

Loss of SVO and AUX cliticisation in Romanian¹

Virginia Hill
University of New Brunswick - Saint John

1. Preview

Contrast Balkan Romance with the rest of Romance languages (Mišeska –Tomić 2006 a.o.):

- basic word order: VSO vs SVO (= S in argument A position)²
- auxiliary status: clitic vs non-clitic

Hypothesis: In Romanian, the two parametric settings may be causally related leading to the change from Romance to Balkan templates

Clue: The structure of Old Romanian (OR) constructions with interpolations between AUX and the related verb (Todi 2001; Dragomirescu 2013; Pană Dindelegan 2016)³

- (1) *ție au [Domnedzeu] [toate aceastea] arătat* (PO {143}; A&H 2017)
to.you has Lord all these shown
'Lord showed all these to you'

Proposal:

- AUX is a free morpheme in (1) and allowed for a grammar with SAI (i.e., AUX-to-C and the subject in Spec, TP), scrambling and neutral SVO word order = typical Romance language.
- AUX cliticization triggered AUX-V adjacency + loss of SVO configuration.
- The transitional stage from one system to another can be documented:
 - (i) constructions with double subjects (allowing preverbal subjects to be reanalyzed as Topics instead of arguments in Spec,TP)
 - (ii) overuse of subject-verb agreement on both AUX and the verb (signalling verb movement above vP).

Conclusion:

The generalization of VSO = an epiphenomenon of AUX cliticization; genuine SVO is residual.

¹ Some examples and analysis come from Alboiu & Hill (2017).

² SVO can also be derived in Romanian (Old and Modern) generally through DP fronting to discourse positions (Hill & Alboiu 2016; Pană Dindelegan 2016 a.o.); i.e., in A' vs A Specifiers.

³ The timeline for *Old Romanian* begins with 1521 and ends in 1780 (Gheție 1997); this covers the oldest preserved piece of writing in Romanian (a short letter) up to the founding of the first Enlightenment movement by Romanian intellectuals. Cross-linguistically, this timeline corresponds to the Early Modern stages of other Romance and South Slavic languages.

2. Data and previous studies

Data: Mostly 16th century OR texts + examples from previous studies ((Todi 2001, Zamfir 2007, Dragomirescu 2013, Nicolae 2015, 2019).

Previous proposals:

- (i) AUX with interpolation in (1) = a syntactic calques from Church Slavonic (e.g., Frâncu 2009). Inference: Church Slavonic has C oriented clitics (Pancheva 2005) → AUX is clitic in (1) but in C vs T.
- (ii) AUX with interpolation in (1) = language internal phenomenon + AUX is non-clitic (Zamfir 2007) → traces of a more ancient word order.
- (iii) Quantitative analysis: the construction is unproductive (e.g., 8, 84% in DIR; 10,31% in PO; 10,88% in Coresi's texts; from Dragomirescu 2013)
- (iv) AUX with interpolation = clitic pronouns with interpolation → items occur between T and v because the verb stays in v (Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2016); however, Nicolae (2019): interpolation AUX is a clitic; interpolation for clitics different from discontinuous verb cluster with AUX. Verb movement is gradual and reduces the discontinuous configuration to a contiguous one.

- (2) a. *așa ne [tare] pedepseș<ti>* interpolation
like.this us hard punish.2
'you punish us hard' (FT, 5: 3v; Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2016)
- b. *cum au Cristus noauă dzis* discontinuous verb cluster
as has Christ to.us said
'as Christ has told us' (FT.1571-5:1v; from Nicolae 2019:26)

What I adopt:

- the generic term *interpolation*
 - the unstable degree of verb-movement in constructions as in (2b)
 - the non-clitic status of AUX, because (3) and (4) and because of SAI - verb deletion (not possible with clitic AUX; Avram 1999; Avram & Hill 2007).
- (3) a. *de să va cunoaște carii l-au rănit și cine nu l-au --*
if REFL.3= will.3SG know who him=has hurt and who not him-has
'if it will be known who has hurt him and who has not'(Pr.I 168:28/ Zamfir 2007: 163)
- b. *De voiu face aceasta de voe, plată am; iară să voiu --*
if will.1SG do This by will pay have.1 but if will.1SG
fară de voe, vistiernicie mi e dată
without by will punishment to.me= is given
'If I will do this willingly, I have rewards; but if I will (do it) unwillingly, punishment is given to me' (NTB 231: 23-24/ Zamfir 2007: 320)
- verb coordination (not with clitic AUX; Avram 1999; Avram & Hill 2007).
- (4) a. *au rânduit și tocmi*
has ordered and regulated

‘he has ordered and regulated’ (Lit.Buc. II: 17/ Zamfir 2007: 163)

- b. *va* *grăi*, *scrie* *și* *faci*
will.3SG speak write and do
‘he will speak, write and do’ (DIR XCCII 183, 8/ Zamfir 2007: 313)

→ AUX cannot be clitic and it occurs in texts written directly in Romanian

- Interpolation with clitics and with AUX should be kept separate

What I doubt:

The analysis of interpolation with clitics according to the Romance template because:

