

Article drop in the diachrony of Romanian*

The 9th International Symposium of Linguistics
Bucharest, May 23-24, 2024

Blanca Croitor & Ion Giurgea

The “Iorgu Iordan - Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics
of the Romanian Academy
ileanablanca@gmail.com; giurgeaion@yahoo.com

1. Article drop in Modern Romanian

- (1) In definite DPs (maximal N-projections), the definite article is not overtly realized iff
- (i) the maximal -projection consists only of D_{+def} and N and
 - (ii) it occurs in the complement position of (most) accusative-taking prepositions
- (2)
- a. Am pus haina pe [scaun(*ul)]
have.1 put coat-the on chair(*the)
‘I put the coat on the chair’ (NOT: ‘on a chair’)
 - b. Am pus haina pe [scaun*(ul) rotund]
have.1 put coat-the on chair(*the) round
‘I put the coat on the round chair’
 - c. Au pus lucruri pe [toate scaune*(le)]
have.3P put things on all chairs-the
‘They put things on all the chairs’

To rule out a bare noun construal, in (2)a-b we used a sg. count N in an episodic context, with no standardized/stereotypical activity reading (as in *dormi pe pat tare* ‘sleep on a hard bed’)

‘Accusative-taking prepositions’: all genuine Ps, at least historically, are ‘accusative-taking’

- Dative-taking: idiomatic uses of Ns (*grație* ‘grace’) or participles (*datorită* ‘due to’ < *datori* ‘to owe, be indebted’, *mulțumită* ‘thanks to’ < *mulțumi* ‘to thank’)

- Genitive taking: functional Ns (e.g. *în fața* ‘in face-the’ = ‘before’) + a few adverbs assimilated to such nouns, containing a final morpheme homophonous with the definite article (*contra* ‘against’, *îndărătul* ‘behind’, *înaintea* ‘before, in front of’), which has ϕ -features (\Rightarrow agreement: *înainte-a me-a* ‘before-the.FS my.FS’ = ‘before me’)

1.1 Exceptions regarding the P:

- among genuine Ps, only *cu* ‘with’ is a clear exception:

- (3) Am vorbit cu studentul/*student
have.1 spoken with student-the/student ‘I spoke with the student’

- *pe* in the collocation *a face pe...* ‘to play, act as, pretend to be...’: probably it takes a small clause (cf. the copular V analysis in traditional grammars, see Manea et al. (2008:353), Dragomirescu et al. (2016:484))

- *de-a* in *a se juca de-a* ‘to play the’: maybe also a small clause

* This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P4-PCE-2021-0042, within PNCDI III.

- *ca* ‘as, than’, *decât* ‘than’ may take (elliptical) clauses (=> they are actually C-elements; they display a prepositional behavior when the remnant of ellipsis is the subject, by assigning Acc to this remnant)

1.2 Exceptions regarding the N:

Nouns with human referents well-established for the speaker and hearer, akin to proper names; they can be familiar but also exophoric (deictic):

- (4) a. E de la bunicu’ / șefu’ / mama. (colloquial)
 is from grand-parent-the boss-the mother-the
 ‘It’s from grandpa’ / the (i.e. our, my, your) boss/ mum’
 b. Lăsați cererea **la colega** (exophoric; speaker’s colleague)
 leave.IMPV.2P application-the to colleague(F)-the
 ‘Leave the application with my colleague.’
- (5) a. A venit tatăl băiatului, încă o așteptăm **pe mamă** /#**mama**
 has come father-the boy-the.GEN still CL.ACC wait.1P DOM mother/mother-the
 ‘The boy’s father has arrived, we’re still waiting for the (his) mother’
 (using *mama* => ‘we’re still waiting for my mother’)
 b. Era altcineva în biroul Mariei, o colegă. Am lăsat
 was.3S somebody-else in office-the Maria.GEN a colleague(F) have.1 left
 cererea **la colegă** /#**colega**.
 application-the to colleague/colleague-the
 ‘There was somebody else in Maria’s office, a colleague. I left the request with the colleague.’
 c. În fiecare birou, răspunderea este la **șef** /#**șefu**.
 in every office responsibility-the is at boss/boss-the
 ‘In every office, the responsibility lies with the boss.’

1.3 Analyses of article drop

- Syntactic (Hill & Mardale 2021, Isac 2018, 2024)

- **Post-syntactic (PF-rule)**: Dobrovie-Sorin (2007), Giurgea (2022, 2024)

- (6) - A DP consisting only of D_{+def} and N^0 receives X^0 -status: $[DP D^0 N^0] \rightarrow [D^0 D^0 N^0]$
 - The [def]-morpheme has a null spell-out inside this complex X^0 when it occurs after Ps

Why?

