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The present paper focuses on the lower part of the Romanian Determiner Phrase. It looks at three main aspects having to do with the functional architecture of the lower DP: syntactic number and its relation with classifiers, partitivity and pseudopartitivity, and bare plural and singular countable nouns. Sections 1 and 2 look at the category of number and the relations it entertains with classifiers in Romanian. Section 3 shows that the pseudopartitive preposition ‘de’ is a genitive case-assigner. Section 4 lists the features of Romanian pseudopartitives and shows that they are single extended projections with one semi-lexical and one lexical head. Section 5 discusses the syntax of Romanian cardinal-noun constructions and shows that they are modeled on the pattern of pseudopartitive constructions. Section 6 takes a cursory look at Romanian bare nouns and shows that bare singular count nouns are legitimized in argument positions by N-to-Num movement. Section 7 presents the conclusions.

1. NUMBER AND CLASSIFIERS

Following Ritter (1992), Deprez (2004), Borer (2005) a.o., the paper starts from the assumption that Romanian Noun Phrases project a Number Phrase; the NumP is the locus of grammatical information, which we take, following Borer (2005), to be [divisibility].

All nouns in all languages are mass and before being able to enter the countable system, they need to be portioned out, divided. This is fulfilled by classifiers in classifier languages and by plural markers in Romanian:

(1) a. san ge ren (Chinese, Cheng and Sybesma (1999))
    three cl person
    ‘three persons’

b. trei persoane (Romanian)
    three persons

With respect to the relation between number morphology and classifier morphology, although the mainstream assumption is that they are in complementary distribution (see, for instance, Chierchia (1998), Borer (2005) a.o.), based on facts such as those in (i) and (ii), that languages with morphological means of marking the plural also feature classifier morphology:
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(i) sensitivity of classifier choice and determiner choice to the semantics of the noun, i.e. to the lexical marking of the noun as count or mass.

(ii) co-occurrence of classifiers and number morphology.

(2)  * două boabe de grâu  (Romanian)
      ‘two grains of wheat’

The Number head in Romanian checks an interpretable feature – divisibility (DIV). The feature DIV in the Num head is matched and checked by the same feature on the noun stem. The plural suffix or the independent classifier can both realise the DIV variable, and the plural marker is a spell-out of an abstract head-feature <div> on an N-stem, the only difference from classifiers being that it is a bound morpheme (see Borer (2005)).

(3) \[
D' \\
D^0 \quad \text{NumP} \\
\quad \text{Num'} \\
\quad \text{Num}^0 \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \quad [+\text{DIV}] \quad [+\text{DIV}] \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{băiat} \quad \text{băieți} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{boy} \quad \text{boys}
\]

NumP can be the complement of a quantifier or quantity phrase (QP), whose role is to count the portions identified by NumP. The absence of NumP from a structure gives rise to a mass interpretation, while the absence of QP will equate plural and bare mass nouns.

(4) \[
\text{QP} \quad \text{Countable configuration – projection of NumP} \\
\quad \triangle \quad \text{trei} \quad \text{Q'} \\
\quad \quad \triangle \quad \text{Q}^0 \quad \text{NumP} \\
\quad \quad \quad [+\text{quant}] \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{Num'} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{Num}^0 \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad [+\text{DIV}] \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \triangle \quad \text{băieți}
\]
Uncountable configuration – absence of NumP

D’
  \( D^0 \)
    \( QP \)
        \( QP \)
            \( \triangle \) mult
            \( Q^0 \)
                \( \triangle \) much
                \( NP \)
                    \( \triangle \) lapte
                    \( \triangle \) milk

2. CLASSIFIERS IN ROMANIAN

The main claim of this section is that the first nominal in binominal pseudo-partitive constructions (aka amount quantifiers or measure phrases) are classifiers, sitting in the head of a Classifier Phrase. This first nominal will be referred to as N1, while the second nominal in a pseudo-partitive structure will be referred to as N2. Pseudopartitives are extended projections with one semi-lexical head – the classifier – and one lexical head – the lexical noun.

2.1. On pseudopartitives

In Romanian, the ‘part-of’ relation is expressed by means of the prepositions ‘dintre’ (from among), ‘din’ (from) and ‘de’ (of). These different prepositions c-select NPs with different syntactic properties. ‘Dintre’ c-selects definite plural NPs, while ‘de’ c-selects mass nouns or bare plurals.