- clitic pronouns appear with interpolation in calques in texts translated from Church Slavonic, and Church Slavonic has systematic clitics at C
- not only clitic pronouns but also the negation *nu* ‘not’ is treated as a clitic at C in some translations (e.g., 6% in Coresi PS), although *nu* is not clitic in OR and it is lower than C; e.g. under calque, *nu* cooccurs with V-to-C, which are routinely complementary in OR

- (5) a. *că nu până în sfârșit [uitat] va fi*
that not until in end forgotten will.3SG be
‘for, in the end, forgotten he will not be’ (Coresi PS {13r})

- b. *nu [milcuiescu]-mă*
not beg.1SG-REFL.1SG.ACC
‘I’m not begging’ (Coresi PS {49v})

What I argue against:

- the clitic status of AUX in (2b)

3. Empirical observations

- AUX is systematically adjacent to C-items, such as *să/de* ‘if’ in (3b) and *wh*-phrases in (7), every time C contains clause typing operators.⁴

- (6) *când va [Domnedzeu] căuta pre voi, duceți-vă afară*
when will.3SG God search DOM you take.2PL outside
de aici oasele mele
from here bones.the my
‘when God will search for you, take my bones out of here’ (PO, 179; A&H 2017)

- The XP intervening between AUX and verb is systematically the subject in the presence of *wh*-movement (7) but can be any other XP in the absence of *wh*-movement (8).

⁴ Clause typing operators can be null or lexical, and are responsible for deriving interrogatives (Cheng 1997), relatives (Donati&Cechetto 2011), imperatives (Rivero & Terzi 1995), exclamatives (Zanuttini & Portner 2003). Declarative clauses are not typed by operators, nor are some relative clauses, especially in Romanian (Sevcenco 2015). In a cartographic representation (Rizzi 1997), clause typing operators are in Spec, ForceP.

(7) *Domnedzeu va [și alalte] tipări și scoate*
 God will.3 also the.others print and publish
 ‘God will also print and publish the others’ (PO, 11; A&H 2017)

(8) *tu însuși ești [aicea] venit* (PO, 60)
 you yourself are.2SG here come
 ‘you yourself came here’

- Chronologically, AUX + interpolation coincides with the use of double subjects: (9a) with topicalization; (9b) with correlatives. Such constructions disappear towards MR (Frâncu 2009, Todi 2001).

(9) a. *[darurile celealalte]i [eale]i să numără între Daruri cele mai slabe*
 gifts.the other they REFL=count.3 among gifts those more weak
 ‘for the other gifts count among the less important gifts’ (SA 75 – Gheție 348)

b. *[Carii]i rămânu în păcate de duhul svânt [ei]i se rup*
 who.the.PL remain.3PL in sins from spirit holy they REFL=break.3PL
 ‘Those who persist in their sins break away from the holy spirit’ (FT 2 – Gheție 162)

- A short-lived peculiarity occurring in 16th century texts is the morphological marking for subject-verb agreement not only on AUX but also on the verb (10).

(10) *[ceia]i ce vor; fi făcuți; aceasta*
 those.PL.MASC that will.3PL be done.PL.MASC this.ACC.FEM
 ‘those who have had done this’ (Cod Tod, 258; A&H 2017)

These observations point to tests on AUX and V movement.

4. AUX properties

AUX = verb without lexical feature but Agr+TAM

MR AUXs are all clitic:⁵

- HIGHER: *avea* ‘have’; *va* ‘will’ (in the Agr component of T; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994)

(11) [TP have/will [AspP....]] - preserve only [phi]

(i) no tense inflection (e.g., *am pus* ‘have.1 put’ but **aveam scos* ‘had.1 put’)

(ii) adjacency to clitic pronouns (sharing of phi-features; Ciucivara 2009)

- LOWER: *fi* ‘be’ = invariable in MR; perfective (Avram & Hill 2007)

(12) [TP [AspP/TP be... [vP...]]] - preserves only [asp]

OR AUXs:

⁵ The conditional auxiliary *ar* is also considered to originate from the ‘will’ root (Zamfir 2007: 295))

- default treatment: ‘have’/‘will’ clitics; only [phi] → merging site as in (11)
- interpolation ‘have’/‘will’ [phi]+[mood] → merge in T but not yet clitic
- ‘be’ shows unstable Agr+TAM and gradual feature stripping toward cliticization (14)

- (13) a. *Era unii den cărtulari aciia șezându și cugeta*
 were some of savants here sitting and reflected
 ‘Some of those savants were sitting here and reflected’ (CEV, 50; A&H 2017)
- b/b’ *de-ai hi domniata sârguit să fi până acmu venit*
 if-have.2SG be lordship.your tried SUBJ be.2SG up.to now come
 ‘If your lordship tried to come before now’ (DIR, XCIII; A&H 2017)
- c. *Ș-am vădzut și noi stâlpii pre mijlocul satului*
 and-have.1 seen also we pillars.the through middle.the village.the.GEN
ce-au fost hotărât Zupco
 that-has been settled Zupco
 ‘And we also saw, across the middle of the village, the pillars that Zupco had settled’
 (DRH, A, XIX, nr. 126, {156} 1626; A&H 2017)