- Dobrovie-Sorin (2007): P+D+N form a complex head

- Giurgea (2022, 2024): D lacks Case (cf. the use of Ps as case markers, see DOM in (5))

Evidence for the latter view: article drop applies at a distance, in coordination:

- (7) distanța între [[casa noastră] și [spital(*ul)]
 distance-the between house-the our and hospital(*the)
 ‘the distance between our house and the hospital’

2. Diachronic and cross-linguistic data

2.1 General remarks

- The phenomenon of article drop conditioned by P and word-like character of the DP (no modification) is a rare phenomenon: it has been reported for Romanian (including the South-Danubian dialects: Aromanian, Meglenoromanian and Istroromanian), Albanian and Macedonian; these languages have been (or still are) in contact => article drop may have been a unique development, which spread via language contact
- Definite article omission after Ps has also been reported for Rhaeto-Romance varieties (Sursilvan, Ladin), but the rule is not strict in these varieties (Meyer-Lübke 1900: §179). A detailed study on the Ladin dialect of Fodom (Mattiuzzi 2020): article drop is
 - not obligatory
 - restricted to locative Ps
 - restricted to count singular inanimate nouns
 - moreover, it is (lexically) restricted to specific types of nouns: ‘their referent is either
 - a) an object which is prototypically a part of a conventional location (like the table and the stove in a kitchen, the bed and the wardrobe in a bedroom, the door of a room) or
 - b) a place or space which is prototypically part of the landscape, like a salient part or building of a village (e.g. the main square, the church), or a landmark (e.g. the wood, the road, the bridge)’ (Mattiuzzi 2020:100)
 - modification is possible but restricted: the only N-modifiers allowed are argumental PPs
- Albanian: article drop is limited to *locative* accusative-taking Ps + instrumental *me* ‘with’ (not comitative *me*) – see Appendix; presumably the zero-allomorph of [def] reflects a locative case, rather than a case-less form as in Romanian (notice also that Ps in Alb. may also take Nom. and Abl., in which case no article drop occurs, and Alb. does not have prepositional case markers like Ro.)
- Romanian: evidence that article drop is of ‘common Romanian’ (‘Proto-Romanian’) date (it is found in all four historical dialects and in the earliest Romanian texts, in the 16th century)
- Prendergast (2017): article drop entered Albanian and Macedonian from Aromanian; evidence:
 - it has replaced the locative case of Old Albanian, which had a definite ending *-t* even for unmodified Ns
 - Macedonian: it is recent, colloquial, not found in the closely related Bulgarian

With respect to Albanian: more research is needed, but a cursory investigation of Buzuku’s Missal (*Meshari*: the oldest extensive Albanian text, 1555) by and large supports Prendergast’s claims:

- no article drop in locative PPs with concrete inanimate referents, time intervals and events, also with some generic abstract nouns:

- (8) *ëmbë qiell-t* ‘in the sky’, (*me na qitunë*) *jashtë ferë-në* ‘to take us out of hell’, *ënbë mal-t* ‘on the mountain’, *për ditë-t* ‘during the day’, *për natë-t* ‘during the night’, *për-ënbi Izrael-t* ‘upon Israel’, *ëndër gjind-t* ‘in the nations’, *ëndë mjesëditë-t* ‘towards South’, *ëndë pjaca-t* ‘in (the) public squares/markets’, *për-ënbi qiell-t* ‘on the sky’, *dierje ënbë e ëndenjuni-t* ‘until sunset’, *ënbë shkam-t* ‘on the chair’, *ënbë kryq-t* ‘on the cross’, *ënde Azje-t* ‘in Asia’, *për-ënbī dhē-t* ‘on Earth’, *ëm Krisht-në* ‘in Christ’, *me të bame-t* ‘with

the deeds’, *ëndë purgatuor-t* ‘in the purgatory’, *ëndë njegullë-t* ‘in the fog’, *ënbë erdhi-t* ‘on the vineyard’, *ëndë e ëngjallun-it* ‘in resurrection’, *ëndër ulqën-it* ‘amidst the wolves’, *me urtë-t* ‘by wisdom’, *me të ditun-it* ‘by knowledge’, *ënbë e dërejtë-t* ‘in justice’, *ëndë fëdigë-t* ‘in torments’, *ëndë gropë-t* ‘in (the) holes’, *ëndë burgje-t* ‘in (the) prisons’, *ëndaj fqinjë-t* ‘among neighbors’

(THE is mostly in the locative-instrumental case, but it can also be accusative, see *jashtë ferë-në*)

- instances of zero-article in locative PPs (with unmodified Ns): mostly with abstract nouns and other mass nouns, which can be analyzed as bare NPs (see (9)a); also with body-parts (see (9)b), otherwise rare with count Ns (see (9)c):

- (9) a. *ën shjenjëtëni* ‘in holiness’, *ëndë e mirë* ‘in good(ness)’, *ëndë karitat* ‘in charity’, *ëndë e dërejtë* ‘in justice/righteousness’, *ëndë t’erëtë* ‘in darkness’, *ën paq* ‘in peace’, *për gjuk* ‘for judgment’, *për dëshmi* ‘for testimony’, *ëndë urtë* ‘in wisdom’, *ëndë zjarm* ‘in fire’, *për të vërtetë* ‘in truth, truly’
 b. *ëndë mend* ‘in mind’, *ën ballë* ‘on the forehead’, *me zemërë* ‘with the(ir) heart’
 c. *pr’udhë* ‘on the way’, *ëndë burg* ‘in prison’