Expressions conveying the ‘part-of’ relation can be classified as (see Tănase-Dogaru (2009), (2012)):
(i) partitive expressions:
   a. ‘dintre’ partitives:

(6) * o parte dintre studenti
     a part from-among students
     ‘a part of the students’

(7) * unul dintre studentii lui
     one from-among students-the his
     ‘one of his students’

   b. ‘din’ partitives

(8) * parte din vin
     a part from wine
     ‘a part of the wine’
(9) * o sticlă din vinul acela
   a bottle from wine-the that
   ‘a bottle of that wine’

(ii) pseudo-partitive expressions:

(10) * o bucată de pâine
     a piece of bread.

With partitive constructions, N2 denotes a definite or delimited domain, while with pseudo-partitive constructions, N2 refers to an indefinite or unrestricted domain. ‘dintre’ partitives always select a definite plural DP, while ‘din’ partitives select both definite plural DPs (o parte din studenţi / a part of students) and mass nouns (o parte din apă / a part of water).

2.2. ‘de’ as a (pseudo)partitive preposition

Romanian lacks the partitive construction, in the sense that Romanian does not use the preposition *de* for standard partitives, while Italian and French do.

(11) a. J’ai vu deux de ces garçons. (French)
     ‘I’ve seen two of these boys’

     b. Ho visto due di questi ragazzi. (Italian)
     (I) have seen two of these boys
     ‘I’ve seen two of these boys’

     c. Am văzut doi dintre / *de aceştia băieți.
     (I) have seen two among / *of these boys
     ‘I’ve seen two of these boys’.

‘De’ is the oldest partitive preposition in Romanian. Partitive *de* is attested in old Romanian before partitive *din* is formed out of *de* (of) and *in* (in):

(12) a. ura de sămbete¹
     one of Saturdays

     b. carele de noi
     which-the of us
     ‘which of us’

     c. numai o parte de nemţi supuşi n-au fost²
     only a part of Germans obedient not-have been
     ‘only a part of the Germans were not obedient’.

Gradually, partitive *din* replaced partitive *de*:

(13) * Aici vede omul adesea dealuri, din care unele sunt cu păduri.³
     Here sees man-the often hills, from which some-the are with forests.
     ‘Here you can often see hills, some of which are full of forests.’

---

¹ See Dicţionarul limbii române 1913, quoted in GALR 2005.
² See Dicţionarul enciclopedic ilustrat, 1926-1931, quoted in Hristea 1984.
In Tănase-Dogaru (2008), (2009), (2012), it is argued that N1s in Romanian pseudopartitive constructions perform the same function as classifiers in classifier languages.

The vast part of the literature claims that, from the point of view of expressing grammatical number, languages fall into two categories (i) classifier languages, i.e. languages with a classifier morpheme ranging over the noun and (ii) languages with plural morphology (see Borer (2005)).

Classifiers are ‘grammatical means for the linguistic categorization of nouns and nominals’ (Aikhenvald (2000:1)). They come in different guises, ranging from purely functional to lexical. Aikhenvald (2000) distinguishes between different types of classifiers, such as: gender systems, noun classifiers, numeral classifiers, possessed/possessor classifiers, verbal classifiers, locative and deictic classifiers.

The following section will argue for a new parameterization of languages according to the way they express grammatical number: classifier languages and plural-classifier languages. The latter category refers to languages where plural morphology and classifier morphology co-exist.

3. PARTITIVE ‘DE’ AND GENITIVE ‘DE’ IN ROMANIAN

The aim of the present section is to discuss the relation between examples such as (14a) and (14b), where (14a) represents a Romanian prepositional genitive and (14b) is an instance of a pseudopartitive construction. Both constructions in Romanian use the preposition ‘de’.

(14) a. pierderea de vieți omenești
    loss-the of lives human
    ‘the loss of human lives’

b. două sticle de vin
    two bottles of wine

3.1. The Genitive and the (pseudo)partitive – the history of de

As stated in section 2.2, partitive de is attested in old Romanian before partitive din is formed out of de (of) and în (in):

(15) * parte de țară și raiul și blagosloviia mea
    part of kingdom-the my and heaven-the and benediction-the my
    ‘a part of my kingdom and heaven and benediction’

In Latin, the partitive is a value of the genitive case as in (16); the inflectional partitive has been gradually replaced by prepositional means of indicating the part-of relation. One can refer to a surviving partitive value in French as in (17), where du is a partitive article. In Romanian, the plural indefinite article can have a partitive value as in (18):

(16) * parum frumenti
    little wheat-gen
    ‘very little wheat’

boire du lait
‘drink part. milk’

mănânc nişte pâine
(I) eat some bread
‘I’m eating some bread’

In Latin, the structure corresponding to present-day Romanian pseudopartitives consisted of a Nom.N1+GenN2 sequence:

a. cadus vini
   jar wine-Gen
   ‘jar of wine’

b. mica panis
   crumb bread-Gen
   ‘crumb of bread’

