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INTRODUCTION

• From the first attestations (cf. *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki* 1500-10), we find cases of auxiliary-participle inversion now obsolete in modern Romanian:

  **Past participle, pronominal clitic, auxiliary**

(1) a. *Izbăvitu-ne-au* de *vrăjmași*<i> noștri

  saved=cl.acc.1pl=have.3sg from enemies(=the) our

  ‘[he] saved us from our enemies’ (old Romanian, PH.1500–10:116r)

b. *Ne-a* *salvat* de *dușmanii* noștri

  cl.acc.1pl=have.ind.3sg saved from enemies(=the) our

  ‘[he] saved us from our enemies’ (present-day Romanian)
INTRODUCTION

• How do we treat these cases of inversion?
  • Nicolae (2019): inversion is residual V2
  • Hill & Alboiu (2016): a learned phenomenon
• Textual differences: laws vs. religious translations vs. non-translated letters
PARTICIPLE INVERSION IN ITALO-ROMANCE

• It has long been argued (see Benincà 1983, 1995, 2006; Ledgeway 2007, 2008, 2020; Wolfe 2018; et al.) that medieval Italo-Romance varieties were characterised by a so-called verb second of V2 constraint necessitating the raising of the finite verb to an unfilled C position. This is often accompanied by the raising of one or more constituents to a higher position to that of the raised finite verb:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[CP [C' [TP [VP SV XP ]]]]} & \Rightarrow \text{[CP XP [C' V [TP (S) [VP (S) [VP SV XP ]]]]} \\
\end{align*}
\]
PARTICIPLE INVERSION IN ITALO-ROMANCE

- Notably, V-to-C raising is blocked in embedded contexts, due to the presence of the overt complementiser, as in (1a)-(b), below:

(2) a. \[CP [\text{Spec l'ofizio} \ [C\text{- comenza} \ [\text{TP/VP l'abado} \ \tau_{\text{comenzava}} \ \tau_{l'ofizio} \ \text{tute} \ \text{fiade}]}}\]
the=job started.3 the=abbot every time
'The abbot began the service on every occasion'

(Old Venetian, NSB 14, Singh 2021)

b. Ben so \[CP \text{ch'} [\text{TP/VP io ho pecado}]]\]
well know.1sg that=1sg I have.1sg sinned
‘I know full well that I have sinned’

(NSB 14, Singh 2021)
PARTICIPLE INVERSION IN ITALO-ROMANCE

• Medieval Italo-Romance and old Tuscan had a syntax characterised by a preverbal position that was not a privileged subject position and to which a variety of constituents could raise.

• Modern Sardinian retained the ability for informational focus in CP allowing for the raising of rhematic objects (see Jones 1993, Wolfe 2018).

• Old Tuscan and modern Sardinian give us a testing ground to compare and analyse instances of past participle inversion of the old Romanian kind.
PARTICIPLE INVERSION
STRUCTURES IN OLD TUSCAN

(3) a. Per una grande pioggia che venuta era _

for a great rain that come was.3sg

'Due to a great deluge that had come upon us'

b. Quello che scritto si trouva _ delli stati mondani

that which written refl.=finds.3sg of-the states worldly

'That which has been written on the worldly states'
Participle inversion structures are limited to embedded contexts and with a ‘subject gap’ (= an unfilled SpecTP)
Participle inversion in Italo-Romance as being ‘stylistic fronting’

- Holmberg (2005): Stylistic fronting as belonging to a higher/learned register and not the output of a natural grammar.
- Poletto (2014): Scrambling of VP elements to vP is much more common in old Italo-Romance rather than the long-head movement that one would have to posit for participle inversion.
PARTICIPLE INVERSION STRUCTURES IN OLD TUSCAN