2.2 South-Danubian Romanian dialects

- Article drop by and large is like in Modern Romanian, but some exceptions have been noticed: Isac (2024:96-99): ex. of anaphoric definites, both with human and inanimate referents, with locative and non-locative readings:

- (10) a. *dusirî tu unî pîdurî, tu unî mardzinî* [...] *cîn-dusirî tu mardzina* (Arom. Pind)
 went.3P to a forest to an edge when went.3P to edge-the
 ‘They went to the edge of a forest. When they got to the edge’
 (Papazizi-Papatheodorou 1996: 288 apud Isac 2024:98)
 b. *acâţară un fur (...) işirâ ta z-eadă cum va lo-aspîndzură pi furlu*
 caught.3P a thief went-out.3P that SBJV-see.3 how will CL.ACC-hang.3 DOM thief-the
 (Arom. Dobrogea, Saramandu 2007:238 apud Isac 2024:98)
 c. *Mes-a nuntru în palaţ, cola flat-av o muşată fêtă (...)* Dupa ce av ucis toţ
 gone-have inside in palace there found-have a beautiful girl after that have killed all
draci din palaţu cela, av mes toţ la fêta şi... (Istrorom.,
 devils-the from palace-the that have gone all at girl-the and Puşcariu 1929:216-217)
 ‘They went into the palace, where they found a beautiful girl. (...) After they killed all
 the devils in that palace, they all went to the girl and...’
 d. *mearseră la murarlu şiu...* (Atanasov 2002: 363)
 went.3P to miller-the and

Looking at the texts: article drop is predominant

- Atanasov (2002): in 7 pages of texts, we only found (10)d
- Papahagi, *Basme*: in the first 38 pages (first 18 fairy tales), only 8 examples of overt Def, all +human and probably belonging to the name-like pattern in 1.2.

Table I: article drop contexts in Papahagi, *Basme*, 1-38

+person		article drop			overt article		
		locative	non-loc.	total	locative	non-loc.	total
	familiar	4		4	-	2	2
	anaphoric	3	2	5	3	3	6
	total	7	2	9	3	5	8
inanimate	particular	94	15	109	-	-	0
	generic, weak	52	2	54	-	-	0
	body-parts	32	2	34	-	-	0
	expressions	15		15	-	-	0
	total	193	19	212	0	0	0

2.3 Daco-Romanian dialects

- no article drop with *pentru* ‘for’ in Maramureş, Bucovina, Sălaj and Năsăud (Vulpe 1984:341, Marin & Marinescu 1984:380):

(11) **păntu zmeura** cobora ursul (Vulpe 1984:341)
 for raspberry-the went-down.IMPF.3S bear-the
 ‘The bear used to come down for the raspberries’

- Marin & Marinescu (1984:380) also notice, for Transylvania (Sibiu), an ex. with *la* ‘to, at’ + human noun, which may be an instance of the name-like pattern in (4): *la doctoru* ‘to the doctor’

2.4 Old Romanian

➤ There are examples where article drop does not occur, and, more seldom, where it does although the N is modified (Nedelcu 2016:430-431, Stan 2013:33, Mica 2022); the exceptions are more frequent in the oldest period (1500-1650) (Mica 2022)

➤ Regarding Ns: the exceptions to article drop are mostly found with nouns referring to persons, in particular those with well-known, clearly identifiable referents (Nedelcu 2016, Pană-Dindelegan 2016:81-82, Mica 2022) – which may involve a ‘contextual recategorization of the noun as a proper name’ (Pană-Dindelegan 2016:82), e.g. *doamna* ‘the lady’, *soltanul* ‘the sultane’, *împăratul* ‘the emperor’, *paşa* ‘the pasha’, *bălaurul* ‘the dragon’ (cf. the Modern Ro. pattern in §1.2)

➤ Regarding Ps: *pentru* ‘for’ is often exempt from article drop (Nedelcu 2016:431)

Mica (2022) counted the ex. of +def and -def with unmodified Ns in a large number of ORo. texts, but without sufficient semantic distinctions:

- no distinction between bare nouns and true definites (→ the larger amount of zero art. in plurals may be due to the inclusion of bare Ns)

- no separate counting of name-like definites which reject article drop even today, e.g. *Domnul* ‘the Lord’, *Fiul* ‘The Son (i.e. Jesus)’, *dracul* ‘the devil’, *Tatăl* ‘the Father (i.e. God)’ => not all the examples of +def for +person +sg. are exceptions to the article drop rule as it is formulated in section 1 (for Modern Romanian)

- no consideration of semantic distinctions within definites

=> we did our own corpus research (on a smaller corpus), see section 4

In any case, Mica’s data confirm the correlation between +person and absence of article drop –

see Table II, where we added the numbers given by Mica for the various prepositions, eliminating *de* ‘of’ and *fără* ‘without’, which often take bare NPs and the elements that do not trigger article drop in Modern Ro. (*cu* ‘with’, *ca* ‘as’, *decât* ‘than’)¹