→ AUX *fi* ‘be’ merges in Asp but varies in inflectional properties (the features it spells out)

- (14) a. C/Fin *era* > T > Asp/T > v +V
 [REALIS] <[PST; ~~u~~phi:3SG]> <[IMPFV; ~~u~~INFL: T]>
- b. C/Fin > T *ai* > Asp/T *hi* > v +V
 [IRREALIS] [~~u~~phi:2SG] [PFV; ~~u~~INFL: T]
- b’. C/Fin *să* > T *fi* > Asp/T > v +V
 [IRREALIS] [~~u~~phi:2SG] <[PFV; ~~u~~INFL: T]>
- c. C/Fin > T *au* > Asp *fost* > v +V
 [REALIS] [PST; ~~u~~phi:3SG] <[PFV; ~~u~~INFL: T]>
-

→ Transitional stages in the grammaticalization of *fi* ‘be’ from non-clitic to invariable clitic

- (13b/b’): free variation of (non)inflected forms for subject-verb agreement
- (15): optional inflection of the past participle for subject-verb agreement

- (15) a. *ceia ce vor fi botezati finul*
 those.MASC who will.1PL= be christened.1PL.MASC godson.the
 ‘those who will have christened the godson’ (LP 242/Zamfir 2007: 317)
- b. *neștiindu nimele de înșii, nice de lucrurile lor_k*

not.knowing nobody about them.MASC nor about deeds.the.FEM their
ce au fost făcuți sau petrecuți în Țara Muntenescă
 that have.3 been done.MASC or undergone.MASC in Wallachia
 ‘with nobody knowing of them, nor of their deeds that they have accomplished or
 enterprised in Wallachia’ (DIR LXXXIX 181: 6 apud Zamfir 2007: 165)

- ✓ adjacency between ‘be’ and past participle (transition from non-clitic to clitic)
- ✓ reinforcement of subject-AUX agreement through Agr inflection on past participle (Agr is weakened on ‘be’ and then lost)

5. Verb movement

Interpolation AUX combines with verb forms: past participle; infinitive; gerund

Interpolation AUX does not interfere with verb movement out of vP

Challenge: prolific constituent fronting (16)

- (16) *iară [cătră necredincioși] [nici un cuvânt] [atunce]*
 but toward unbelievers not one word then
[al lui] nu va fi (PO, 32)
 of his not will.3SG be
 ‘but not one word of his will then be directed toward the unbelievers’

Tests:

- (i) bare quantifiers in post-verbal A subject position (Cinque 1990, Erteschik-Shir 1997)

- (17) *s-ară fi grăit aimintrea [vP cineva pântru noi]*
 if=would.3 be spoke otherwise someone for us
 ‘if someone would have spoken differently for us’ (DIR XLIV, 5,1600; A&H 2017)

→ post-verbal subjects occur routinely

- (18) a. *se-au [de voe] dată [vP elă pre muncă]*
 REFL.3=has of will given he towards work
 ‘he willingly strived to work’ (CEV 88:35 apud Zamfir 2007: 159)
- b. *până vor [mai bine] înțelege [vP creștinii]*
 until will.3PL more= well understand Christians.the
 ‘until the Christians will better understand (this)’ (CM, 263r/ Nicolae 2015:13)
- c. *Iară era [acii] șazând [vP unii den cărtulari] și cugetând*
 and were here sitting some of savants and reflecting
 ‘And some of the wise men were sitting here and reflecting’ (NT, 42v; A&H 2017)

- (ii) XP merged in the discourse field of vP

(19) a. *Acesta va [ca cu seacerea] răteza [de pre lume] [vppre mine]*
 this will.3SG as with sickle.the mow of from world DOM me
și pre ruda mea toată.]
 and DOM family my all
 ‘As by sickle, this one will mow me and my family out of this world’ (Moxa, 2 158)

b. *să ară amu fi [acii] [vP Fiiul pacelor]*
 if would.3 now be here son.the easter.GEN
 ‘if the Son of Easter would be here’ (C-Tetr, 2 139v; A&H 2017)

(20) [CP/TP ‘have’/’will’ [AspP/TPanterior ‘be’ [AspP verb [vP <verb>]]]] **V-to-Asp**

(21) a. *nici să ară cineva den morți învia*
 not.even if AUX.COND.3SG someone from dead.PL resurrect.INF
 ‘even if someone resurrected from the dead they would not have faith’
 (CC1.1567:124r; from Nicolae 2019: 33)

b. *S-au neștire de intaiul ceas lucratu*
 if=AUX.PERF.3SG someone from first.the hour work.PPLE
 ‘if someone worked since dawn’ (CSVII.1590-602:63v; from Nicolae 2019: 33)

→ c. [CP/TP ‘have’/’will’ [AspP/TPanterior ‘be’ [AspP [vP verb]]]] **V-to-v**

Conclusions:

- Interpolation AUX may cooccur with verbs that move or stay in situ (V-to-Asp; Asp-continuative or perfect heads in Cinque’s 1990 hierarchy)⁶
- Theoretical consistency: verb movement is generalized in 16th century texts
- Interpolation AUX cooccurs with the spellout of subjects in vP (transition to VSO)

6. Word order: interpolation material

The type and merging site of interpolated XP correlate with the clause typing operator

6.1. Declarative clauses: Scrambling

AUX lower than the negation *nu* ‘not’ (free morpheme in Isac 2015 for MR; Hill & Alboiu 2016 for OR) + supports proclitics + precedes the verb in Asp

(22) a. *și nu-l va [numai] proslăvi [vP [Dumnezeu] [pre cela]]*
 and not=him will.3 only bless God DOM that
 ‘and God will not only bless that one’ (CEV, 246; A&H 2017)

b. *Iară era [acii] șazănd [vP unii den cărtulari] și cugetând*

⁶ The exact locations for *fi* ‘be’ and the past participle are not important for this analysis. Just on semantic grounds, *fi* ‘be’ would merge in T-anterior (the middle of {Asp}-field), the past participle in Asp-perfect, the gerund in Asp-continuative, the infinitive in Asp-proximative. Tests are not available.

and were here sitting some of savants and reflecting
 ‘And some of the wise men were sitting here and reflecting’ (NT, 42v; A&H 2017)

- c. *se-au* [de voe] datu [vP elu pre muncă]
 REFL.3=has of will given he towards work
 ‘he willingly strived to work’ (CEV 88:35 apud Zamfir 2007: 159)

→ AUX in Agr/T

→ XP between AUX and verb in Asp is in the middle field (a Spec, Asp) = scrambling

→ Zamfir (2007): scrambled XPs in declaratives are mostly (but not exclusively) AdvPs

→ only one XP interpolation at a time when V-to-Asp

(23) [CP C [TP AUX [AspP XP [Asp verb [vP (<XP>)[vP <verb> (<XP>)]]]]]]

Conclusion:

Interpolation involves scrambling to A’ Spec,AspP vs adjoining to AspP (a uniqueness constraint reminiscent of quantificational chains).⁷

6.2. Conditional clauses: SAI + (Scrambling)

- OR complementizers: *să* or *de* in Force (Hill & Alboiu 2016) = clause typing operators
- Verb in Asp : [*afară*] adjoined to vP (24a); *fi* ‘be’ in Asp (24b)

(24) a. *Să voiu [eu] tinde [afară] mâna mea*
 if will.1SG I stretch out hand.the my
 ‘if I will extend my hand outside’ (PO, 188; A&H 2017)

b. *De va [neştine] fi avându vro fată*
 if will.3sg someone be having a girl
 ‘if someone had a girl (with a former wife)’ (Prav.:229r; from Nicolae 2019:19)

- Word order: *să/de* > non-clitic AUX > Subject > (XP) > verb > Objects = SAI
 → BQ-subject in A position higher than Spec,vP = Spec,TP

(25) a. *nece să arî [cineva] [PP din morţi] învie. nu va avea credinţi*
 nor if would someone from dead return not will have faith
 ‘even if someone would return from the dead, he would not have faith’
 (Cod Tod, 98:6; A&H 2017)

b. *S-au [neştire] [PPde întâiul ceas] lucratu. să ia astăzi*
 if=has someone from first.the hour worked subj take today
plată dereaptă
 pay deserved

⁷ No exception to this rule in declarative clauses in my data. Caveat: if the verb remains in vP (Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2016), more than one constituent should be able to interpolate as merged in Topic/FocusP above vP, in addition to scrambling.

‘If someone worked since dawn, he should receive the deserved pay today’
(C-PS,VII 63v; A&H 2017)

- c. *de-ai* *hi* [*dommiata*] *sârguit* *să* *fii* *până acmu* *venit*
if-have.2SG be lordship.your tried SUBJ be.2SG up.to now come
‘If your lordship tried to come before now’ (DIR, XCIII; from A&H 2017)

➤ clitics

- (26) *De se* *va* *omul* *sui* *in ceriu* 1.[CI-AUX]-to-Fin = SAI⁸
if REFL.3 will.3 man.the ascend to heaven 2. AUX in T + Subj in Spec,vP
‘If man would ascend to heaven’ (FD.1592-604:466r; from Nicolae 2019)

➤ Neg-to-Fin instead of AUX-to-Fin (unattested) → no SAI

- (27) [_{CP} OP_{cond} Force_{să/de} [_{FinP} AUX [_{TP} DP_{SU} [_T <AUX> [_{AspP} (XP) [_{Asp} (V) [_{vP} ...]]]]]]]]]