• Molnár (2017): Stylistic fronting as being related to a Topic/Focus interpretation.
  • Old Romanian participle inversion is both pragmatically marked and unmarked circumstances.
  • It’s clear that we’re not dealing with the same phenomenon here.
## A Summary of Participle Inversion Structures in Old Tuscan vs. Old Romanian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Tuscan</th>
<th>Old Romanian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted to embedded clauses</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Subject gap', i.e. requirement that SpecTP be unfulfilled</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic/Focus interpretation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PARTICIPLE INVERSION IN MODERN SARDINIAN

- Participle inversion attested in modern Sardinian (Jones 1993, 2013) in both matrix and embedded contexts:

  (4) a. **Mossidu m’ at su cane**
      bitten me=have.3sg the dog
      'The dog has bitten me'

  b. **Appo natu ki ** **arrivatos sun**
      have.1sg said that arrived be.3pl
      'I said that they have arrived'
PARTICIPLE INVERSION IN MODERN SARDINIAN

• Jones (2013, 2018): participle fronting can be linked to Narrow Focus or, in some cases, a mirative Focus interpretation, whereby the information presented is 'particularly surprising or unexpected'.

• The syntactic distribution of this structure has parallels to our old Romanian data, the pragmatic interpretation of this structure in Sardinian leaves questions.
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE OLD(MOLDOVAN) ROMANIAN TEXTUAL CORPORA

- (Religious) texts translated into Romanian started to occur as a consequence of the Reformation, mainly affecting Transylvania, but also towns in Moldova (cf. Goina 2020:17)
- Reformation: the liturgy was supposed to be in the language of the people; it is very likely that the first translations in Romanian were a response of the Orthodox Church to the changes that took place in the Catholic/Protestant Church.
Mitropolit Dosoftei (1624-1693) notes, in the introduction of the translated liturgy, that the liturgy should be held in people’s language, *[a]*vând copii *identice* ale obișnuitei sfinte rugăciuni, precum cele traduse din antologii bine alcătuite cu ajutorul textelor grecești (‘having identical copies of the usual holy prayers, like those translated from well-formed anthologies, relying on the model of Greek texts’).
• Translated texts: where should we look?
  • The translator: in the case of Codicile Voronețean, Costinescu (1981) proposes that he was either a Romanian or someone that knew Romanian very well, probably active within Reformation/Hussite movement or of Catholic confession.

\[ ? \]
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE OLD(MOLDOVAN) ROMANIAN TEXTUAL CORPORA

- The language of the original: *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki* is argued by Mareș (1982:200) to have been a (copy of a) translation from Church Slavonic, compiling features of a Serbian version, compiled by Branko Mladenović (1346), and of the oldest Church Slavonic version known to date.
• Non-translated texts: a clear-cut picture?
  • It was rather rare even among boyars and that those that had this skill probably grew up and attended school abroad.
  • Towards the end of the eighteenth century, no more than 2% of the secular population possessed writing skills.
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE OLD(MOLDOVAN) ROMANIAN TEXTUAL CORPORA

• Letters = foreign models (and unknown writers)? Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea are likely to show unclear syntactic tendencies; the writers were either bilinguals themselves, as below, or were following foreign models (mainly Slavonic models):

(5) Ačasta cherte iasti sachezu- hokem (DÎ.1590-1.LXXV)
    this book be.3SG thing too high
    ‘This letter is very important’
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE OLD(MOLDOVAN) ROMANIAN TEXTUAL CORPORA

• Instruction in a foreign language?
  • Grigore Ureche (1590-1647) grew up and studied in Poland, emigrating there at an early age.
  • While his text is clearly not translated, it may still show a series of morphosyntactic phenomena that are rather idiolectal, than typical of spoken old Romanian.
The first 50 pages of *Tâlcul Evangheliilor* (1567) were analysed (of around 27,800 words) for instances of inversion:

(6) a. *Luat-* au pre voi Tatăl în mila lui* (CC1.1567:11\(^v\))

taken have.3sg dom you father=the in grace his

'The lord has taken you all in his grace'

b. *Cum m-* au *tremis* Părintele, și eu tremiț voi* (CC1.1567:7\(^v\))

how me=have.3sg sent parent=the and I send.1sg you

'Just as the lord sent me, I will send you'
AN ANALYSIS OF A TRANSYLVANIAN TEXT

• Occurrences of this phenomenon were rare:
  • 27 overall occurrences of auxiliary-participle inversion that were exclusively in matrix contexts.
  • The majority of these instances of inversion (16/27) occur in contexts in which the verb was the first clausal element
  • In this text, it generally holds in this text that we do not find inversion in embedded clauses introduced by an overt complementiser.
AN ANALYSIS OF A TRANSYLVANIAN TEXT

• The pragmatics of participle inversion:
  • Unclear whether a lot of these structures are of a pragmatically marked nature or not.
  • In this text, inversion occurs in mainly (what would seem to be) unmarked contexts and seems to be more of syntactic requirement than one that contributes to the pragmatics interface:

(7) **Chemat-au nește păscari** (CC1.11567:53^v^)

 `called= have.3SG some fishermen`

‘He called upon some fishermen’
AN ANALYSIS OF A TRANSYLVANIAN TEXT

- Auxiliary-participle inversion is also found in this text after elements that occupy the first/second positions within the clause, as in (8a)-(c):

(8) a. Eu păzit-am ei în numele tău (CC1.1567:40v)
   I guarded=have.1sg them in name=the your
   'I guarded them in your name'

b. și besereca aceasta zidit-au noao (CC1.1567:63v)
   and church=the this built=have.3sg us
   'He built this church for us'
Auxiliary-participle inversion is also found in this text after elements that occupy the first/second positions within the clause, as in (8a)-(c):

(8) c. Aceastea toate scris-au Ioan Zlatoust (CC1.1567:69r)

these all written=have.3sg John Chrysostom

'St. John Chrysostom wrote all these'
How do we account for the distribution in these structures within either a V2 framework or within the context of the southern Slavic/(Old) Church Slavonic influence?
LET’S TEST:
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

Pros
LET’S TEST:
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

• In Serbo-Croatian from the 16th century onwards, auxiliary and pronominal clitics obligatorily target the second position within the clausal spine:

(9) Jovan je potpuno zaboravio Petar.
    Jovan be.prs.3sg completely forget.pple Petar

‘Jovan completely forgot Petar.’ (Serbo-Croatian, Migdalski 2006)
LET’S TEST:  
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

- In present-day Bulgarian, auxiliary and pronominal clitics are not required to occur in second position and are generally found preverbally (10), but are banned from clause-initial position (cf. 11a-b);

(10) Ivana \(\text{ne e ošte napisala domašnoto si.}\)

Ivana not be.prs.3sg still write.pple homework=the her

‘Ivana has not finished her homework yet.’

(Bulgarian, Krapova 1999)

(11) a. ** [CP [TP [T° Mi go] [AspP dade Vera včera.]]]

cl.dat.1sg cl.acc.3sg give.pst.3sg Vera yesterday

b. [CP [TP [SpecTP Dade] [T° mi go] [AspP dade Vera včera.]]]

give.pst.3sg cl.dat.1sg cl.acc.3sg give.pst.3sg Vera yesterday

‘Vera gave it to me yesterday.’

(Bulgarian, Franks and King 2000)
LET’S TEST:
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

• The pros of aux-participle inversion in old Romanian as being a second-position effects phenomenon:
  • Translations
    • Texts from the 16th century and the beginning of 17th century present many syntactic structures which seem to copy the syntax of the original text; even after the second half of the 17th century, (religious) translations have an archaic style.
LET’S TEST:
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

- *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki* (1500–10): oldest Slavonic version + Serbian version (made by Branko Mladenović, cca. 1346) ⇒ (Balkan) Slavonic features are expected (cf. 12 & 13):

12) *Izbăvitu-ne-au*

\[ \text{save.pple=cl.acc.1pl=have.ind.prs.3sg} \]

de \vrăjmași<i>\> noștri

‘[God] saved us from our enemies’  