Table II: def-marking on unmodified Ns in Mica (2022) after Ps other than *de*, *fără*, *cu*, *ca*, *decât*

	personal nouns		count non-personal nouns	
	+def	-def	+def	-def
texts from 1520-1650	206 (41%)	296 (59%)	7 (1.5%)	440 (98.5%)
texts from 1660-1780	396 (29%)	991 (71%)	21 (3%)	661 (97%)

Our corpus research (see section 4 for details):

- The exceptions to article drop mostly concern personal nouns with a name-like interpretation, which in Old Romanian also comprise names of functions (*the king*, *the master*, etc.)
- Regarding Ps, *pentru* ‘for; by’ and *derept* ‘for; because of’ are often exempt from article drop

3. On the origin of article drop

- The phenomenon, which nowadays is essentially morphological, must have resulted from the reanalysis of a semantics-based pattern:
 - For a certain type of definites, the use of the article was variable or not yet established => people misinterpreted the conditions regulating the absence of the article, replacing a semantic conditioning with a formal one (after P + no modification)
 - It is well-known that the emergence of definiteness marking is gradual, the article spreading over time to more and more contexts (see Laury 1997, Lyons 1999, Hawkins 2004, De Mulder & Carlier 2011, Skrzypek 2012, Kraiss 2014, Ortmann 2014, Simonenko forthc.):
- (12) anaphoric and exophoric > contextual (‘pragmatic’) uniqueness > ‘semantic uniqueness’
(+ particular reference) > generics

What are **the relevant features** we have to look for?

(i) **Locative use:** it is significant that the only P that consistently lacks article drop is *cu* ‘with’. This is *the only Romanian preposition that already lacked any spatial meaning in Latin*, i.e. at a stage of the language which predates the emergence of articles

Other Ps with non-spatial uses also have spatial uses or at least etyma with spatial uses:

- *de* ‘of’: - partitive, genitive, comparative, aboutness(‘about’), cause/agent, certain complements
 - spatial: ablative (Source) (nowadays usually with a PP compl.: *de la*, *de pe*, *din*, etc.)
- *despre* - ‘about’
 - spatial (Old Ro.) ‘from, from on (from the surface of)’ < *de+spre* ‘on’ (< Lat. *super*)
- *spre* (< Lat. *super*) > *pre* > *pe* - differential object marker; certain complements
 - spatial: ‘on’, ‘onto’, ‘upon’ (later differentiated into *pe* ‘on’ and *spre* ‘towards’)
- *pre* (< Lat. *per*) > *pe* - (Old Ro.) means (‘by, through’)
 - spatial: perlocative (usually with a PP complement: *prin*, *pe la*, *pe după* etc.)
- *de către* - agent (Modern Ro.)
 - spatial (Old Ro.): ‘from’ (= *de* ‘from’ + *către* ‘towards’ < Lat. *contrā*)

¹ Among non-personal nouns, Mica distinguishes 4 categories: prototypical, collective, mass, and abstract. We considered only the first two categories, because article-less mass and abstract nouns can also represent bare NPs.

- *fără* - ‘without’ (Old Ro.: often + *de*-PP, and also with the meaning ‘besides’)
 - spatial origin: Lat. *forās* ‘outside’
- *prin* - means (‘by’)
 - spatial: ‘through’: < *pre* ‘through’ (< Lat. *per*) + *în* ‘in’ (< Lat. *in*)
- *pentru/prentu/printru* - purpose, reason (‘for’), (Old Ro. also) means (‘by’)
 - spatial: ‘through, in’ (< *pre* ‘through’ + *întru* ‘in, into’ < Lat. *intrō*)
- *întru* - purpose (‘for’) (Old Ro.)
 - spatial: ‘in, into’ (< Lat. *intrō*)
- *d(e)rept* - cause (‘because of’), purpose (‘for’), ‘instead’
 - spatial: ‘before, in front of, towards’ (< part. *derept*, Lat. *dērectus/dīrectus* ‘straight(ened); oriented towards’)

Significantly, besides *cu*, the other Ps which in Old Ro. show a significant number of exceptions to article drop have predominantly non-spatial uses (reason, purpose):

- *pentru* ‘for’ already had predominantly non-spatial uses in Old Ro. (in the variants *prentu*, *printru*) and had even become specialized for non-spatial uses in the variant *pentru* (see Chivu 1991); the spatial use – perlocative + interior: ‘through (the interior of)’ – was subsequently restricted to the form *printru* which has become, in Modern Ro. an allomorph of *prin* before the indefinite article (following the distribution of *în/întru* ‘in’); *pentru* is still exempt from article drop in an area of Northern Romania (see 2.3 above: Maramureș, Bucovina, Năsăud, Sălaj)
- *derept* ‘for, because of’ also had predominantly non-spatial uses since the earliest attestations

Why location?

Some studies have noticed that emerging articles (not yet generalized) tend to be used for important discourse referents (see De Mulder & Carlier 2011 and references therein)

Definite locations are often used to specify a spatio-temporal frame and do not become important discourse referents (e.g. *from the pocket*, *on the wall* etc.). This may have led to a higher frequency of zero-marked definites with locative Ps.