Conclusion:

- SAI confirms non-clitic AUX
- Non-clitic AUX is in Agr/T in the presence of declarative ‘that’, but moves to Fin in the presence of conditional *să/de*.
- V-to-C is lost in MR conditionals
- SAI indicates that Spec,TP used to be an A position in OR, hence genuine SVO attested

6.3. Interrogative clauses: SAI

Theoretical predictions: V-to-C; no scrambling (XP scrambling interferes with wh-movement)
OR data show:

- Complementizers = 0
- Clause typing operators = wh-phrases or 0
- SAI = Aux-to-C + Subject in Spec, TP
- No scrambling → OK AdvPs with first merge in A’-Spec (29)
- Neg-to-Fin (30) = no SAI
- Proclitics: either [CI+AUX]-to-Fin or Long distance Agree (MR option)

- (28) a. *cum* *voiu* [*eu*] *lăsa* *pre* *voi* *și* *pre* *mituteii* *voștri?*
how will.1SG I abandon DOM you and DOM children yours
‘how am I going to abandon you and your children?’ (PO, 210; from A&H 2017)

- b. *iară* *când* *va* [*unchiul*] [*mainte*] *lua* *nepoata*
and when will.3 uncle.the first take niece.the
‘and when the uncle will have first married his niece’ (Prav:265v; Nicolae 2019: 26)

⁸ Equivalent to Fr. *s’aurait-il regardé* ‘refl3-would.3-he looked’ = SAI with proclitics vs *regardes-le* ‘look at him’ = V-to-C with enclitics

- (29) *Ce va [amu] fi noao?*
 what will now be for.us
 ‘What will be for us now?’ (CEV, 220; from A&H 2017)
- (30) *au nu v-am eu spus voao ca*
 PART not to.you-have.1 I told to.you that
 ‘didn’t I tell you that...’ (DVT.1679-99:284v; from Nicolae 2019)
- (31) *Sau cine va va pre voi mantui de la mene?*
 or who you will.3 DOM you save from me
 ‘Or who will save you from me?’ (MI.~1630:182r; from Nicolae 2019)
- (32) a. [_{ForceP/FocP} **WH** [_{FinP} AUX [_{TP} DP_{SU} [_T <AUX> [_{AspP} (V) [_{vP} <DP_{SU}> (V) <WH>]]]]]]]]
 b. *[[_{ForceP/FocP} **WH** [_{FinP} AUX [_{TP} DP_{SU} [_T <AUX> [_{AspP} **XP** [_{Asp} V [_{AspP}<XP> [_{vP} <DP_{SU}> <WH>]]]]]]]]]]

6.4. Relative clauses: (SAI)

Clause typing operator → obligatory SAI

Wh-movement unstable (Sevcenco 2015 for OR; Dobrovie-Sorin 1990 for MR)

→when -Wh-movement (matching derivation) scrambling ok

→when +Wh-movement (raising derivation), scrambling is out

- (33) a. *ce va [el] dzice voao aceaia faceți*
 what will.3 he say to.you that do.2PL
 ‘whatever he says to you you do it’ (PO, 145; from A&H 2017)
- b. *Ținem ce au [Domnul] [pp cu noi] făcut*
 hold.1PL what has God with us done
 ‘we hold what God did unto us’ (PO, 221; from A&H 2017)

Support from the theory of grammar:

- Rizzi (1997): chains for operators in Spec, ForceP are anaphoric (vs Spec,FocP)
- Bhatt & Pancheva (2005): conditionals and free relatives have identical feature content

6.5. Summary of results re: non-clitic AUX

- There is AUX-to-Fin in the presence of clause typing operators, hence the adjacency between AUX and the relevant complementizers or *wh*-phrases.
- There is an argumental position for subjects in Spec,TP which can host bare quantifiers. This is seen in configurations with clause operators, where the subject immediately follows AUX in Fin. This subject cannot be in Spec,vP, as it is higher than V in Asp.
- AUX-to-Fin and subject in Spec,TP linearizes as SAI.
- Scrambling to an A’ Spec,AspP occurs in complementary distribution with *wh*-movement because it involves a quantificational chain.

No clause typing operator (i.e., declarative clauses)

(34) a. [CP C [TP **DP**_{SU} [T AUX [AspP **XP** [Asp V-V [vP <DP> <v> ...<XP>]]]]]]]

With clause typing operators (i.e., conditionals, interrogatives, relatives)

b. [ForceP/FocP **WH** [FinP AUX [TP **DP**_{SU} [T <AUX> [AspP V [vP <DP_{SU}> <WH>]]]]]]]

7. Diachronic change

Theoretical predictions:

(i) AUX cliticization involves head-head fusion with the verb, that is, T=Asp. One consequence is the suppression of Spec,AspP between these heads, which allowed for scrambling. So the fronting to discourse positions of constituents with wide scope could only target the CP, not the middle field.

(ii) AUX cliticization also cancels AUX-to-C and SAI. If operators activate the [modal] feature of Fin, which probes for compatible goals, clitic AUX fails to qualify as a goal, so, instead, the verb must undergo the movement to Fin. That introduces LHM in the language.

(iii) AUX cliticization and the loss of SAI also entail the loss of the clue for Spec,TP as an A position for subjects. So preverbal subjects are reanalysed as Topics in the CP domain.

