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0. Intro
- the paper focuses on the lower part of the Romanian DP:
  (i) syntactic number and its relation with classifiers
  (ii) (pseudo)-partitivity: classifiers in pseudo-partitives
  (iii) bare plural and singular count 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 Deprez (2004), Borer (2005) a.o. – a NumP in the Romanian DP, the locus of grammatical information, i.e. [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
   three persons

- complementary distribution?

(i) classifier choice and determiner choice is sensitive to the semantics of the noun, i.e. to the lexical marking of the noun as count or mass.
(ii) classifiers and number morphology co-occur

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

- following Borer, NumP checks an uninterpretable 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.
- NumP can be the complement of a quantifier / 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.

Countable configuration – projection of NumP

Uncountable configuration – absence of NumP
2. Classifiers in Romanian

Claim: N1 in pseudo-partitive constructions (aka amount quantifiers or measure phrases) are classifiers, sitting in the head of a Classifier Phrase. 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 studenți
      a part from-among students
      ‘a part of the students’
   (7) unul dintre studenții 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 studenți / 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 acești 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 nemți supuși n-au fost²
    only a part of Germans obedient not-have been
    ‘only a part of the Germans were not obedient’

d. gotoviți doao sute de voinici se meargă până la Chiesariia și șaptezeci de călărași și
doao sute de săgetători dintr-al treile ceas de noapte³
    prepare two hundreds of soldiers to go up to Chiesariia and seven-tens of infantrymen
    and two hundreds of archers of the third hours of night
    ‘Get ready two hundred soldiers to go to Chiesaria and seventy infantrymen and two
    hundred archers of the third hours of the night.’

Gradually, partitive din replaced partitive de:

(13) Aici vede omul adesea dealuri, din care unele sunt cu păduri⁴
    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’

Claim: N1s in Romanian pseudopartitive constructions perform the same function as classifiers in classifier languages.
   - languages fall into two categories:
     (i) classifier languages, i.e. languages with a classifier morpheme ranging over the noun (areal feature of
         languages in Asia and Southeast Asia). Because classifiers are obligatory with numerals in every
         language in which they occur, they are traditionally analyzed as individuating, i.e. identifying countable
         entities.
     (ii) languages with plural morphology

   - 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.
   - Borer (2005) suggests that the absence of plural inflection correlates with the existence of classifiers:

(14) a. Qianmian turan tiao chu lai yi zhi laohu (Chen 2003)

¹ See Dicționarul limbii române 1913, quoted in GALR 2005
² See Dicționarul enciclopedic ilustrat, 1926-1931, quoted in Hristea 1984
³ Codicile Voronețean, quoted in Nedelcu 2007:42
Front suddenly jump out one CL tiger
‘suddenly a tiger jumped out in front of us’

b. Ta mai le yi zhuang fangzi
he buy_perfasp. one CL house
‘He bought one house’

- in languages with plural morphology, measure phrases are required by mass nouns in order to be countable:

(15) a. two grains of sand / three drops of whisky / a loaf of bread
d. două boabe de orez / trei pahare de lapte / un cub de zahăr
two grains of rice / three glasses of milk / a cube of sugar

3. Partitive ‘de’ and genitive ‘de’ in Romanian

- any connection between (16a) and (16b)?

(16) a. pierderea de vieți omenești
loss-the of lives human
‘the loss of human lives’
două sticle de vin
two bottles of wine

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

- partitive de is attested in old Romanian before partitive din is formed out of de (of) and in (in):

(17) Deaci de vă veți pocăi și carii vor face bire să-i dau parte de împărăția mea și raiul și blagosloviia mea
so if you will repent and which will do good subj.-him give part of kingdom-the my and heaven-the and benediction-the my
‘So, I will give a part of my kingdom and heaven and benediction to those of you who will repent and do good deeds’

- in Latin, the partitive is a value of the genitive case as in (18); the inflectional partitive has been gradually replaced by prepositional means of indicating the part-of relation.
- one can speak about a surviving partitive value in French as in (19), where du is a partitive article. In Romanian, the plural indefinite article can have a partitive value as in (20)

(18) parum frumenti
little wheat-gen
‘very little wheat’

(19) boire du lait
drink part. milk
‘drink (some) milk’

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

5 ‘Legenda duminicîi’ – MS. BAR 5910, quoted in Nedelcu 2007:100
- in Latin, the structure corresponding to present-day Romanian pseudopartitives consisted of a Nom.N1+GenN2 sequence. This inflectional genitive seems to have evolved into a prepositional genitive.