In Romanian, there are three types of genitives: AL-genitives, bare genitives and DE-genitives. If the genitive DP is a bare NP, the assigner is the preposition de as in (20) (see Cornilescu (2004)):

* acordarea de burse studenţilor
  giving-the of scholarships students-the-Gen
  ‘The assignment of scholarships to the students’

Romanian disposes of an inflectional genitive, while in other Romance languages the genitive is prepositional, marked by de ‘of’ (see Grosu (1988), Dobrovie-Sorin (1987) a.o.). While Romanian developed an inflectional genitive, the prepositional genitive, based on the same preposition de as in all Romance, became very limited and specialized (see Cornilescu (2004) for details). Romanian has developed a morphological distinction between ‘anchoring genitives’, always DPs, and ‘non-anchoring (Prepositional) genitives’, always bare NPs (in the sense of Koptjevskaya-Tamm (2005)).

The inflectional genitive and the de genitive show different morpho-syntactic and semantic properties (see Cornilescu (2010)):

a. citirea cât mai des a autorilor clasici
   reading.the more frequently of classical authors

b. citirea frecventă de romane poliţiste
   reading.the frequent of crime fiction

* Anchoring Gens
  Non-anchoring Gens

a. inflectional
b. DP
   a. prepositional
   b. NP
   c. referential, < e>-type denotation
   c. <e, t> denotation

Therefore, Romanian has developed a reliable syntax-semantics correlation in the domain of the Gen, by developing an inflectional Gen system alongside of the prepositional de one. The
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Morphosyntactic specialization of the genitive in Romanian led to the disappearance of partitive *de* in constructions like *unul de noi* /‘one of us’.

Concerning the question of why Romanian lost the construction, while all other Romance kept it, we will adopt the claim in Cornilescu (2006), according to which Romanian lost partitive *de* as a by-product of the specialization of genitive *de*. As a result of this analysis, genitive *de* only selects NPs interpreted as properties. *de* is replaced in proper partitives because the complement of *de* must be specific/definite and interpreted as individual, which was rendered impossible as a result of the specialization of the genitive.

4. Characteristic features of Romanian pseudopartitives

The aim of this section is to investigate the syntactic and semantic behavior of Romanian pseudopartitives. Starting from van Riemsdijk (1998), (2005), Vos (1999) and Tănase-Dogaru (2009), the section will look at agreement patterns, and selection and modification phenomena with the aim of showing that Romanian pseudopartitives are extended double-headed projections.

4.1. Agreement phenomena

The verb selects either N1 or N2, as shown by the fact that it can agree in number with either of them:

(23) a. Un număr de studenți mă așteptau pe hol.
    A number.SG of students.PL me were expecting on hallway.

   b. Un număr mare de studenți a venit.
    A number.SG great of students.PL has come.

This kind of variation is expected if we assume that pseudopartitives constitute a unitary phrase involving two nominal constituents. To put it simply, we would expect N1 in pseudopartitive constructions to trigger agreement when N1 has semi-lexical status; on the other hand, N2 is expected to trigger agreement when N1 has functional status.

(24) a. Un vârf de sare e suficient.
    A peak.MASC of salt.FEM is sufficient.MASC

   b. Un pic de sare e suficientă.
    A little.MASC of salt.FEM is sufficient.FEM.

In (24a), the noun ‘vârf/peak’ triggers agreement on the adjective and is thus assigned semi-lexical status, while in (24b), the noun ‘sare/salt’ triggers agreement on the adjective, which is a clue to the functional or ‘pure degree’ status of ‘pic / a little’ (see also Doetjes and Rooryck (2003)).

4.2. Selection phenomena

Selection is between the predicate and either N1 or N2. In (25) the verb ‘turn over’ may select either the object ‘tray’ or the second noun – ‘pastries’, resulting in two interpretations, one in which the tray gets turned over and the other in which the pastries get turned over:
They have overturned a tray of pastries.

They have overturned a tray with pastries.

N1 can have either a quantificational or a referential interpretation. In the former case, it indicates a certain amount or quantity while in the latter case it refers to an actual object, one that is present in the universe of discourse. The fact that N1 can be a discourse referent can be made clear by means of pronominal reference (see 26).

When the verb imposes strong selectional restrictions on N1, like a ține ‘to hold’, N1 has a referential interpretation and it refers to an actual object in the discourse domain (26a). The construction contains two referential expressions: sticlă ‘bottle’ and lapte ‘milk’, which can be referred to by means of the pronouns ea for the feminine sticlă (26b) and el for the masculine substance noun lapte (26c):

(26)  

a. Ion ține o sticlă de lapte,  
   Ion holds a bottle of milk.

b. (Ea) e spartă.FEM  
   it is broken.

c. (El) e acru.MASC  
   it is sour.