(\text{old Romanian, PH.1500–10:116r})

13) *Dalь mi е e*

\[ \text{give.pple(msg) cl.dat.1sg be.ind.prs.3sg} \]

carь

tzar

‘The tzar gave it to me’  

(\text{old Serbian, Radanović-Kocić 1988})
In many cases, old Serbian clitics are verb-adjacent and occur lower in the clause than in second position (Migdalski 2016:236; cf. also Radanović-Kocić 1988);

(14) Da vi **ni ste** rekli

that you cl.dat.1pl be.ind.pres.2pl tell.pple(mpl)

‘That you told us’ (old Serbian, Radanović-Kocić 1988)
LET’S TEST:  
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

- Non-translated texts:
  - **Letters** followed a foreign-usually Slavonic-model and to show a rather formal style ⇒ (Balkan) Slavic features are expected (cf. 15a-c);

(15) a. *Pus-am* *mena* *domniia-mele.*  
   (old Romanian, Iași, DÎ.LXIV.1583)  
   `put.pple=have.ind.prs.1sg` `hand=the` `lordship=mine`

b. *Pus-am* *mena.*  
   (old Romanian, Iași, DÎ.LXXII.1588)
   `put.pple=have.ind.prs.1sg` `hand=the`
   ‘I’ve put my hand’

c. *Scris-am* *adecă noi, birăul** cel rumănescu** şi. cu cel armenescu*  
   (old Romanian, Suceava, DÎ.XCVII.1593-7)  
   `write.pple=have.ind.prs.1pl` `that.is` `we` `office=the` `that` `Romanian` `and with that Armenian`
   ‘We, the Romanian and Armenian offices, have written’
Let’s Test:
(1) Second Position Effects

- The frequency of verb-auxiliary word order is lower than in original texts translated texts:

(16) Acmu noi am înțelesu că ați
now we have.ind.prs.1pl understand.pple that have.ind.prs.2pl
oprit domneavoastră
stop.pple you
‘Now we’ve understood that you stopped [it]’
(old Romanian, Suceava, DÎ.CIII.1595)
Moldovan chronicles (e.g., Letopisețul Țării Moldovei, written by Grigore Ureche, Letopisețul Țării Moldovei, written by Miron Costin):

(i) the verb-auxiliary word order is preferred in yes/no questions (17), whereas the auxiliary-verb word order in preferred in wh-questions (18-20) (cf. Hill and Alboiu 2016:66):

(17) Aședzat-au domn la Muldova, în locul put.pple=have.ind.prs.3pl voivode at Moldova in place=the ghiaurului ce au perit?
tyrant=the that have.ind.prs.3sg die.pple

‘Have they picked another voivode to replace the tyrant that died?

(old Romanian, CLM.1700–50:218v)
(17) Aședzat-au domn la Muldova, în locul put.plode=have.ind.prs.3pl voivode at Moldova in place=the ghiaurului ce au perit?
tyrant=the that have.ind.prs.3sg die.plode

‘Have they picked another voivode to replace the tyrant that died?’

(old Romanian, CLM.1700–50:218v)

(18) Cine au fost, doamne, mai credzut
who have.ind.prs.3sg be.plode lord more trustworthy
la măria ta și cinstit ca mine?
at highness=the your and honest than me

‘Oh, lord, who has been more trustworthy and honest than me during your reign?’

(old Romanian, CLM.1700–50:255r-v)
Let’s Test: (1) Second Position Effects

(ii) direct speech:

(19) Fost-au acolea sîrbi, unguri, lăși,
be.pple=have.ind.prs.3pl there Serbs Hungarians poles
nu numai munténi
not only Wallachians

‘There also were, alongside Wallachians, Serbs, Hungarians, and Poles’

(old Romanian, CLM.1700–50:268r–y)
(iii) (formulaic?) beginning of a new paragraph.