Verifying the predictions:

7.1. Loss of scrambling

Cause:

- AUX is reanalyzed as a clitic (Balkan characteristic)
- obligatory adjacency of clitic AUX (and other clitics) in T to the verb in Asp [AUX=V]

Mechanism:

heads T and Asp are fused at PF ((Distributed Morphology; Siddiqi 2009)

Consequence:

- Spec,AspP for scrambling is eliminated
- fronted constituents may either precede or follow [AUX=V]

Options for constituent fronting:

- the discourse area above vP (for narrow scope)
- the CP field (for wide scope).

Evidence for transitional stages (short lived): subject-verb hyper-agreement (35)

(35) *să va fi crescută feciori*
if will.2SG be raised.FEM sons
'if she would have raised sons' (NTB 282r:12-13; Zamfir 2007:317)

→ the phi-features of T are redistributed on inflectional heads at PF because Agr features can associate with both T and Asp, through fission, on the condition that they are adjacent.

→ (35) is an indication for the learner that *fi* ‘be’ is adjacent to the verb, with no intervening Spec position, therefore, a clitic.

Change:

- the clitic status of AUX is stabilized (hyper-agreement disappears)
- AUX/T and V/Asp heads are systematically fused at PF

7.2. From T-to-C to Asp-to-C

Cause:

- clitic AUX merged in TP field does not move - irrespective of clause type
- T_{have’/will’/Asp_{be’/Asp_{verb}} adjacency - irrespective of clause type}

Consequence:

- [modal] in Fin probes for verb or negation instead of clitic AUX → loss of SAI

Mechanism

- Long Head Movement (LHM - Rivero 1993 et seq.) replaces SAI
- unsystematic LHM in the 16th century (Zafiu 2014; Nicolae 2015, 2019)

- (36) a. *[FocP până când [TopP păcătoșii [FinP laudă [TP -se?]]]]*
until when sinners.the boast -themselves
‘until when will sinners keep boasting?’ (CEV, 24; A&H 2017)
- b. *Dară [FocP cine [TopP amu den bogați [FinP putea [TP-se-va spăsi?]]]]*
but who now from rich could =himself=will repent
‘But who from among the rich will be able to repent?’ (CEV, 325; A&H 2017)

Evidence for LHM (i.e., Asp_{verb}-to-Fin):

- enclitics in T
- Focus and Topic constituents precede V

Change:

- loss of clues for [modal] in Fin → checking through move changes to long distance Agree, irrespective of clause type
- reanalysis of trigger for LHM - from [modal] to [focus] null operator in 17th century → Asp_{verb}-to-Focus in complementary distribution with Neg-to-Focus and with wh- or any XP movement to Spec, FocP (Alboiu et al. 2015; Hill & Alboiu 2016)
- SAI (i.e., T-to-Fin with A Specs) changes to LHM (i.e., Asp-to-Foc with A’ Specs) → head movement is equally split into A- versus A’- movement (Roberts 2001, 2010).

Note:

V-to-Focus is not due to some discourse feature on V (i.e. the lexical verb is not focused) but applies to AUX as well as long as AUX is not a clitic.⁹

⁹ Alboiu et al (2015) argue that OR had a null focus operator that triggered head-to-head movement for checking. Only non-clitic elements merged in heads qualified for this movement. So V-to-Focus is justified through configurational needs, not through the focus feature itself, which explains why not only the verb but also NEG could be probed (whichever head was closer to the probe).

- (37) *Fostu-s-au cersut cazacii să-i lase călări ..*
 be.PST.PRTC-REFL-has beg.PRTC Kazakhs SUBJ-them leave riding
 ‘The Kazakhs had begged them to let them ride their horses.’ (N, 381; A&H 2017)

7.3. SVO to VSO

Cause:

- loss of SAI → loss of evidence for Spec, TP

Consequence:

- gradual reanalysis of high subjects as topics, instead of argumental

Mechanism:

- subject spellout in situ (Spec, vP)
- gradual long distance Agree T-DP_{subject} instead of DP movement
- reanalysis of utterances as Topic-comment structures

Evidence of transitional reanalysis up to 19th century (Frâncu 2009)

- post-verbal subjects in the presence of non-clitic AUX (see ex. (16))
- double subjects that involve topicalization or correlatives (38)

- (38) a. *[Radul-vodă cel Frumos]_j [acesta]_j au făcut mănăstirea ot Tanganul*
 Radu-King the Handsome this has=built monastery.the at Tangan
 ‘King Radu the Handsome has built the monastery of Tanganul’ (Frâncu 2009: 340)
- b. *[Volodiovskie, starostele de Camenită,...]_j [el]_j au intrat...*
 Volodjovskiy clergyman.the of Camenita he has entered
 ‘Volodjovskiy, the clergyman from Kraskow, entered’ (N, 45; A&H 2017)
- c. *[Cine]_j cearcă, [el]_j află... și [cine]_j cere [el]_j dobândeste*
 who Tries He discovers and who asks he obtains
 ‘the one who tries discovers and the one who asks obtains it’ (Prav, 239/ Gheție 162)

→ the spelled out pronoun provides evidence for Spec,TP

→ it also provides evidence that the doubling phrase is a topic

Change:

- only the clue for the topic status of the DP remains,
- any preverbal subject is directly associated with a topic reading, without the need of further prompting from a resumptive element in Spec,TP
- slow stabilization for this parametric setting (much later than loss of SAI)

Problem: bare quantifier subjects (BQ)

- BQ in Spec, vP = narrow scope only (Alboiu 2002)
- BQ with wide scope need an A position at left periphery of clauses (Motapanyane 1994, Hill 2002)
 → quantifiers “indentifying without exclusion” (É. Kiss 1998: 252) or else failure to bind variable in TP

- A position reanalyzed from Spec, TP to Spec, FinP (Hill & Alboiu 2016)
 - BQ precedes *să*-SBJV in Fin (36a)¹⁰
 - BQ follows constituents in Topic and Focus (36b)

(36) a. *Cineva să stea < cineva > la ușă.*
 someone SUBJ stand at door
 ‘Someone should stand by the door.’ (from A&H 2017)

b. [*TOPP*Noaptea], [*FOCP*în mod sigur] *cineva se va împiedica de scară.*
 night.the in way sure someone REFL=will stumble on stairs
 ‘In the night, someone will certainly stumble on the stairs.’ (from A&H 2017)

Result for MR: subject positions after loss of Spec, TP

- Spec,vP as the neutral A-position (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 a.o.);
- Spec,FinP = A-position for quantifiers with wide scope (Hill & Alboiu 2016)
- Spec, FocusP above vP for subjects with information focus (Belletti 2008)
- Spec,FocusP in C for contrastively focused subjects (including *wh*-subjects);
- Spec, TopP in C for topicalized subjects (Cornilescu 2000 a.o.);
- Spec,ForceP for relativized subjects (Rizzi 2004)

8. Conclusions

Epiphenomena of AUX cliticization:

- i. Loss of XP scrambling through loss of Spec, AspP due to AUX=V adjacency
 - grammar shifts to complete discourse configurationality (in terms of É. Kiss 1998)
- ii. Shift from SAI to LHM
 - reanalysis of trigger for V-movement from [modal] to [focus] null OP
 (null OPs are lost by the 19th century, hence no LHM in MR)
- iii. Shift from SVO to VSO
 - loss of Spec, TP triggered by loss of SAI

References

- Adams, M. 1988. Les effets V2 en ancien et en moyen français, in P. Hirschbuhler & A. Rochette (eds), *Aspects de la syntaxe historique du français*, *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée* 7: 13-40.
- Alboiu, Gabriela. 2002. *The Features of Movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: EUB.
- Alboiu, G. & V. Hill. 2017. Grammaticalization of Auxiliaries and Parametric Changes. *The Linguistic Review*: 34 (3): 1-23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/tlr-2017-0007>

¹⁰ Spec,FinP as A position is available cross-linguistically (Rizzi & Shlonsky 2007 on SubjP). Also, Fin has mixed A/A' properties allowing for DP-movement across reduced CPs (=FinP) selected by raising verbs in Balkan languages (Bošković 2007). Hence, in OR and MR, Fin has dual A/A' status given that it is selected by verbs of both subject raising and control (see Hill & Alboiu 2016). This dual status likely follows from the encoding of both A' (i.e. [modal] feature) and A-properties (i.e. finiteness/agreement), as in Rizzi (1997).

- Alboiu, G.; Hill, V; Sitaridou, I. 2015. Discourse-driven V-to-C in Early Modern Romanian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 33 (4): 1057-1088.
- Avram, L. 1999. *Auxiliaries and the Structure of Language*. Bucharest: EUB.
- Avram, L. & V. Hill. 2007. An irrealis BE auxiliary in Romanian. In Araunovich, Raül (ed). *Split Auxiliary Systems*. 47-64. Amsterdam: Walter Benjamins.
- Bhatt, R. and R. Pancheva. 2006. Conditionals. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax* edited by Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk, v. I, Blackwell, 638-687.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2008. *Structures and Strategies*. New York: Routledge.
- Bošković, Željko. 2007. On the Locality of Motivation of Move and Agree. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 589-645.
- Cheng, Lisa. 1997. *On the Typology of Wh-Questions*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A' dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads. A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ciucivara, Oana. 2009. A Syntactic analysis of Pronominal Clitic Clusters in Romance: The View from Romanian. PhD dissertation, NYU.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2000. The Double Subject Construction in Romanian. In Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*, 83-134. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1990. Clitic doubling, wh-movement and quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 351-397.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Donati, Caterina & Carlo Cecchetto. 2011. Relabeling heads: A Unified Account for Relativization Structures. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(4): 519-560.
- Dragomirescu, Adina. 2013. O schimbare parametrică de la româna veche la româna modernă în sintaxa formelor verbale compuse cu auxiliar. *Limba română LXII* (2): 225-239.
- Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae. 2016. Interpolation in Old Romanian and Istro-Romanian. Paper presented at LSRL 46, April 3-5, Stony Brook, New York.
- Embick, David and Rolf Noyer. 2007. Distributed Morphology and the Syntax-Morphology Interface. In *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Interfaces*, edited by G. Ramchand & C. Reiss, 289-324. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Erteschik-Shir, Naomi. 1997. *The Dynamics of Focus Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frâncu, Constantin. 2009. *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521-1780)*. Iași: Demiurg.
- Gheție, Ion (ed). 1997. *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche*. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and Pieces of Inflection. In *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, edited by K. Hale & S. Keyser, 111-176. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Harris, M. 1978. *The Evolution of French Syntax: A comparative approach*. London: Longman.
- Hill, V. 2002. Adhering Focus. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33.1 : 164-172.
- Hill, Virginia & Gabriela Alboiu. 2016. *Verb movement and clause structure in Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Isac, Daniela. 2015. *The Morphosyntax of Imperatives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kayne, Richard. 1991. Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:647-687.
- Kiss, Katalin É. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus. *Language* 74 (2): 245-

