

Early Modern Romanian and Wackernagel's law

Gabriela Alboiu and Virginia Hill

Abstract

Historical linguistic studies consider that the use of enclitics in Early Modern Romanian is due to the presence of Wackernagel's law. This characterization fits in the tradition of Indo-European and Romance historical linguistics, where the presence of Wackernagel's law is determined on the basis of phonological criteria. This paper argues that, when we approach the same data from the perspective of diachronic syntax, there is no support for this claim. We draw a distinction between encliticisation and the second position requirement for clitics, and show that the tendency for encliticisation in Early Modern Romanian is the result of syntactic operations that front the verb or/and the phrasal constituents for reasons that are unrelated to the phonological properties of clitics. We identify the triggers for such movements in discourse driven syntax.

1. Introduction

Wackernagel (1892) established a phonological principle for Proto-Indo-European languages whereby clitics (i.e., phonologically non-accented items for him) occupy the second position in the clause. The element in first position, hosting the enclitic, could be a word or a phrasal constituent. The second position clitic rule reflects on contemporary ideas regarding the morpho-phonological properties of clitics in Medieval Romance languages, where clitics, which normally preceded the verb, were noted to follow the verb in main clauses in the absence of some other sentence initial constituent (Tobler 1875/1912; Mussafia 1888). Wackernagel's law has been successfully developed for explaining diachronic changes in Slavic languages as well (Slawski 1946 a.o.).

Romanian is genetically Romance but it had intensive language contact with South Slavic languages, in which Wackernagel's law is strongly represented (Bošković 2001; Browne 1974; Franks 2000; Pancheva 2005). While there are no studies where Wackernagel's law is tested for Romanian, in light of its genealogy and its geography, Early Modern Romanian¹ (henceforth EMR) and the previous stages of the language are assumed, in historical linguistics, to belong to the typological group with Wackernagel's law (Frâncu 2009, following Meyer-Lübke 1890, Sandfeld 1930). From this perspective, the fact that Modern Romanian (henceforth MR) has proclitics instead of enclitics, regardless of clitic position in the clause, shows a diachronic change, whereby the language switches to the typological group that does not obey Wackernagel's law (Frâncu 2009 a.o.).

An immediate question mark arises for this assumption from the fact that EMR (at least in its written form) was under intensive influence from Church Slavonic, which displays Wackernagel's law. In this respect, the justification for Wackernagel's law in EMR could come from language contact. However, South Slavic languages show a diachronic intensification in the second position clitic requirement, compared to Old Church Slavonic (Migdalski 2006; Radanović-Kocić 1988; Tomić 1996), whereas MR displays the opposite result, by abolishing Wackernagel's law. Why would the trend be reversed in Romanian, instead of being intensified?

More precisely, MR displays proclitics on verbs, which may occur clause initially, as in (1a) – clitics in bold; enclitics are also possible with certain verb forms, such as imperatives or gerunds (1b). Note that under the umbrella of 'clitics', Romanian includes not only pronouns, but short adverbs and auxiliary verbs as well (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994), which is also the range of clitics acknowledged in Wackernagel (1892). The clitics that help us test Wackernagel's law are the EMR/MR pronouns and the auxiliaries.

¹ The time span for Early Modern Romanian (EMR) starts with mid 16th c. (the time of the first written documents) up to the end of the 18th c. (Densușianu 1901; Chivu et al. 1997).

- (1) a. **L-am** chemat pe Ion.// **L-aș** **fi** chemat pe Ion.
 him-have called DOM Ion him-would have called DOM Ion
 ‘I have called Ion.’// ‘I would have called Ion.’
- b. **cheamă-I**// **chemându-I**
 call.IMP-him calling-him
 ‘call him!’// ‘calling him’

Since procliticization is generalized to finite verbs in MR, often resulting in the presence of clitics in clause initial position, as in (1a), it is clear that Wackernagel’s law is not operative in this grammar. Encliticization, however, is not prohibited, see (1b).

Contrasting with MR, EMR displays alternating locations for clitics around the finite verb when in clause initial position, either as enclitics, (2a), or proclitics, (2b).