(20) Perit-a\textsuperscript{u} in c\text{\textc"{e}}st\text{"{u}} r\text{"{a}}zboi\text{"{u}} oameni însemn\text{"{a}}\text{"{t}}i de\text{\textipa{p}}le=have.ind.prs.3pl in this war people important from boi\text{"{e}}rii Muldovei

boyars=the of Moldova

‘In this war died some important boyars of Moldova’

(old Romanian, CLM.1700–50:271r)
LET’S TEST:
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

Cons
LET'S TEST:
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

- The verb(-clitic)-auxiliary word order can also occur lower in the clause (21) (but cf. also old Serbian):

(21) Pe învățătura tâține-său, a lui Ștefan vodă, trimis-au

on advice=the father=his a of Ștefan voivode send.pple=have.ind.prs.3sg

la împărățiiia turcilor pre Tăutul
to kingdom=the of.the.Turks dom Tăutul

‘Following the advice of his father, Ștefan voivode, he sent Tăutul to the Ottoman Empire’

(old Romanian, ULM.1725.A-2f.58r)
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

• Old Romanian negation differs, up to a certain extent, from its (Balkan) Slavic counterparts (cf. Migdalski 2006)

• Clausal negation strictly precedes the clitic elements, e.g. pronominals, auxiliaries.

(22) *N-*  am  făcut  Nici  un  rău

\[ \text{neg} = \text{have.1sg} \text{ done not a sin} \]

‘I have not sinned’
LET’S TEST:
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

• Serbo-Croatian: a constituent negation (23) and a sentential negation (24); the participle can precede the neg+auxiliary clitic cluster only when the sentence is pragmatically marked (25);

(23) Pročitao **nije** knjigu nego pismo.

read.pple(msg) neg+be.ind.prs.3sg book but letter

‘He didn’t read the book but a letter.’ (Serbo-Croatian, Migdalski 2006)

(24) Ja **nisam** čitao knjigu.

l neg+be.ind.prs.1sg read.pple(msg) book

‘I haven’t read the book.’ (Serbo-Croatian, Rivero 1991)

(25) Čitao knjigu **nisam!**

Read.pple(msg) book neg+be.ind.prs.1sg

‘Read the book, I did not!’ (Serbo-Croatian, Tomić 1996)
Bulgarian: negation attracts finite verbs and (clitic/non-clitic) auxiliaries (26); more generally, it attracts the first available head from the hierarchy in (27) (Migdalski 2006:115); participle movement is blocked by sentential negation (28);

(27) Ne sǔm pročel knigata.
    neg be.ind.prs.1sg read.pple(msg) book=the
    ‘I haven’t read the book’
    (Bulgarian, Migdalski 2006)

(28) li > šte > AUX (except 3rd singular e) > DAT > ACC > REFL > e
    (Bulgarian, Franks and King 2000)

(29) *Pročel ne sǔm knigata, a pismoto.
    read.pple(msg) neg be.ind.prs.1sg book=the but letter=the
    (Bulgarian, Migdalski 2006)
LET’S TEST:
(1) SECOND POSITION EFFECTS

(30) **N-am făcut nici un rău**
     neg=have.1sg done not a sin
     ‘I have not sinned’

(31) Ja **nisam čitao knjigu.**
     I neg+be.ind.prs.1sg read.pple(msg) book
     ‘I haven’t read the book.’

(32) **Ne sŭm pročel knigata.**
     neg be.ind.prs.1sg read.pple(msg) book=the
     ‘I haven’t read the book’
LET’S TEST:
(2) VERB SECOND

Pros
Let’s Test:
(2) Verb Second

- Participle inversion in old Romanian is a syntactic constraint affected by activation of the clausal left periphery with several parallels with the V2 structures attested for medieval Western Romance.