However, this does not account for the second feature that triggers article drop:

(ii) Absence of modification

=> Our hypothesis:

- (13) The definites for which zero-marking after Ps was allowed, at an unattested stage of Ro., were the so-called *weak definites* (in the sense of Carlson & Sussman 2005)

Weak definites are new and have variable references with respect to various operators, being paraphrasable with indefinites (see Carlson and Sussman 2005, Aguilar-Guevara 2014, Schwarz 2014, Krifka & Modarresi 2016, Brocher et al. 2020, Krifka 2021):

- (14) a. He’s reading **the newspaper** every morning= He’s reading a newspaper every morning
 b. They had to go to **the hospital** = They had to go to a hospital (OK different hospitals)

They introduce arguments of stereotypical activities → strong lexical restrictions

- (15) a. He's reading **the book** ≠ He's reading a book
 b. They had to **visit the hospital** ≠ They had to visit a hospital
 c. They had to go to **the hospital** for a footage ≠ They had to go to some hospital....

In spite of the apparent equivalence with indefinites, the definiteness marking is not meaningless. As shown by Schwarz (2014), there is a presupposition that an entity of type N should be available in the described situation:

- (16) [context: a cruise ship on the Atlantic; in the middle of the ocean]
 a. # We have to get you to the hospital somehow!
 b. We have to get you to a hospital somehow! (Schwarz 2014)

=> there is an *iota* operator, but it scopes very low:

- Schwarz (2014): the definite is part of a kind-of-events; the event introduced by the main predicate is an instantiation of this kind

- (17) $[[\text{read the newspaper}]] = \lambda x. \lambda e. [[\text{Ag}]] (\cup_{k_{\text{read-the-newspaper}}})(x)(e) =$
 $\lambda x. \lambda e. \exists e' [e' \leq \iota * \{e' | \text{read}(e')\} \& \exists y [y = \iota(\text{newspaper}(e')) \& \text{Th}(e') = y] \wedge e' \leq s_e]$
 $\& e \leq e' \& \text{Ag}(e) = x]$

- Krifka & Modarresi (2016): the definite is a function of the matrix event => it is bound by VP-level existential closure, like exist. bare nouns; definiteness comes from the fact that for certain events stereotypical participants are defined:

- (18) Mary took John **to the hospital**.
 $[x_1 \ x_2 \mid x_1 = \text{Mary}, x_2 = \text{John}]$
 $\exists [e_3 \ x_4 \mid x_4 = \text{hospital-of}(e_3), \text{take-to}(x_1, x_2, x_4, e_3)]]$

Why weak definites are a likely source for article drop:

(i) The restriction to prototypical activities leads to restricted modification – only kind-level modifiers are allowed (see Aguilar-Guevara 2014)

- (19) a. Ann went to **the hospital** and Joan did too (OK variable reading: weak def.)
 b. Ann went to **the old hospital** and Joan did too (no variable reading)
 c. Ann went to **the psychiatric hospital** and Joan did too (OK variable reading)

(ii) In languages with fully developed articles, absence of THE is still found in certain idiomatic constructions with an interpretation akin to weak definites, in locative PPs:

- (20) a. go to church, go to school, be at school
 b. be in jail
 c. go to bed
 - stereotypical activities:
to church: for the divine service, *to school*: for learning, *in jail*: for serving a sentence
 - no modification (**be in old jail*, **be at music school*)

- (21) en prison ‘in prison’, en classe ‘in class’ (Fr.)
- (22) a. andare in chiesa ‘go to church’ (It.; cf. Meyer-Lübke 1900: §179)
 b. entrare in barca ‘get on the boat’
 c. essere in campagna ‘be in the countryside’
 d. rimanere in sella ‘stay in the saddle’ (= ‘to stay afloat, remain successful or keep doing well’)
 e. (essere) in biblioteca ‘(be) in the library’
 f. (essere) in giardino ‘(be) in the garden’
 g. prendere in bocca ‘take in the mouth’
 h. uscire/partire di/da casa ‘get out of the house, leave home’

(iii) Weak definites usually have inanimate referents

- Aguilar-Guevara (2014) lists the types of nouns that allow a weak definite reading; among them, only the type *profession* has a human denotation, with a few verbs (*call the doctor/plumber, go to the doctor, the plumber came*)

=> possible explanation for the exceptions to article drop found with personal nouns

(iv) Weak definites often occur in locative PPs

- Examples of locative PPs with a weak def. interpretation that can be assumed for the society of Proto-Romanian / Late Balkan Latin:

- (23) a. go to the forest/woods, be in the forest (for work), go to the field, work in the garden, in the vineyard, in the orchard, go (for work) to the vineyard/orchard
 b. take (the heard, the cattle) to the pasture
 c. put/bring... in the wagon (*pune/duce în căruță*)
 d. put (food) on the fire, warm/stay by the fire (*pune pe foc, (se) încălzi/sta la foc*)
 e. put (food) on the table, be/sit at the table (*pune la masă, fi/sta la masă*)
 f. lie on the bed (*sta în pat*), get out of bed (*se scula din pat*)
 g. go to the plowing, be at (the) plowing (*se duce la arat, fi la arat*)
 h. go to church, be in church (*merge/fi la biserică*)
 i. go to the market/fair, buy at the market/fair, bring the cows to the fair (*la târg*)
 j. be on the road/way (*fi pe drum/pe cale*)

=> we reconstruct a Proto-Romanian stage with the contrast

- (24) a. Pune mâncarea **spre focu** / lemne **’n focu**
 puts food-thes on fire woods in fire
 ‘(S)he’s putting/puts the food on the fire /woods on the fire’
 b. Se ul’ță **la focu-lu**
 REFL watches to fire-the
 ‘(S)he’s watching the fire’
- (25) a. Lucrează/Mearge **la viñe**
 works goes to/at vineyard
 ‘He’s working in the vineyard/going to the vineyard’
 b. Mearge **la viñ-a de susu / la viñ-a veacl’e**
 goes to vineyard-the of up to vine-the old

‘He’s going to the upper/old vineyard’

Moreover, there may have been speaker variation, some speakers using DEF for both types.

The frequency of the pattern in (24)a-(25)a led to a reanalysis, *in particular for those speakers who used DEF for both types*:

- Locative Ps => zero DEF
- Modification (see (25)b) => +DEF

An intermediate stage might have looked like the one in Fodom (see 2.1 and Mattiuzzi 2020): zero article only with locative Ps and with nouns indicating prototypical locations or prototypical objects in a location

4. Some Old Romanian data: a corpus research

Texts:

- religious: - *Codicele Voronețean* (1563-1583, with an older lost original)
 - Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și Molitvenic rumânesc* (1567-1568)
- historical: - Mihail Moxa, *Cronica universală* (1620)
 - Grigore Ureche, *Letopiseșul Țării Moldovei* (1642-1647), pp. 57-115
- documents: - *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*
 - DIR XVII A (Moldova), I. 1601-1605
 - DIR XVII A (Moldova), II. 1606-1610
 - DIR XVII A (Moldova), IV. 1616-1620
 - DIR XVII B (Țara Românească), II. 1611-1615

- We extracted all the examples with personal nouns (in article drop contexts)
- For non-personal nouns (which predominantly undergo drop, see Mica’s results in 2.4 above), we only extracted the examples without drop (the exceptions)

Results:

(I) Most nouns without drop belong to the ‘**name-like**’ category – referents well-established for the speaker and hearer or for the speaker’s community:

(a) Nouns conventionally used for referring to divine/supernatural beings: *Tatăl* ‘the Father’, *Fiul* ‘the Son’, *Domnul* ‘the Lord’, *Părintele* ‘the Father’, *dracul* ‘the devil’, *Precista*, *preacurata* ‘the perfectly pure, immaculate(FEM)’ (= Virgin Mary), *spășitorul* ‘the Savior’

(b) Kinship terms, referring to the speaker’s relatives: *părintele* ‘the father’

(c) Names of (political, administrative, military, ecclesiastic) functions: *împăratul* ‘the emperor’: (45 ex.), *domnul* ‘the king’ (the title of the sovereigns of the Romanian states) (4 ex.), *craiu* ‘the king’ (used for the sovereigns of Catholic states) (7 ex.), *papa* ‘the pope’ (1 ex.), *vornicul* ‘a sort of minister’ (1 ex.), *gărdinariul* ‘the cardinal’ (2 ex.), *pârcălabul* ‘the prefect/mayor’ (1 ex.), *părintele* ‘the priest’ (2 ex.), *giupânul* ‘gentleman, master’ (1 ex.), *împărăteasa* ‘the empress’ (1 ex.), *miiășul* ‘the commander (of a thousand men)’, (2 ex.), *vătașul* ‘the captain/overseer’ (1 ex.)

- only in the singular
- no variable reference (only 1 exception in the corpus)
- no generic reference

- we do not include here referents new/unfamiliar for the hearer: indirect anaphora (ex. ‘some man X ... *the children...*’), anaphora with an indefinite antecedent

- (26) ce se cade a fi și a se ști **între domni** și între țer[i]
 what REFL ought.3S to be and to REFL know among lords and among countries
 ‘What ought to be and to be known among lords and among countries’
 (DIR XVII, B. II,12 [1611])

Types (a) and (b) have remained exempt from article drop to this day

For type (c), now we have article drop, except for some familiar uses (*șefu* ‘the boss’):

- (27) a. și-l duse legat la împăratul (Moxa, C. 152)
 and-him brought.3 bound.MS to emperor-the
 b. și-l duse legat la împărat(*ul) (Modern Ro.)
 and-him brought.3 bound.MS to emperor(*-the)
 ‘and he brought him bound to the emperor’

(II) Regarding Ps, *pentru* and *derept* ‘for’ show many exceptions, although they can also occur with article drop; the exceptions are particularly common with abstract nouns

(III) In some instances when the article occurs on an adjectival/participial base, the presence of the article might be explained by a structure with a null N, in which case this would not constitute an exception (cf. Modern Ro. *la ultimul* ‘at last-the’, with N-ellipsis)

- (28) n-ară putea bate așa **pre nevinovatul** (Coresi, T. Ev. - Molitv. 29^v)
 not-would.3S can beat so DOM innocent-the
 ‘He couldn’t beat like that the innocent (person).’