- (2) a. **Află-să** această țară să fie fostă lăcuit și alții într-însa...
 happens-REFL this country SUBJ be.SUBJ.3 been lived and other in-it
 ‘This country happens to have been inhabited by others as well.’
 (Ureche/Panaitescu 1958: 67)
- b. **Să vedea** că după acest război fără noroc, ce făcuse
 REFL saw that after this war without luck that made
 leșii cu Stefan vodă, va fi perirea lor.
 Poles.the with Stefan king will be destruction their
 ‘You could see that after this unlucky war the Poles had made against king
 Stefan, this will be their destruction.’ (Ureche/Panaitescu 1958: 115)

The alternating locations of the clitic in (2) is seen in historical linguistics as reflecting a transitional phase from a stage of the language with strict application of Wackernagel's law to a stage where such a law is abolished (Chivu et al. 1997, Frâncu 2009, Todi 2001).

2. Questions

The mismatch between the disappearance of Wackernagel's law, on the one hand, and the general diachronic tendencies for Romanian under the impact of the Balkan Sprachbund, on the other hand, has not escaped the attention of historical linguists. The standard explanation in this respect is as follows: it is assumed that older stages of Romanian had only a short pronominal clitic paradigm that conformed to the second position clitic requirement. Note that there are no texts to confirm this hypothesis, since the first documents date from the mid 16th century. In EMR, around the beginning of the 17th century, an innovation occurs in this clitic paradigm, where a prothetic sound *î* [[*+*]] (high, central, unrounded) is added to some short clitics, making them stronger (though still accentless). From that point on, short and reinforced clitics may be used in free alternation, as in (3), where the clitic pair occurs in the same religious text.

(3) cu pizmă huluiia-**l** // cu pizmă **îl** huluiia (Frâncu 2009: 277)
with hate cursed-him with hate him cursed

In (3), the short clitic follows the verb, whereas the reinforced clitic precedes the verb. Thus, the phonological innovation allows the language to by-pass the second position clitic requirement in the relevant contexts, and by analogy, the proclitic use is extended to other contexts. Accordingly, alternations in clitic placement as in (2) and (3) reflect only on changes in the phonological properties of clitics (Chivu et al. 1997, Frâncu 2009, Todi 2001).

This phonologically based hypothesis leaves room for important questions. First, relating the innovation of prothesis in clitics to the change in clitic placement from post- to

pre-verbal runs into empirical inconsistencies. One inconsistency is that EMR short clitics are not banned from pre-verbal position before prothesis emerged. For example, in *cumu i-au dat împăratul slobozie* ‘as to.him-has given emperor.the freedom’ (Scrisoarea lui Neacșu, 1521 in Mareș et al : 51) the clitic cluster *i-au* ‘to.him-has’ forms a prosodic unit with the verb, not with the relative pronoun on its left, as would be expected under the theory of prothesis. In other words, proclitics were used in the 16th century in the same way they are used in MR, as *l-am* ‘him-have’ in (1), with the only difference that they do not often occur in the beginning of the clause. Another weak point in the prothetic hypothesis is that only a restricted series of clitics benefited from this innovation. Direct object clitic pronouns for first and second person, reflexives and third person feminine do not show prothesis. For these classes of clitics, nothing has changed in their phonology that would justify a change in their ordering. Rather, it looks like the proclitic use triggers the prothetic innovation, and not the other way around.

Wackernagel’s law provides an explanation for the tendency of avoiding clitics in clause initial position, but the data show inconsistencies in this respect as well. First, the writing style in EMR displays a requirement for transition formulae. In particular, *și* ‘and’ often begins a new clause, indicating its relevance to what has been said before. Clitics following this particle will then necessarily be in second position. Note, however, that this type of ‘and’ is considered neutral for Wackernagel’s law in Romance (Fischer 2003; Rivero 1993), since it doesn’t have a syntactic function in the clause. Accordingly, linearizations such as *Și se-au dus în sus pre Dunăre* ‘and REFL-have gone upstream on Danube.the’ (Scrisoarea lui Neacșu, 1521 in Mareș et al : 51) would indicate that Wackernagel’s law is absent in EMR before prothesis in clitics emerges.