When N1 has a purely quantificational interpretation (27a) – in other words, when it functions as a classifier – we can only refer back to the substance noun lapte (27b), since the classifier does not refer to an actual object that is present in the universe of discourse:

(27)  

a. Ion a băut o sticlă de lapte,  
   Ion drank a bottle of milk.

b. * (Ea) e spartă. FEM  
   it is broken.

c. (El) e acru. MASC  
   it is sour

4.3. Modification and extraction phenomena

N1 is semantically ‘bleached’, and is thus transparent to modification:

(28)  

a. un pahar rece de bere  
   a glass cool of beer

b. o sticlă minunată de șampanie  
   a bottle wonderful of champagne

c. un stol grăbit de școlărițe  
   a bevy hurried of schoolgirls

The adjectives modifying the first noun obviously refer semantically to the second noun. The fact the pseudo-partitive as a whole can be modified by attributive modifiers that rather belong to N2 than N1 suggests the fact that the semantic head of the construction is N2. Modification facts point to N2 as the lexical head of the extended nominal projection (which can
be modified by attributive modifiers) and to \(N_1\) as the functional / semi-lexical head of the same projection, which is transparent to modification.

### 4.4. The syntactic structure of Romanian pseudopartitives

All the facts presented in the preceding sections point to an analysis of pseudopartitive constructions in Romanian as involving a single extended projection (apud van Riemsdijk (1998)). The classifier phrase is headed by a semi-lexical or ‘quasi-functional’ item such as *sticlă (de vin)* / bottle of wine or *ceașcă (de ceai)* / cup of tea. The role of ‘de’ is to assign case to \(N_2\), i.e. the complement of \(N_1\).

\[
(29) \quad \ast \quad [\text{CardP} \ o \ [\text{ClasP} \ sticlă \ [\text{FP} \ de \ [\text{NP} \ vin]]]]
\]

\[
[\text{CardP} \ \text{a} \ [\text{ClasP} \ \text{bottle} \ [\text{FP} \ of \ [\text{NP} \ \text{wine}]]]]
\]

\[
\text{CardP} \\
\quad \quad \text{o Card’} \\
\quad \quad \text{Card’} \quad \text{ClasP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{Clas’} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{sticlă} \quad \text{Clas’} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{PP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{P’} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{P’} \quad \text{NP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{de} \quad \text{vin}
\]

### 4.5. Silent Classifiers

When there is no classifier inflection, silent nouns occupy the head of the Classifier Phrase in Romanian (building on Kayne’s (2003) analysis of degree quantifiers in English as adjectives that always select a silent NUMBER / AMOUNT noun).

Nouns in ‘plural-classifier’ languages can be conceived of as projecting a NumP – which is responsible for divisibility – and a ClasP – which is responsible for identifying the portions divided by NumP, before they interact with numerals.
One syntactic environment in Romanian which clearly contains a silent noun NUMBER is represented by ‘what-of’ exclamative constructions (see Tănase-Dogaru (2009)):

\[(32)\]
\[
\text{a. Ce case au unii!}
\] What houses have some (people)  
Some have such big/beautiful houses!

\[
\text{b. Ce de case au unii!}
\] What of houses have some (people)  
Some have so many houses!

(32a) can only be an exclamation about some salient property of houses, for example their being large or beautiful; (32b) exclaims about the relatively large number of the houses in question. Romanian differs from languages like English or Dutch, where what-exclamatives are consistently ambiguous between an interpretation where the number of elements is involved and an interpretation some other ‘relatively excessive property’ (van Riemsdijk (2005) is marveled at:

\[(33)\]
\[
\text{a. Wat heft die auto een deuken! (van Riemsdijk (2005))}
\] What has that car a dents

\[
\text{b. What dents that car has!}
\]

(33) may be uttered to exclaim either about the relatively large number of car dents or about the type of dents, i.e. their large size or their deformation. In contrast, in the case of Romanian what-exclamatives what seems to make the difference is the element ‘de / of’.

Where mass nouns are involved, ‘de’ signals the silent noun AMOUNT:

\[(34)\]
\[
\text{a. Ce de vin a băut! = ce AMOUNT de vin a băut}
\] What of wine he drank = what AMOUNT of wine he drank  
‘What an amount of wine did the guy drink!’

\[
\text{b. Ce vin au avut la petrecere! = ce KIND vin au avut la petrecere (good, etc)}
\] What wine they had at party = what KIND wine they had at party  
‘What a good wine they had at the party!’