Table III: article drop of personal nouns in our corpus

Personal nouns, +def (no article drop)			
names for divine/supernatural beings	54	Total name-like: 124	Total: 136
kinship terms anchored to the speaker	2		
names of functions, familiar sg. referents	68		
with <i>derept</i> and <i>pentru</i> ‘for’	5		
with adjectival/participial bases	7		
others:			
- unique/max. in a restricted situation, based on specific shared knowledge	3		Total: 10
- unique/max. in a restricted situation, based on general shared knowledge	1		
-anaphoric	2		
- indirect anaphor	1		
- generic	3		
Total no article drop:	146 (25%)		
Personal nouns, -def (article drop)	434 (75%)		

An analysis of nouns with article drop confirms that for all semantic types of definites which do not belong to the name-like type, article drop is predominant:

‘Investment in education is sacrosanct’

- e. Kadare shkroi një novel të famshme **për Gjirokastrën**
Kadare wrote a novel AGR famous about Gjirokastrë-the
‘Kadare wrote a famous novel about Gjirokastra.’
- f. Autobuset **për Gjirokastrën** niset për një orë. (goal)
bus-the for Gjirokastrë leaves in an hour
‘The bus for Gjirokastra leaves in an hour.’

- (30) a. shpënzimet **për shkollë*(n)** (Dalina Kallulli, Renata Topciu, p.c.)
expenses-the for school-the
- b. i procesit të mësimit **në shkollë*(n)** (Dalina Kallulli’s judgment)
AGR process-the.OBL AGR education-the.OBL in school(the) on an attested ex. without
‘of the process of education in school’ drop)

- Vătăşescu (1989), Bujar Rushiti (p.c.): article drop is obligatory with locative Ps (*në* ‘in’, *mbi* ‘on’, *nën* ‘under’, *ndër* ‘among’, *nëpër* ‘through’, *përmbi* ‘above’)

- (31) a. varej **mbi tryezë** (pure locative) (Vătăşescu 1989:350-351)
hang.IMPF.3S over table ‘It was hanging over the table’
- b. u hodhën **mbi armikun** (PP complement with an adversity meaning)
REFL threw.3P on enemy-the
‘They jumped on the enemy’

- Vătăşescu (1989): *për* ‘about, regarding; for’ normally lacks article drop; zero-article only with abstract Ns, e.g.

- (32) lufton **për paqe**; dalëmë **për gjah**
fights for peace went-out.1P for hunt
: these may be analyzed as bare NPs

=> presumably the zero-allomorph of [def] reflects a locative case, rather than a case-less form as in Romanian; notice also that Ps in Alb. may also take Nom. and Abl., in which case no article drop occurs, and Alb. does not have prepositional case markers like Ro.

This case is extended to instrumental ‘with’, but not to comitative ‘with’ (and the related complements) – ex. from Vătăşescu (1989:354-355):

- (33) degjojmë **me veshë*(t)**
hear.1P with ears(*the)
‘We hear with the(our) ears’
- (34) a. sillet mirë **me shokët** b. luftoj **me pengesat**
behaves well with friends-the struggle.1S with obstacles-the
‘(S)he behaves well with his/her friends.’ ‘I’m struggling with the obstacles’

Corpus

- Cod. vor. = *Codicele voronețean* [1563-1583]. Ediție îngrijită de Mariana Costinescu. București, Editura Minerva, 1981.
- Coresi, T. Ev. – Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și Molitvenic rumânesc* [1567-1568]. Ediție critică de Vladimir Drimba. București, Editura Academiei Române, 1998.
- DIR = Mihail Roller (redactor responsabil), *Documente privind istoria României în secolele XIII-XVII*. București, Editura Academiei.
- Doc. Î. = *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. Ediție îngrijită de Gheorghe Chivu, Magdalena Georgescu, Magdalena Ioniță, Alexandru Mareș și Alexandra Roman-Moraru. București, Editura Academiei Române, 1979.
- Moxa, C. = Mihail Moxa, *Cronica universală* [1620]. Ediție îngrijită de G. Mihăilă. București, Editura Minerva, 1989.
- Ureche, L. = Grigore Ureche, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei* [1642-1647]. Ediție îngrijită de P. P. Panaitescu. Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, București, 1955.

