examples analyzed here[2] indicate that the personal pronoun tends to referentially bind a topic with the semantic features [+human, +entity reading, +endophoric], while the demonstrative pronoun tends to referentially bind a topic with the semantic features [+/-human, +entity reading, +exophoric] or [+human, +generic]. The contrast between proximal/distal demonstrative rather points to psychological distance. Thus, it appears that the main opposition between the 3rd person personal pronoun and the demonstrative as anaphors that semantically bind the hanging topic is [+/- endophoric], i.e., discourse internal (i.e., discursively constructed) or discourse external (i.e., evoked from outside the discourse); generic assertions correlate with demonstratives. The case in 2(f) stands apart: the hanging topics are performative expressions (*I* + proper name), and the binding anaphor is the 1st person inclusive plural pronoun (*we*), which referentially agrees with the cumulative deictic topics.

Hanging topics can be focused (2a) or not (2b-m).

The syntactically and prosodically isolated hanging topic could be interpreted as an underelaborated/elliptical presentative sentence which introduces the discourse topic.

Concluding: the so-called "double subject" constructions under (2) are a topic management device that introduces the discourse topic in a discursively prominent position as hanging topic, followed by a sentence whose anaphoric subject is referentially identified by the hanging topic. The extrasentential, adjunct-like constituent is not syntactically integrated in the sentence, and it is prosodically isolated. The phenomenon is common in discourse configurational languages and occurred both in Latin (known as *nominativus*

---

[2] The examples herein analyzed are taken from Carabulea (*op.cit*.), Stan (*op.cit.*), Dindelegan (*op.cit*) and *Syntax of Old Romanian, Online Annexes*, https://lingv.ro/2021/08/16/the-syntax-of-old-romanian/

pendens), in old Romance (Stark 2022) and in old English (Villa-García 2023). In oral varieties of configurational languages still occurs but it is banned from their written varieties.

3.4. Verum focus operator

The term *verum focus* refers to a phenomenon first described by Höhle (1988, 1992) as the functional effect of an accent intentionally placed by a speaker to emphasize the truth value of his/her proposition. In German, *verum focus* is marked by a pitch accent on the verb/an element relating to the finite verb of a main or of an embedded clause (Lohnstein 2016: 291−313). Other languages resort to other strategies to mark *verum focus*.[3] *Verum focus* is assigned under certain discourse constraints, specifically "the propositions expressed by these clauses need to be 'given' in some way in the discourse situation", as well a prior "controverse discussion (or known disputed positions) of the topic" (Lohnstein 2016: 306). Propositions marked by *verum focus* appear to impose "a strong tendency on the addressee not to behave otherwise than believing the proposition expressed". Hence, *verum focus* is viewed as "a focus on the mood component with the effect that alternatives to the expressed mood function are obliterated in the situation of discourse" (Lohnstein 2016: 307).

These above-mentioned characteristics of *verum focus* coincide with the function of the apparently "double subject" in 3(a,b). Example 3(a) is an excerpt from a code of laws, where the proposition conveys the deontic modal value of obligation. In the absence of a modal verb, the repetition of the pronominal subject *ea* 'she' as the already available noun in discourse *aceaea soacră* in the right periphery of the sentence appears to be a strategy to emphasize the truth value of the sentence, hence a lexical-syntactic strategy to mark *verum focus* in the absence of an overt modal verb. Under this analysis, the subject of the sentence is the pronoun *ea,* while *aceaea soacră* is an appositive adjunct in the right periphery. The repetition of the subject evokes the whole preceding sentence conveying thus emphasis. Example 3(b) is an excerpt from a canonical writing with obvious persuasive function: *verum focus* comes naturally to emphasize the propositional content. The subject *acesta cuvânt* 'this word' is repeated as an adjunct in the right periphery of the sentence. We will call these apparent subjects *verum focus operators*, as a lexical-syntactic strategy of marking *verum focus*.

Concluding: some apparently "double subject" constructions are the outcome of a lexical-syntactic strategy of marking *verum focus* in texts where the persuasive effect is inbuilt in their structure (law and canonical religious texts). This *verum focus* marking strategy consists in the repetition of the syntactic subject of the sentence as an isolated adjunct in the right periphery of the sentence.

3.5. Explicative apposition

The example in (4) is a typical case of explicative apposition, not a double subject: the noun *the marriage* clarifies the referent of the pronoun *el.* The phenomenon is the result of simultaneously speaking and thinking: the speaker-writer delivers the message presenting

---

[3] English, for example, resorts to the auxiliary verb *do*, to a lexical strategy, the adverbial *indeed* or to prosodic accent: John *did* lock the door; John came, *indeed*; John IS coming. A cross-linguistic view on *verum (focus)* operators, in Gutzmann, Hartmann, and Matthewson (2020).

the entity denoted by *el* as salient but he soon makes a self-correction and adds a clarification. This phenomenon that can be called *appositive subject* is specific to orality and in old Romanian texts reflects the fluid boundaries between writing and speaking.