\[ [\text{CP} \ [\text{C'} \ [\text{TP} \ [\text{VP} \ [\text{S} \ V \ \text{XP}]@Id]]]] \Rightarrow [\text{CP} \ \text{XP} \ [\text{C'} \ V \ [\text{TP} \ (S) \ [\text{VP} \ (S) \ [\text{VP} \ S \ V \ \text{XP}]@Id]]]] \]
• (1) Asymmetric distribution between matrix and embedded contexts:
• In some texts, participle inversion is blocked by the presence of the overt complementiser, much like for many medieval Romance varieties the overt complementiser blocks or at least limits V-to-C movement, suggesting that the raised participle targets a C-internal position:

(33) a. \([_{CP}[^CSculatu \left[_{CP}se- \right. \au]\right]]\)
    risen \hspace{1cm} \text{refl.}=\text{have.3}
‘He has arisen’ \hspace{1cm} \text{(old Romanian, CC1.1567:14°)}

b. Gicea \([_{CP} c\text{"a} \left[_{TP/VP}s- \right. \au \right. \începutu a fi \ Hristos\right]
    \text{said.3sg} \hspace{1cm} \text{that} \hspace{1cm} \text{refl.}= \hspace{1cm} \text{have.3} \hspace{1cm} \text{begun} \hspace{1cm} \text{to be} \hspace{1cm} \text{Christ}
‘They say that Christ begun to be...’ \hspace{1cm} \text{(old Romanian, CC1.1567:2°)}
b. Gicea  [CP că  [TP/VP s-  au  începutu a  fi  Hristos] (CC1, 2v)
said.3sg  that  refl.=  have.3 begun  to be  Christ
‘He said that Christ begun to be...’

(34) Ben  so  [CP ch’  [TP/VP io  ho  pecado]]
well know.1sg  that=  I  have.1sg  sinned
‘I know full well that I have sinned’  (Old Venetian, NSB 14, Singh 2021)
LET’S TEST:
(2) VERB SECOND

Cons
LETS TEST:
(2) VERB SECOND

• This is not the case across all texts within the OR corpora, whereby Nicolae (2019) identifies cases of inversion in embedded contexts:

(35) să să știe că socotit- am dintru inima mea
subj refl=know.3sg that considered=have.1sg within heart mine
'It should be known that I have carefully considered...'

(Nicolae 2019:54)
Daco-Romance retained informational focus constructions after presumed loss of V2 in southern România (cf. Ledgeway 2020):

• Could participles raise to the InfFoc projection of CP?

• Pragmatic interpretation is not always clear from the context, some cases where participle inversion leads to marked structure and some where this cannot be posited.

• We find cases of inversion with first-position constituents, such as Informational or Contrastive Foci, within the old Romanian corpora.

(36) Aceastea toate scri- au Ioan Zlatoust
these all written=have.3sg John Chrysostom
'St. John Chrysostom wrote all these'
**LET’S TEST:**
**(2) VERB SECOND**

- A Romanian V2 system:
  - Nicolae (2019, 2021): participle (and not auxiliary raising) raising satisfies V2 in old Romanian $\Rightarrow$ participle inversion is a result of a V2 constraint in old Romanian
  - Why can other strategies not satisfy V2 in old Romanian?
  - Such a system would also imply a more rigid V2 constraint in the variety, going against what has been proposed to be the case for old Southern Romance (or old Daco-Romance in particular, c.f. Wolfe 2021) varieties in which V-to-C verbal raising generally satisfies the constraint (viz. Ledgeway 2007, 2008, 2020).
Auxiliary-participle inversion is a learned construct from southern Slavic languages from which these texts were translated, possibly reinforcing V2 traces that had begun to be lost.
(21) a. Sculatu-se-au … risen=refl.=has.3 ‘He has arisen’

⇒ Verb second?

b. Sculatu-se-au … risen=refl.=has.3 ‘He has arisen’

⇒ 2P clitics?
CONCLUSION

- Neither V2 nor second-position clitics were a feature of spoken old Romanian. A proposal for either constraint in old Romanian fails to hold consistently in the corpora.

- Aux-participle inversion is the result of translations of older southern Slavic texts, a result of which superficially resembles the then-absolute V2 constraint.
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