To briefly conclude section 4, pseudo-partitives have been shown to consist of a single extended projection with one semi-lexical element, i.e. the classifier and one lexical element, ‘de’ case-marking the second nominal element. In a parallel manner, seemingly ‘discontinuous’ constituents like ‘what of’ in Romanian are shown to consist of one semi-lexical silent noun and a lexical noun, with the same preposition ‘de’ marking the transition between the two nominal domains.
5. The Structure of Cardinal-Noun Constructions in Romanian

Cardinal-noun constructions in Romanian enter two distinct types of syntactic configurations: spec-head for cardinals from ‘one’ to ‘nineteen’ and head-complement for cardinals from ‘nineteen’ onwards:

(35) a. două fete 
    two.fem girls.fem 
  
b. douăzeci de fete 
    twenty of girls 
    ‘twenty girls’ 

(36) a. lower cardinals in Romanian (1-19) are ‘adjectival’ and higher cardinals in Romanian are nominal (19→); 
  
b. the prepositional construction with cardinals in Romanian is a type of prepositional-genitive construction.

There are syntactic differences between lower and higher cardinals crosslinguistically (see Corbett (1978), Franks (1994), Zweig (2006), Danon (2011) a.o.). While lower cardinals behave ‘adjectivally’, higher cardinals seem to behave ‘nominally’.

Corbett (1978) proposes two universals accounting for the crosslinguistic behaviour of cardinals: 
(1) simple cardinal numerals fall between adjectives and nouns 
(2) if they vary in behavior it is the higher which will be more noun-like (1978:368). 

Romanian cardinals evince two different types of syntactic structures (apud Danon (2012)). The first type of structure is one in which a projection of the numeral occupies a specifier position, this being the case of Romanian cardinals from 1 to 19:

(37) * zece cărţi 
    ten books 

The second type of structure is one in which the cardinal heads a recursive DP structure, this being the case of Romanian cardinals from 19 onwards (38):

(38) * douăzeci de cărţi 
    twenty of books 
    twenty books
As for the similarities in point of syntactic structure between cardinal-noun constructions and pseudopartitive constructions, Perlmutter & Orešnik (1973) and Corbett (1978) are the first to assume that their underlying structures are similar. Following their assumptions, I argue that the structure of Romanian prepositional cardinal-noun constructions is similar to the structure of pseudopartitive constructions and the *de* surfacing in both structures is a prepositional genitive marker\(^5\). The embedded nominal in cardinal prepositional constructions, i.e. head-complement structures, needs case. The case-assigner in Romanian is *de*, which checks (abstract) genitive case

6. **Bare nouns in Romanian**

The section argues that the syntactic structure of bare singulars contains a Number Phrase (see Ritter (1992)), which triggers N-to-Num movement. Number is a strong feature in the Romanian DP and N-to-Num raising allows bare singulars to merge in argument positions in Romanian (see Tănase-Dogaru (2009)).

6.1. **Bare plurals**

Following Deprez (2004), Dobrovie-Sorin et al. (2006), Dobrovie-Sorin (2013), bare plurals are Number Phrases and, therefore, they can be directly merged in argument positions in English and Romanian.

Following Deprez (2004), morphology plays a direct role in the interpretation of bare nominals. The richness of plural morphology determines whether a syntactic node NumP is

---

\(^5\) Corbett (1978) accounts for the presence of the preposition of in *a sack of potatoes* or *hundreds of books* in terms of a *genitive* insertion rule.
REMARKS ON LOWER FUNCTIONAL ARCHITECTURE OF THE ROMANIAN DP

Obligatory projecting in a given language (e.g. Romanian). The presence of NumP plays a compositional role in determining the interpretation of the structure containing it. The basic denotation of a noun is that of kind and the role of the NumP is that of retrieving instantiations of a kind and imposing a measure function on these instantiations.

Romanian disallows bare plurals and bare mass terms in preverbal subject position. These asymmetries were originally explained in terms of ECP violations, i.e. bare plurals and bare mass terms in A-positions must be lexically governed by the verb.

(41) a. Elefanți*(i) sunt mari (Romanian).
Elephants*(the) are big.

b. * Apă vine pe conductă./ *Apă e udă.
Water comes on pipe. / Water is wet.

Bare nouns are available in postverbal subject position but only with episodic interpretation:

(42) a. * Maimuțe trăiesc în acel copac. (Romanian)
Monkeys live in that tree.

b. în acel copac trăiesc maimuțe.
In that tree live monkeys.

c. Vine apă pe conductă.
Comes water on pipe.

The ‘only DP arguments’ hypothesis (see Chierchia (1998), Longobardi (1994)) accounts for such contrasts in terms of proper government violation. The bare NP is actually introduced by an empty D₀ and since empty categories must be properly governed, (43c) is the grammatical version.