3.6. Additive focal adverbial (*și ea/el/și acestea*)

The examples in (5) show an adverbial use of the colocation *și ea/el/acestea,* which is a focal particle with an additive meaning, similar to the English *also, too*: the entity denoted by the subject is marked as contrastive topic having an antecedent expressed previously in discourse, and triggers the presupposition "not only….. but also, somebody/something else".

The adverbial use of a pronominal collocation as focal particle is not singular in Romanian; the reciprocal marker *unul pe altul* has a pronominal internal structure which reflects the subject and the object in the reciprocal structure but functions as an adverbial adjunct. In the same way *si el, și ea, și aceasta* reflect the gender and number of the subject they refer to, but do not double the subject, instead they are sentential adjuncts that function as presupposition triggers ("like somebody/something else"). The additive adverbial adjunct (with a pronominal internal structure) marks similarity between the host (the noun it refers to: *Melha* in 5a, *Pană* in 5b, *pravilele 'codes of law'* in 5c) and the antecedent (the noun to which it presuppositionally refers). As a focal particle, it shows similarity across discourse and is sensitive to the argumentative property of its host sentence and subject antecedent (as argued by Winterstein 2011): read in the narrative context in which it occurs[4], 5(a) backs the idea of successive generations; 5(b) appears to present an intricate narrative with several characters; 5(c) occurs in a presentative passage from a code of laws, which establishes rules of action.

Along with the adverbial focal particle *și el/ea/și acesta,* another focal particle *și* also occurred in old Romanian:

(7)   pecum va mărturisi **și**   **soră-sa** cea   mai mare
         as   will witness **and** **sister-his** CEA   elder (Iorga SN 1728)

While the host of the adverbial clitic *și* is a noun (*și soră-sa*), the adverbial colocation *și el/și ea/și acesta* is a sentence modifier. The former focalizes the entity denoted by the noun (in (7) the subject), the latter focalizes the event presented in the propositional content (5a-c).

3.7. Relators as apparent subjects

Examples like those in (6) were interpreted to have double subject: the *wh*-word and the DP of the same sentence. Nevertheless, the sentence is closer to coordination than to subordination, and the *wh*-word is not a relative pronoun syntactically integrated in the sentence but functions as a mere sentence linker; it does not connect the sentence to an antecedent in discourse, nor does it embed the sentence in a DP or a VP but simply marks cohesion between adjacent propositions. GR II: 216 distinguishes between

---

[4] It occurs in a passage from the Bible 1688, presenting the successive births of offsprings that populated the Earth.

relatives (rom. *relativizatori*) and relators (rom. *relatori*): the former are overt CPs that head embedded relative clauses, the latter are conjunction-like terms which simply mark discourse continuity, not a syntactic anaphor. Hence, the relator *care* is an *apparent subject*.

Concluding: examples like those in (6) do not show double subject but a relator adjacent to the sentential subject.

3.8. Remnants: focal particle conveying affective stance

The existing descriptions of old Romanian did not present the structures exemplified below in (8), which have been identified only in later stages, and which are used in the oral register of the present-day language.

(8)   a. Vine   **ea**   **mama!**
            comes   **she**   **mother!**
            'Watch out, mother is coming!' [warning]
         b. **Ion**   vine   **el** mai târziu
            Ion   comes   **he** later
            'Don't worry, John will come later' [reassurance]
         c. **Ion** face **el**   ce   face   și   câștigă   mereu [surprise]
            Ion does he what   pro does   and   pro wins always
             'Ion does what he does and he always wins! Amazing'

Type 8(a) appears to have two (most often) adjacent subjects, specifically a 3rd person pronominal cataphoric subject (*ea 'she'*) followed by a nominal subject (*mama 'mother'*); type 8(b) appears to have a proper noun subject (*Ion*) followed by the verb (*vine 'comes'*) and a resumptive 3rd person pronominal anaphoric subject (*el 'he'*). Both structures have a strong prosodic accent on the verb. Type 8(c) appears to have a nominal subject (*Ion*) followed by a verb and a postverbal 3rd person pronominal anaphoric subject (*el 'he'*); the repetition of the verb is on a par with the prosodic accent on the verb in 8(a,b). These structures are used in affective, familiar speech (GR II: 352−353), and seem related to the structures exemplified in (3) for old Romanian.