- 273.
- Mišeska -Tomić, Olga. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-syntactic Features*, Dordrecht: Springer.
- Motapanyane, V. 1994. An A-position for Romanian subjects. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 25: 729-734.
- Nicolae, Alexandru. 2015. *Ordinea constituenților în limba română: o perspectivă diacronică*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Nicolae, Alexandru. 2019. *Word order and parameter change in Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ordóñez, Fernandez. 1998. Post-verbal asymmetries in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16(2): 313-345.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed). 2016. *The syntax of Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pancheva, Roumyana. 2005. The Rise and Fall of Second-Position Clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23: 103-167.
- Pesetsky, David. 1987. Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In E. Reuland & A. B. ter Meulen (eds.), *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 98-130. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press
- Rivero, M. L., 1993. LHM vs V2 and null subjects in Old Romance. *Lingua* 89: 217-245.
- Rivero, M.L. & A. Terzi. 1995. Imperatives, V-movement and logical mood. In *Journal of Linguistics* 31. 301-332.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1996. Residual Verb Second and the wh-Criterion. In *Parameters and Functional Heads*, eds. Adriana Belletti and Luigi Rizzi, 63-90. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*, ed. L. Haegeman, 281-339. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rizzi, L. & U. Shlonsky. 2007. Strategies of subject extraction. In *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics*, ed. H. M. Gärtner & U. Sauerland, 115-160. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roberts, I. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax. A comparative history of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Roberts, Ian. 2001. Head Movement. In *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, eds. Mark Baltin and Chris Collins, 113-147. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Roberts, I. 2007. *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, I. 2010. *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sevcenco, Anca. 2015. Restrictive and Appositive Relatives. *Formal Approaches to DPs in Old Romanian*. ed. Hill, V., 329-364. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Siddiqi, Daniel. 2009. *Syntax within the word*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Sportiche, Dominique. 1995. Clitic Constructions. In Laurie Zaring and Johan Rooryck (eds), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 213-276. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Todi, Aida. 2001. *Elemente de sintaxă românească veche*. Iași: Editura Paralela 45.
- Vance, B. 1997. *Syntactic Change in Medieval French: Verb second and null subjects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Zafiu, Rodica. 2014. Auxiliary encliticization in 16th century Romanian: restrictions and regularities. *Linguistica Atlantica* 33 (2): 71-86.
- Zamfir, Dana. 2007. *Morfologia verbului în daco-româna veche*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
- Zanutini, Raffaella & Paul Portner. 2003. Exclamative clauses: at the syntax-semantics

interface. *Language* 79(1): 39-81.

Textual References

- CCat Al. Roman-Moraru. 1982. Coresi-Catehism. In Gheție, Ion (ed), *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. 101-105. București: Editura Academiei.
- CEV Pușcariu, Sextil & Procopovici, Alexie. 1914. *Carte cu învățătură (1581)*. București: Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co.
- CM Drimba, Vladimir. 1998. *Coresi, Tâlcul evangheliilor și molitevnice românești*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Cod Tod Drăgan, Nicolae. 1914. *Două manuscrise vechi: Codicele Todorescu și Codicele Marțian*. București: Editura Academiei (Librăria Socec & Sfetea).
- C-PS Toma, Stela. 1976. *Coresi. Psaltirea slavo-română*. București: Editura Academiei.
- C-Tetr.2 Dimitrescu, Florica. 1963. *Tetraevangelul tipărit de Coresi. Brașov 1560-1561*. București: Editura Academiei.
- DIR Chivu, Gheorghe et al. 1979. *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. București: Editura Academiei.
- DRH Oțetea, Andrei et al. 1969. *Documenta Romaniae Historica A*. București: Editura Academiei.
- FT Gheție, Ion. 1982. *Fragmentul Todorescu (Carte de cântece)*. In *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. 336–343. Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Moxa Mihăilă, G. 1989. *Mihail Moxa, Cronograf*. București: Minerva.
- N Iordan, Iorgu. 1955. *Ion Neculce, Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. Bucharest: Editura de Stat.
- NT ----- . 1988. *Ștefan, Simion, Noul Testament (1648)*. Alba Iulia: Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe Române.
- PO Pamfil, Viorica. 1968. *Palia de la Orăștie 1581-1582*. București: Editura Academiei.