In Chierchia’s (1998) view, the restricted distribution of Romance bare plurals can be accounted for on the basis of the Nominal Mapping Parameter. Romance languages are of the type [-argumental, +predicative], which means that nouns in Romance languages are essentially predicates. Since predicates cannot occur in argumental positions, it follows that in this type of languages, NPs cannot be made into arguments without projecting the D level. This entails that bare arguments are only found in positions governed by a lexical verb, i.e. post-verbal object positions:

(43) a. Ho preso biscotti con il mio latte (Italian)
(I) had cookies with my milk

b. Am mâncat biscuiți (Romanian)
(I) have eaten cookies

Following Chierchia’s (1998) account of [-argumental, +predicative languages] but departing from the logic of the ‘only DPs as arguments’, the present paper argues that NPs cannot be made into arguments in Romanian unless the NumP level is projected. In other words, NumPs are sufficient for argumenthood.
The object position is relatively unproblematic. Bare plurals in object position in Romanian are governed by the verb, are licensed as foci and interpreted existentially. Foci go to the nuclear scope, topics go to the restrictor.

(44) a. Astăzi am cumpărat mere/zahăr.
    Today have bought apples / sugar.

b. Astăzi am gătit cotlete / musaca.
    Today have cooked cutlets / mousaka.

The subject position poses more problems for Romanian bare plurals. Firstly, Romanian BPs are disallowed in preverbal position with generic interpretation (see 45a); secondly, the postverbal position becomes available for Romanian BPs but only with existential interpretation (see 45c-d):

    Youngsters are hardworking.

b. În fiecare zi în acest cartier mor împuşcaţi tineri.
    Every day in this neighborhood die shot youngsters.

c. În această sală se încarcă puşti.
    In this room se load guns.

d. Erau puşti în grădină.
    Were guns in the garden.

(46) NumP
    Num’
    Num0 NP
    studenţi

Both object and subject bare plurals are NumPs and can be therefore merged in A-positions (they are legitimized by the number projection). There are however, constraints linked to information structure and the type of predicate which rule out bare plurals in pre-verbal subject position.

6.2. Bare singulars

Bare singulars occupy predicate positions (47a) and argument position, as objects of verbs and prepositions (47 b,c) (see Tănase-Dogaru (2009)):

(47) a. Ion e ţăran
    John is peasant.
    ‘John is a peasant’

b. Ion are nevastă
    John has wife.
    ‘John has a wife/John is married’.

c. Ion stă pe scaun.
    John sits on chair.
    ‘John is sitting on the chair’
It is a widely-accepted view in the literature that in Romance (pre-verbal) subject position, BS countables are ruled out, in contrast with object positions. The subject position is regarded as restricted to fully referential entities – full DPs of the semantic type \(<e>\) - so that a NumP structure could not function in this slot without a determiner or quantifier.

(48) * Copil se juca pe stradă
Child se played on street
‘The/A child was playing in the street’

These differences between subject and object positions available for BS have led to the idea that BS objects have a freer distribution than BS subjects because they are (semantically or lexically) incorporated by the main verb (see van Geenhoven (1998), Farkas and de Swart (2003), Massam (2001), Dobrovie-Sorin et al (2006) a.o.).

Normative grammars of Romanian consider that bare nominals cannot occur in subject position in Romanian unless they form part of a rather restricted class of constructions, which express either physiological / psychological states or natural phenomena (see GALR (1963), (2005). Very frequently, BS occurring in subject position are mass terms:

(49) a. mi-e sete / mi-e foame / e iarnă
I-Dat. is thirst / I Dat. is hunger / is winter
‘I am thirsty / I am hungry / it is winter’

b. E întuneric / soare / frig
Is dark / sun / cold
‘It is dark / sunny / cold’

(50) * Carne se găseşte dar nu ştiu dacă vom găsi peşte.
Meat refl. 3rd pers. find but not know whether will find fish.
‘One can find meat but I don’t know whether we will find fish’

Despite the asymmetry between the subject and object positions discussed in the literature on bare nouns, there are some contexts with BS subjects are available:

(51) a. Casă se găseşte foarte greu (Alexandra Cornilescu p.c.)
house refl. 3rd pers. find very difficult
‘it is very difficult to find a house’

b. Bărbat bun se vede foarte rar
man good refl. 3rd pers see very rarely
‘You can rarely see a good man’

c. Viată nu există pe alte planete (GALR (2005)).
Life not exists on other planets
‘there is no life on other planets.’

d. Limbă străină nu se cere pentru angajare
language foreign not refl. 3rd ask for employment
‘we don’t ask you to know foreign a language to get hired’
BS can appear in pre-verbal subject position as negative polarity items in negative constructions or in topicalization structures:

(52) a. Strop de ploaie n-a căzut.  
   Drop of rain not has fallen  
   ‘Not a drop of rain has fallen’

b. Picior de student n-am văzut azi  
   Leg of student not have seen today  
   ‘I haven’t seen the ghost of a student today’

(53) a. Nevastă nu va avea cât va trăi.  
   Wife not will have how will live  
   ‘as for a wife, he will not have one as long as he lives’

b. Prieten bun n-am avut de ani de zile  
   friend good not have had since years of days  
   ‘I haven’t had a good friend in years’

Object BS are licensed:

a) under negation

(54) a. Băiatul n-a adus mingea azi  
   Boy-the not brought ball today  
   ‘The boy didn’t bring a ball today’

b. Nu-mi doresc maşină.  
   Not-me wish car  
   ‘I don’t want a car’.

b) with verbs selecting relational nouns (a căuta / look for, a găsi / find, a vrea / want, a dori / wish, apud Laca’s (1999) examples for Spanish)

(55) a. Ion caută secretară / nevastă / femeie / professor / bucătar.  
   Ion searches for secretary / wife / woman / teacher /cook

b. Ion dorește nevastă tânără.  
   Ion wants wife young.  
   ‘Ion wants a young wife’

c) with light verbs

(56) a. a avea timp/nevoie/obicei  
   have time/need/custom

b. a face sport / baie / dragoste / amor / febră / scandal / curățenie  
   make sport / love / fever / scandal / cleaning

c. a da exemplu  
   give example

d) with verbs belonging to a class associated with HAVE, MAKE/DO or possession / acquisition verbs
e) verbs imposing strong selectional restrictions

(57) a. Ion are casă / maşină / copil mic / carte de credit / paşaport / bucătăreasă.
Ion has house / car / little child / credit card / passport / cook
‘Ion has a house / a car / a little child / a credit card / a passport / a cook’

b. Casa asta are lift / grădină
This house has an elevator / a garden
‘This house has an elevator / a garden’

(58) a. Maria poartă pălărie / uniformă / poșetă / cravată / cămașă / rochie scurtă
Maria wears hat / uniform / purse / tie / shirt / short dress
‘Maria wears a hat / a uniform / a tie / a shirt / a short dress’

b. Ion folosește stilou / creion
Ion uses pen / pencil
‘Ion uses a pen / a pencil’

c. Ion conduce camion.
Ion drives truck.
‘Ion drives a truck’

Therefore, BS appear both as subjects and objects, both in pre-verbal and post-verbal positions. However, BS distribution in post-verbal (object) positions is freer than in pre-verbal positions. The next sections will try to clarify why this is so.

6.3. The Incorporation Hypothesis

Incorporation (see Masullo (1992), Van Geenhoven (1998), Massam (2001), Farkas & De Swart (2003), a.o.) is loosely speaking strict adjacency of the bare noun to the verb or preposition (or a specific location inside the VP, where the noun always appears, often resulting in morphological incorporation), narrow scope of the noun (often associated with property-denotation and / or inability to act as antecedent of anaphoric expressions) and number deficiency or neutrality (relating to the fact that the noun may refer to singular or plural entities or to ‘general number’ in the sense of Corbett (2000)).

BS in Romanian are problematic for an incorporation analysis as defined above, in the sense that they are number-specific and discourse-transparent. Also, modification and coordination of BS in possible in Romanian.

In their analysis of Brazilian Portuguese, which allows BS freely in both object and subject positions, Schmitt and Munn (2004) argue that such nouns are number-neutral. They can be interpreted as either singular or plural (59 a), cannot license the adjective ‘different’ (59 b) and induce durative readings, in contrast to the singular indefinite, which forces a terminative reading (59 c). This shows that the BS is not quantified, despite the fact that it is morphologically singular.
(59) a. Eu vi criança na sala. E ela estava / elas estavam ouvindo
   I saw child in-the room. And she was / they were listening.
   b. *Eles escreveram livro diferente.
   They write book different
   c. *Eu escrevi carta em duas horas / eu escrevi uma carta em duas horas
   I wrote letter in two hours / I wrote a letter in two hours.

   Romanian BS can only be interpreted as semantically singular (60a), license the adjective
   ‘different’ (60 b) and induce terminative reading with verbs such as ‘build’ (60 c).

(60) a. Ion şi-a cumpărat maşină. Ea / aceasta este mare.
   John bought carFEM. It 3SG.FEM / this 3SG FEM is big.FEM.
   ‘John bought a car. It is big’
   b. Ion şi-a luat maşină diferită de a lui Gheorghe.
   John took car different from gen.Gheorghe.
   ‘John bought a different car from Gheorghe’s’
   c. Ion şi-a construit casă în doi ani.
   John built house in two years.
   ‘John built a house in two years.’