References

- Aguilar-Guevara, Ana. 2014. *Weak definites: Semantics, lexicon and pragmatics*. PhD diss., Utrecht University.
- Brocher, Andreas, Frederike Weeber, Jet Hoek, and Klaus von Heusinger. 2020. Referent Management in Discourse: The Accessibility of Weak Definites. *CogSci*. 2829-2835.
- Carlson, Gregory & Rachel Sussman. 2005. Seemingly indefinite definites. In Stephan Kepser & Marga Reis (eds.), *Linguistic Evidence*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 26-30.
- Chivu, Gheorghe. 1991. Prepozițiile pentru și printru în secolul al XVI-lea'. *Limba Română* 40, 45-47.
- Demiraj, Shaban. 1986. *Gramatikë historike e gjuhës shqipe*. Tirana: Shtëpia botuese “8 Nëntori”.
- Dragomirescu, Adina, Isabela Nedelcu, Alexandru Nicolae, Gabriela Pană- Dindelegan, Marina Rădulescu Sala & Rodica Zafiu. 2016. *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, 2nd edition. Bucharest: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 2007. Article-drop in Romanian and extended heads. In G. Alboiu, A. A. Avram, L. Avram, and D. Isac (eds.), *Pitar Moș: A Building with a View. Papers in Honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 99–106. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Giurgea, Ion. 2022. 11. Definite article drop after prepositions in Romanian, a reassessment. In Gabriela Alboiu, Daniela Isac, Alexandru Nicolae, Mihaela Tănase-Dogaru, Alina Tigău (eds.), *A Life in Linguistics: A Festschrift for Alexandra Cornilescu on her 75th birthday*, 309-330. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București
- Giurgea, Ion. 2024. Article Drop and Case Marking in Romanian. *Isogloss* 10(2)/3, 1-23.
- Hawkins, John A. 2004. *Efficiency and complexity in grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, Virginia & Alexandru Mardale. 2021. *The Diachrony of Differential Object Marking in Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Isac, Daniela. 2018. The Typology of Determiners in Romance: the Role of Modification. Paper presented at 48th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL 48), April 25-28.
- Isac, Daniela. 2024. *Definiteness in Balkan Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kraiss, Andrew. 2014. The Evolution of the Definite Article in Old High German. *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 26 (2): 127-155.
- Krifka, Manfred & Fereshteh Modarresi, 2016, Number neutrality and anaphoric update of pseudo-incorporated nominals in Persian (and weak definites in English), *Proceedings of SALT 26*, 874–891.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2021. Weak definites and their anaphoric potential. Paper presented at the Zürich Center of Linguistics: <https://www.linguistik.uzh.ch/en/forschung/idaroe/Unterseite.html>
- Laury, Ritva. 1997. *Definiteness in interaction. The emergence of a definite article in Finnish*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manea, Dana, Gabriela Pană-Dindelegan, Rodica Zafiu. 2008. Verbul. In: Valeria Guțu-Romalo (ed.), *Gramatica Limbii Române. I: Cuvântul*, 323–584. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
- Marin, M. & B. Marinescu. 1984. Graiurile din Transilvania. In Valeriu Rusu (ed.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*. Craiova, Scrisul românesc, 320-353.
- Mattiuzzi, Tommaso. 2020. Spelling out a covert D: ‘slim’ DPs and article-drop in Fodom locative PPs. MA thesis, University of Padua.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. 1900. *Grammaire des langues romanes*. Trad. fr. par A. Doutrepoint et G. Doutrepoint. III: Syntaxe. Paris, H. Welter.
- Mica, 2022/forthc. *Fixarea constrângerii de nearticulare a substantivului după prepoziții în limba română*. PhD dissertation, University of Bucharest, 2022, to appear at Editura Universității din București.
- De Mulder, Walter & Anne Carlier. 2011. Definite Articles. In Heine Bernd & Narrog Heiko (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nedelcu, Isabela. 2016. Prepositions and Prepositional Phrases. In Gabriela Pană-Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 424-443.
- Ortmann, Albert. 2014. Definite article asymmetries and concept types: Semantic and pragmatic uniqueness. In Thomas Gamerschlag, Doris Gerland, Rainer Osswald & Wiebke Petersen (eds.), *Frames and concept types: Applications in linguistics and philosophy*. Berlin: Springer, 293-321.
- Pană-Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2016. Gramatica *animatului* în limba română – cu raportare la limba veche. *Limba română* 65(1), 74–91.
- Prendergast, Eric Heath. 2017. *The Origin and Spread of Locative Determiner Omission in the Balkan Linguistic Area*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2014. How weak and how definite are weak indefinites?. In Ana Aguilar-Guevara, Bert Le Bruyn & Joost Zwarts (eds.), *Weak Referentiality*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 213–235.
- Simonenko, Alexandra. forthc. Changing Patterns of Deixis in the Nominal Domain. To appear in *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Diachronic Linguistics*.
- Skrzypek, D. 2012. *Grammaticalization of (in)definiteness in Swedish*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.
- Stan, Camelia. 2013. *O sintaxă diacronică a limbii române vechi*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.

- Vătășescu, Cătălina. 1989. L'emploi de l'article dans le syntagme préposition+nom dans les langues roumaine et albanaise. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung (ZPSK)*, 42(3), 349-356.
- Vulpe, Magdalena. 1984. Subdialectul maramureșean. In Valeriu Rusu (ed.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*. Craiova, Scrisul românesc. 354-389.