(21)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>cadus vini</td>
<td>jar wine-Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'jar of wine'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>mica panis</td>
<td>crumb bread-Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'crumb of bread'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 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 (22) (see Cornilesu 2004):

(22)  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>acordarea de burse studenților</td>
<td>giving-the of scholarships students-the-Gen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'The assignment of scholarships to the students’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Romanian disposes of an inflectional genitive, while in other Romance languages the genitive is prepositional, marked by de ‘of’ (see Grosu 1988 a.o.).
- Romanian developed an inflectional genitive and the prepositional genitive, based on the same preposition de as in all Romance, became very limited and specialized (see Cornilesu 2004 for details). Romanian has developed a morphological distinction between ‘anchoring genitives’, always DPs, and ‘non-anchoring (Prepositional) genitives’, always syntactic NPs (in the sense of Koptjevskaya-Tamm 2005).
- the inflectional genitive and the de genitive show different morpho-syntactic and semantic properties (see Cornilesu 2010):

(23)  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>citirea</td>
<td>cât mai des</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading.the</td>
<td>more frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>citirea</td>
<td>frecventă</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reading.the</td>
<td>frequent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(24)  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchoring Gens</td>
<td>Non-anchoring Gens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>inflectional</td>
<td>a prepositional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>b NP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>referential, &lt;e,t&gt;-type denotation</td>
<td>c. &lt;e, t&gt; denotation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- if we inspect the paradigm in (25), it may seem natural to assume that (25a) and (25b) are genitives. It remains to be seen why (25c) is a genitive, since it is not morphologically marked.

(25)  

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>câștigător al unui premiu</td>
<td>gagnant d’un prix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>câștigător a două premii</td>
<td>gagnant de deux prix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>câștigător de premii</td>
<td>gagnant de prix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- if we interpret Case as abstract case, i.e. syntactic case, which subsumes morphological case, the function of the abstract case is to license an argument of a predicate (see Sigurdson 2000). So, the role of the genitive is to license an argument within the noun phrase.
- moreover, Genitive case obligatorily marks the internal argument of event nominalizations, corresponding to the Accusative case of the verb (26):
(26) a. cumpărarea mașinii
    buying-the car-the-Gen
    ‘the buying of the car’
b. au cumpărat mașina
    bought-3-Pl car-the
    ‘they bought the car’

- 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 morphosyntactic specialization of the genitive in Romanian led to the disappearance of partitive *de* in constructions like *unul de noi*.

Concerning the question of why Romanian lost the construction, while all other Romance kept it, there are two possible explanations (see Cornilescu 2006):

(i) Romanian replaced *de* with *dintre/din* because of the ambiguity of *de*. That, however, does not explain why all other Romance languages kept *de*.

(ii) Romanian lost partitive *de* as a by-product of the specialization of genitive *de*. It is this second hypothesis that we adopt, apud Cornilescu 2006, who convincingly argues in favor of this view.

- 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

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:

(27) 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 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.
- in (28a), the noun ‘vârf/peak’ triggers agreement on the adjective and is thus assigned semi-lexical status, while in (28b), the noun ‘sare/salt’ triggers agreement on the adjective, which is a clue to the functional or ‘pure degree’ status of ‘pic / a little’.

(28) 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.

4.2. Selection phenomena

- selection is between the predicate and either N1 or N2. In (29) 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:
a. Ei au răsturnat o tavă de prăjituri + ambiguous
   They have overturned a tray of pastries.

b. Ei au răsturnat o tavă cu prăjituri. – ambiguous
   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.

- When the verb imposes strong selectional restrictions on N1, like *a ţine ‘to hold’, N1 has a referential interpretation and it refers to an actual object in the discourse domain (30a). 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 (30b) and el for the masculine substance noun lapte (30c):

  (30) a. Ion ţine 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 (31a) – in other words, when it functions as a classifier – we can only refer back to the substance noun lapte (31b), since the classifier does not refer to an actual object that is present in the universe of discourse:

  (31) 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:

  (32) a. o gaşcă idioată de huidume
      a gang idiotic of bullies

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

  c. un stol grăbit de școlărice
      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 N1 as the functional/semi-lexical head of the same projection, which is transparent to modification.
- some extraction phenomena also point to the fact that, although consisting of two constituents, pseudo-partitive constructions have one referent:
a. Bani, Ion are o grămadă (*de)  
Money, John has lots (*of).
b. Spectatori, au plecat o mulţime (*de)  
Spectators, have left a multitude (*of)
c. Ceai, a băut toată lumea câte o ceaşcă (*de)  
tea, has drunk all world each a cup (*of)

- when N2 is topicalized, the functional element de/of disappears, which we take to indicate the fact that pseudo-partitives consist of a unique multi-headed projection.