In a syntactic approach, Cornilescu (1997) analyses the pronoun in these "double subject" constructions as a clitic subject, an expletive devoid of reference. In a pragmatic approach, it appears that the presence of the pronoun distinguishes between speech acts: assertion (without the pronominal element) vs. warning/reassurance/surprise (with the pronominal element). Accordingly, I will interpret the expletive pronominal not as a clitic subject but as an illocutionary force indicating device: a focal particle which focalizes the semantic relation between the verb and the nominal in order to convey a pragmatic meaning: speakers' affective stance.

Concluding this section, I hypothesize that the recurrent subject in old Romanian (example 3a) grammaticalized as a fixed pattern where the pronominal acquired the pragmatic function of focus particle (focalizing the subject – verb semantic relation), thus conveying the affective stance in certain types of speech acts.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The author argues that the so-called "double subject" constructions are not syntactic configurations but orality-driven phenomena with various pragmadiscursive functions. Lack of prosodic markers made these phenomena opaque and led researchers to a syntactic interpretation based on presumed structural relations between adjacent or distant coreferential entities.

In old Romanian, orality phenomena were pervasive in all types of texts, original and translations, as authors were not fully aware of register distinctions, which did not represent the norm in Romanian culture at that time. In a discursive approach, the so-called "double subjects" are proved to be *discontinuous subjects* (**3.1.**), *recurrent subjects* (**3.2.**), *hanging topics* (**3.3.**), *verum focus operators* (**3.4.**), *appositive subjects* (**3.5.**), *additive focal adverbials* (**3.6.**), *apparent subjects* (**3.7.**), and *focal particles* conveying affective stance (**3.8.**), which are all the epiphenomena of simultaneously planning – delivering the message.

Considerable changes did not occur from old Romanian to present-day: all the patterns herein discussed do exist in the present-day spoken language. What has changed is their variationist markedness (oral, familiar, colloquial) and the degree of tolerance of written language for spoken language structures.

SOURCES

A.1620   *Alexandria.* Ed. F. Zgraon, Bucharest: Fundaţia Naţională pentru Ştiinţă şi Artă, 2005 (*Cele mai vechi cărţi populare în literatura română*, 11). (South Transylvania, Braşov or Haţeg)

BB.1688   *Biblia.* Ed.: *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului şi Noului Testament*, tipărită întâia oară la 1688 în timpul lui Şerban Vodă Cantacuzino, Domnul Ţării Româneşti, Bucharest: Editura Institutului Biblic, 1977. (Wallachia, Bucharest)

CC².1581   Coresi, *Evanghelie cu învăţătură.* Ed. S. Puşcariu, Al. Procopovici: Diaconul Coresi, *Carte cu învăţătură (1581)*, vol. I, *Textul*, Bucharest: Socec, 1914. (Braşov)

CD. 1644   Evanghelie învăţătoare tipărită la Mănăstirea Deal (Cazania de la Dealu).

CLRV   Al. Mareş, *Crestomaţia limbii române vechi*, I *(1521−1639),* Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1994.

DÎ   *Documente şi însemnări româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea*, text stabilit şi indice de Gh. Chivu, M. Georgescu, M. Ioniţă, Al. Mareş, Al. Roman-Moraru, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, 1979.

DVS.1682–6 Dosoftei, *Viaţa şi petreacerea svinţilor*, Iaşi. (Moldova)

ISN   N. Iorga, *Scrisori de negustori,* Vălenii de Munte, 1925.

PO.1582   *Palia de la Orăştie.* Ed. V. Pamfil, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1968. (Banat-Hunedoara; Gheţie and Mareş 2001: 99)

Prav.1581   *Pravila ritorului Lucaci.* Ed. I. Rizescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1971, 161–83. (Moldova, Putna Monastery)

Prav.1646   *Carte românească de învăţătură.* Ed.: *Carte românească de învăţătură. 1646*, ed. Colectivul pentru vechiul drept românesc condus de acad. A. Rădulescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1961, 33–106 (*Adunarea izvoarelor vechiului drept românesc scris*, 6). (Moldova, Iaşi)

Prav.1652   Prav.1652   *Îndreptarea legii.* 1652, ed. Colectivul pentru vechiul drept românesc condus de acad. A. Rădulescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1962 (*Adunarea izvoarelor vechiului drept românesc scris,* 7), 33–631. (Wallachia, Târgovişte)

Prav.1780   *Pravilniceasca condică.* 1780, ed. Colectivul pentru vechiul drept românesc condus de acad. A. Rădulescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1957 (*Adunarea izvoarelor vechiului drept românesc scris,* 2), 36–156. (Wallachia, Bucharest)

REFERENCES

Avram, M. (coord.), 2007, *Sintaxa limbii române în secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea,* București, Editura Academiei Române.