(60 a, b) show that Romanian BS are quantified objects and have singular reference. (60a)
shows that the BS ‘maşină’ introduces a discourse-transparent object, which can be referred to by
anaphora. (61 a, b) show that Romanian BS may appear modified by adjectives and relative
clauses. In addition, such nouns may appear in coordinated structures (61 c) (see Dayal (2003),
who argues that incorporated bare singulairs cannot be conjoined or modified):

(61) a. Ion vrea nevastă tânără (şi frumoasă).
   John wants wife young (and beautiful).
   ‘John wants a young and beautiful wife’
   b. Ion doreşte nevastă care nu fumează / care dansează
   John wishes wife that not smokes / dances
   ‘John wants a wife who shouldn’t smoke/ who dances’
   c. Ion vrea nevastă şi copil / Ion foloseşte cuţit şi furculiţă.
   John wants wife and child / John uses knife and fork.
   ‘John wants a wife and a child / John uses a knife and a fork’

The ‘strict adjacency rule’ of incorporation is not observed by Romanian BS:

(62) a. Ion are şi casă şi maşină.
   John has also house and car.
   ‘John has both a house and a car’
   b. Ion nu are încă casă.
   John not has yet house.
   ‘John doesn’t have a house yet’
   c. Ion are deja maşină.
   John has already car
   ‘John already has a car’
d. Ion va avea de mâine pașaport.
   John will have as of tomorrow passport.
   ‘As of tomorrow, John will have a passport.’

These examples show that the bare singular can be separated from the incorporating verb by an adverb. Therefore, the ‘strict adjacency rule’ of incorporation is not observed by Romanian bare singulars.

Tănase-Dogaru (2007) assumes, following Deprez (2005) that a singular noun in a +Pl language projects Number syntactically. Romanian BS are, therefore, NumPs, with an empty Num⁰ head, i.e. without overt morphological material. When a BS is merged in an object position in Romanian, N moves to Num.

(63)  
\[ \text{VP} \]  
\[ \text{V'} \]  
\[ \text{V⁰} \]  
\[ \text{NumP} \]  
\[ \text{caută} \]  
\[ \text{Num'} \]  
\[ \text{Num⁰} \]  
\[ \text{NP} \]  
\[ \text{nevastă⁰} \]  
\[ \text{tj} \]

One valuable attempt at remedying the situation is the formulation of a Lexical Incorporation rule by Dobrovie-Sorin et. al (2006). In the authors’ view, Lexical Incorporation combines lexical items (e.g., wife, good, walk, etc.) bearing syntactic categorial labels (N, Adj, V, respectively) and yields a complex lexical item bearing a phrasal categorial label (e.g., NP or VP). The complex lexical element thus obtained is inserted into a syntactic position that bears the same syntactic category.

Example derivation:

- Lexical Incorporation

(64)  
\[ \text{a. Pick up an array of lexical items:} \]
\[ [\text{Vcaută}] \text{‘seek, look for’}, [\text{Nnevastă}] \text{‘wife’}, [\text{Adjtânără}] \text{‘young’} \]

\[ \text{b. Lexical Incorporation:} \]
\[ (i) \ [\text{Nnevastă}] + [\text{Adjtânără}] \Rightarrow [\text{NPnevastă tănără}] \]
\[ (ii) \ [\text{Vcaută}] + [\text{NPnevastă tânără}] \Rightarrow [\text{VPcaută nevastă tânără}] \]

The semantic analysis associated with the rule of Lexical Incorporation of bare singulars involves predicate modification, and from this point of view, the authors’ proposal is comparable to Dayal’s (2003) rule of Pseudo-incorporation and to Farkas & de Swart’s (2003) rule of Theta-Unification. The accounts differ from insofar as they do not assume that the incorporation of bare singulars pertains to the Lexicon.
7. CONCLUSIONS

The present paper has looked at the lower part of the functional architecture of the Romanian DP. It has analysed the relation between the projection for Number and the Classifier projection and it has reached the following conclusions:

In the Romanian DP, number projects syntactically. Moreover, number is strong so that NumP is sufficient for argumenthood.

Secondly, contra mainstream analyses, number morphology and classifier morphology have been shown to co-occur on Romanian and other languages with morphological means of marking the plural.

Thirdly, the first nominal in pseudopartitive constructions perform the same function as classifiers in classifier languages. Pseudopartitive constructions have been shown to behave as single extended projections with one semi-lexical and one lexical head. Moreover, cardinal-noun constructions equal pseudopartitive constructions in point of syntactic structure.

Fourthly, bare singular nouns were shown the project Number. In the structure of bare nouns in Romanian, N moves to Num, licensing bare nouns in object positions.
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