4.4. The syntactic structure of Romanian pseudopartitives

- pseudopartitive constructions in Romanian involve 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 ceaşcă (de ceai) / cup of tea.
- De assigns case to N2, i.e. the complement of N1.

(34)   [CardP o [ClasP sticlă [FP de [NP vin]]]]
       [CardP a [ClasP bottle [FP of [NP wine]]]]

(35)  

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 (2000, 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.
- exclamative constructions in Romanian contain a silent noun NUMBER:

(37)  

a. Ce case au unii!  
What houses have some (people)  
Some have such big/beautiful houses!  
b. Ce de case au unii!  
What of houses have some (people)  
Some have so many houses!

- (37a) can only be an exclamation about some salient property of houses, for example their being large or beautiful; (37b) 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:

(38)  

a. Wat heft die auto een deuken! (van Riemsdijk 2005)  
What has that car a dents  
b. What dents that car has!

(38) 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’.
- in Romanian exclamatives, ‘de’ signals NUMBER; no ‘de’ signals the silent KIND / TYPE / SORT; whenever the overt ‘number’ is present, ‘de’ is obligatory:

(39)  

a. Ce de băieți la petrecere! = Ce de NUMBER băieți la petrecere.  
What of boys at party = what of NUMBER boys are at party  
‘there are so many boys at the party’  
b. Ce băieți sunt la petrecere! = Ce KIND boys are at party (tall, handsome, etc)  
What boys are at party! = What KIND boys are at party  
‘the boys at the party are really handsome, tall, etc’  
c. Ce număr mare *(de) băieți la petrecere!  
What number big *(of) boys at the party!

- where mass nouns are involved, ‘de’ signals AMOUNT (see Kayne 2005); no ‘de’ signals KIND:

(40)  

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!’  
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!’

- 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:

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

(42) 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, Hurford 2003, 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 behavior of cardinals:
  ♦ simple cardinal numerals fall between adjectives and nouns
  ♦ 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 2011).
- 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:

(43) zece cărți
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 (44):

(44) douăzeci de cărți
twenty of books
twenty books

(45) [NP [CardP zece cărți]]
- Perlmutter & Orešnik (1973) and Corbett (1978) are the first to assume that the underlying structures of cardinal-noun constructions and pseudopartitive constructions 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. The embedded nominal in cardinal prepositional constructions, i.e. head-complement structures, needs case. The case-assigner in Romanian is de, which assigns (abstract) genitive case.

6. Bare nouns in Romanian

- the syntactic structure of bare singulars contains a Number Phrase (see Deprez 2004), 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.

6.1. Bare plurals

- bare plurals are Number Phrases so 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 obligatorily projected 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.

6 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’.
(47) a. Elefanți*(i) sunt mari (Romanian).
    Elephants 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:

(48) a. *Maimuţe trăiesc în acel copac. (Romanian)
    Monkeys live in that tree.
b. în acel copac trăiesc maimuţe.
    In that tree live monkeys.
c. Vine apă pe conductă.
    Comes water on pipe.

- the ‘only DP arguments’ hypothesis (see Cherchia 1998, Longobardi 1994) accounts for such contrasts in terms of proper government violation. The bare NP is actually introduced by an empty D^0 and since empty categories must be properly governed, (48c) is obviously 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:

(49) a. Ho preso biscotti con il mio latte (Italian)
    (I) had cookies with my milk
b. Am mâncat biscuiţi (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’, I claim that NPs cannot be made into arguments in Romanian unless the NumP level is projected. 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.

(50) 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; secondly, the postverbal position becomes available for Romanian BPs but only with existential interpretation:

(51) a. în fiecare zi în acest cartier mor împuşcaţi tineri.
    Every day in this neighborhood die shot youngsters.
b. în această sală se încarcă puşti.
    In this room se load guns.
c. Erau puşti în grădină.
    Were guns in the garden.
- 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.

\[(52) \text{NumP} \]
\[\text{Num'} \]
\[\text{Num^0} \ NP \]
\[\text{studenți} \]

### 6.2. Bare Singulars

Bare singulars occupy the following syntactic positions (see Tănase-Dogaru 2009):
- predicate position (53a)
- argument position, as objects of verbs and prepositions (53 b,c).

\[(53) \text{a. } \text{Ion e țăran} \]
\[\text{John is peasant.} \]
\[\text{‘John is a peasant’} \]
\[\text{b. } \text{Ion are nevastă} \]
\[\text{John has wife.} \]
\[\text{‘John has a wife/John is married’} \]
\[\text{c. } \text{Ion stă pe scaun.} \]
\[\text{John sits on chair.} \]
\[\text{‘John is sitting on the chair’} \]