Corbeanu, R. C., 2014, "Repetarea și reluarea subiectului în secolul al XVI-lea", *Limba română*, LXIII, 3, 333–356.

Chomsky, N., 1970, "Remarks on nominalization", in R.A. Jacobs, P.S. Rosenbaum (eds), *Reading in English Transformational Grammar*, Waltham, Ginn, 184−221.

Pană Dindelegan, G., M. Maiden (eds), 2016, *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 101−103.

Pană Dindelegan, G., 2016, "Subject doubling", in Pană Dindelegan and Maiden (2016), 101−103.

Féry, C., S. Ishihara (eds), 2016, *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Gutzmann, D., K. Hartmann, L. Matthewson, 2020, "Verum focus is verum, not focus: Cross-linguistic evidence", *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5 (1): 51, https://www.glossa-journal.org/article/id/5299/, [accessed February 2024].

GLR II = V. Guțu Romalo (ed.), 2008, *Gramatica limbii române, volumul II,* București, Editura Academiei Române.

Hale, K., 1982, "Preliminary remarks on configurationality", in *Proceedings of North Eastern Linguistic Society,* GLSA, UMass, Amherst, 86−96. https://ling-phil.mit.edu/papers/hale/papers/hale047.pdf [accessed February 2024]

Halliday, M. A. K., 1967, "Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Part 2", *Journal of Linguistics,* 3, 2, 199–244.

Hill, V., G. Alboiu, 2016, *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Höhle, T. N., 1992, "Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen, in J. Jacobs (ed.), *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, Opladen, Westdeutscher Verlag, 112–141.

Höhle, T., 1988, "Vorwort und Nachwort zu Verum-Fokus", *Sprache und Pragmatik* 5, 1−7.

Kiss, K. É. (ed.), 1995, *Discourse Configurational Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Lohnstein, H., 2016, "Verum focus", in C. Féry, S. Ishihara (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 290–313.

Marouzeau, Jules, 1922, *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine. I. Les groupes nominaux*, Paris, Champion.

Meillet, Antoine, 1908, *Introduction à l'étude comparée des langues indo-européennes*, Paris, Hachette.

Talmy, L., 1978, Figure and ground in complex sentences, in: J. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of human language. Vol. 4. Syntax,* Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 625–649.

Vincent, N., 1988, "Latin", in Martin Harris and Nigel Vincent (eds.), *The Romance Languages*, London, Routledge, 26–78.

Weil, H., [1844] 1887, *The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages Compared with that of the Modern Languages,* Boston, MA: Ginn & Co., 29.

Winterstein, G., 2011, "The meaning of the additive too: presupposition and discourse similarity", in *Logic, Language, and Computation: 8th International Tbilisi Symposium on Logic, Language, and Computation, TbiLLC 2009, Bakuriani, Georgia, September 21–25, 2009. Revised Selected Papers 8*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 322–341.

Densusianu, O., 1938, *Histoire de la langue roumaine*, tome II, Paris, Erneste Leroux.

Carabulea, E., 1965, "Repetarea şi reluarea subiectului în limba română din sec. al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea", in *Omagiu Rosetti*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 103–109.

Li, Ch. N., S. Thompson, 1976, "Subject and topic: a new typology of language", in C.N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, New York, Academic Press, 457–489.

Cornilescu, A., 1997, "The double subject construction in Romanian. Notes on the syntax of the subject", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, XLII, 3−4, 101−147.

Carabulea, E., 2007, "Repetarea şi reluarea subiectului", in Mioara Avram, *Sintaxa limbii române în secolele al XVI-lea – al XVIII-lea*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 33–40.

Ledgeway, A., 2012, "From Latin to Romance: configurationality, functional categories and head-marking", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 110, 3, 422−442, https://www.researchgate.net/ publication/263175140_From_Latin_to_Romance_Configurationality_Functional_Categories_ and_Head-Marking [accessed February 2024].

Stan, C., 2013, *O sintaxă diacronică a limbii române vechi*, Bucureşti, Editura Universităţii Bucureşti.

Latrouite, A., R.D. Van Valin Jr., 2019, "Degrees of discourse configurationality and beyond", in: *Paper presented at the Role and Reference Grammar*, University at Buffalo, The State University of New York. https://ubwp.buffalo.edu/rrg2019/wp-content/uploads/sites/101/2019/09/ Latrouite_VanValin.pdf [accessed February 2024]

Stark, E., 2022, "Hanging topics and frames in the Romance languages: Syntax, discourse, diachrony", in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/display/10.1093/ acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-652 [accessed February 2024]

Villa-García, J., 2023, "Hanging topic left dislocations as extrasentential constituents: toward a paratactic account. Evidence from English and Spanish", *The Linguistic Review*, 40, 2, 265–310.