- 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.

\[(54) \text{a. } \text{*Copil se juca pe stradă} \]
\[\text{Child se played on street} \]
\[\text{‘The/A child was playing in the street’} \]
\[\text{b. } \text{*Femeie discuta politică} \]
\[\text{Woman was discussing politics.} \]
\[\text{‘The/A woman was discussing politics’} \]
\[\text{c. } \text{*Bărbat juca fotbal} \]
\[\text{Man was playing football.} \]
\[\text{‘The/A man was playing football’} \]

- these differences between subject and object positions available for BS have lead 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 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:

(55) 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’

(56) Carne se găsește dar nu știu dacă vom găsi pește.
    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’

- always a verb of existence
- 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:

(57) 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. Viață 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:

(58) 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’

(59) 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
a. Băiatul n-a adus minge 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)

(61) a. Ion caută secretară / nevastă / femeie / professor / bucătar.
Ion searches for secretary / wife / woman / teacher / cook
b. Ion doreşte nevastă tânără.
Ion wants wife young.
‘Ion wants a young wife’

c) with light verbs

(62) a. a avea timp/nevoie/obicei
have time/need/custom
b. a face sport / baie / dragoste / amor / febră / scandal / curăţenie
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 acquisition verbs

(63) 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
House this has elevator / garden
‘This house has an elevator / a garden’

e) verbs imposing strong selectional restrictions

(64) a. Maria poartă pălărie / uniformă / poşetă / cravată / cămaşă / 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 foloseşte stilou / creion
Ion uses pen / pencil
‘Ion uses a pen / a pencil’
c. Ion conduce camion.
Ion drives truck.
‘Ion drives a truck’

f) proverbs

(65) a. Cui pe cui se scoate.
Nail on nail se-pull out
‘fight fire with fire’
b. Ban la ban trage.
Coin to coin drives
‘nothing succeeds like success’
c. Deal cu deal se întâlnește, dar om cu om?
Hill with hill meets but man with man?
‘we are bound to meet again’

SO, 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, i.e. 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 (1999, 2000, 2004) argue that such nouns are number-neutral. They can be interpreted as either singular or plural (66 a), cannot license the adjective ‘different’ (66 b) and induce durative readings, in contrast to the singular indefinite, which forces a terminative reading (66 c). This shows that the BS is not quantized, despite the fact that it is morphologically singular.

(66) 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 (67 a), license the adjective ‘different’ (67 b) and induce terminative reading with verbs such as ‘build’ (67 c).

(67) a. Ion şi-a cumpărat maşină. Ea / aceasta este mare.
John bought car. It 3SGFEM / this 3SG FEM is bigFEM.
‘John bought a car. It is big’
b. Ion şi-a luat maşină diferită de a lui Gheorghe.
John took car different from 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’

(67 a, b) show that Romanian BS are quantized objects and have singular reference. (67a) shows that the BS ‘maşină’ introduces a discourse-transparent object, which can be referred to by anaphora. (67 a,b) show that Romanian BS may appear modified by adjectives and relative clauses. In addition, such nouns
may appear in coordinated structures (68 c) (see Dayal 2003, who argues that incorporated bare singulars cannot be conjoined or modified):

(68) 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:

(69) 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 paşaport.
John will have as of tomorrow passport.
‘As of tomorrow, John will have a passport’

In previous work, (Tănase-Dogaru 2007) I assumed, following Deprez (2005) that a singular noun in a +Pl language projects Number syntactically. Romanian BS are, therefore, NumPs, with an empty Num\(^0\) head, i.e. without overt morphological material. When a BS is merged in an object position in Romanian, N moves to Num.

(70) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V'}^0 \\
\text{NumP} \\
\text{caută} \\
\text{Num'} \\
\text{Num}_{ij} \\
\text{nevastă}_j \\
\text{NP} \\
\end{array}
\]

The basic claim is that N-to-Num movement allows the noun to be merged in argument position, paralleling the manner in which proper names move to D\(^0\). N-to-Num movement allows the noun to be merged in object position; the subject position needs the D level.
7. Conclusions

In the Romanian DP:
(i) number projects syntactically; number is strong; NumP is sufficient for argumenthood
(ii) number morphology and classifier morphology co-occur
(iii) N1 in pseudopartitive constructions are classifiers; pseudopartitives are single extended projections with one semi-lexical and one lexical head
(iv) cardinal-noun constructions equal pseudopartitive constructions
(v) bare singular nouns are NumPs, where N moves to Num, licensing bare nouns in argument positions
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