Even if we were to accept *și* ‘and’ as a legitimate host for enclitics, there would still be inconsistencies concerning the application of Wackernagel’s law. The requirement for second position placement of clitics is systematic and rigid, whereas EMR encliticization displays random locations. For example, in (3), the first constituent is a prepositional phrase, but the clitic occurs on the subsequent verb, hence in third, not second, position.

Actually, the reinforced clitic, between the prepositional phrase and the verb, seems to obey Wackernagel's law better than the old short form. Data such as (3) clearly indicate that the rise of prothesis is independent of Wackernagel's law.

Another ordering issue concerns clitics with imperatives. Interestingly, the same word order as in (3) is maintained in MR with third person short clitics on imperative verbs, as further shown in (4). If the emergence of reinforced third person clitics is sufficient to allow for procliticization, why is this operation disallowed in this same context (4b)? Note that EMR imperatives disallow this alternation as well.

- (4) a. Cu pizmă huluiște-I!
with hate curse.imp-him
'Curse him with hate!'
- b. *Cu pizmă **îl** huluiște!
with hate him curse.imp

In (4), the imperative reading on the verb depends on its position in relation to the clitic: it is successful with encliticization (4a) but not with procliticization (4b). The latter triggers an indicative (assertive) reading instead of an imperative one. The contrast in (4) is not predictable under the phonological hypothesis.

To sum up, leaving aside the inconsistencies in the phonological justification for the clitic distribution in EMR, the main problems arising from classifying EMR as a second position clitic language concern the word order: either the enclitic position is not respected (since the enclitic may surface in third, fourth or other position), or the reinforced proclitic is banned from the predicted environments (i.e., in front of verbs). Since word order is a syntactic problem, a syntactic approach is necessary to clarify clitic placement in EMR.

3. Wackernagel's law in generative grammar

The syntactic approach we propose will be couched in the framework of generative grammar, although a technical treatment of our findings will be avoided. Wackernagel's law has already been translated to syntactic constraints in this framework, notably in Rivero's studies on Romance and Slavic languages (Rivero 1993 and previous work).

Rivero's main argument is that the position of the clitic reflects not only on phonological requirements (i.e., need of an adequate lexical host), but on morpho-syntactic requirements as well, mainly relating to the nature of complementizers (henceforth, C). The complementizer phrase (CP) is hierarchically higher than the rest of the clause (i.e., Inflectional Phrase – IP), that is, [CP > IP], where IP is the domain for verb inflection. The features of the head C attract either constituent movement (e.g., for operators, topicalization etc.) or verb movement (e.g., as a structure preserving device). The second position clitic requirement has the clitic attached to any of these items, specifically, to whichever constituent is in the first position in the clause (i.e., in CP). This is illustrated with the Bulgarian data in (5), where the clitic *e* 'has' attaches either to the XP *Petur*, (5a), or the verb head (X) *procel* 'read'.

- (5) a. Petur e procel knigata . **XP/constituent > clitic**
Peter has read book.the
'Peter has read the book.'
- b. Procel e knigata. **X/verb > clitic**
read has book.the
'He has read the book.' (from Rivero 1991: 323)

Importantly, the two items cannot co-occur in front of the clitic, as seen in (5c), which Rivero mentions is due to a syntactic restriction on doubly filled CP, independent of phonological restrictions on clitics.

- (5) c. *Petur procel e knigata. **XP > X > clitic**
Peter read has book.the

When verb movement to C applies, the verb may by-pass an auxiliary, as long as the auxiliary is a clitic, which is the case in South Slavic, as in (6b) for Serbo-Croatian. This is known as Long Head Movement (henceforth LHM).

- (6) a. Ja **sam** citao knjigu. - LHM (XP > clitic)
 I have read book.the
 'I have read the book.'
- b. Citao **sam** knjigu. + LHM (X > clitic)
 read have book.the (from Rivero 1991: 330).

Only non-finite verb stems may undergo LHM, as in (6b). That is, past participles in relation to 'have'/'be' auxiliaries (V > pronouns-'have'/'be'), or infinitives in relation to 'will' auxiliaries (V > pronouns-'will'). If a finite (tense inflected) verb stem moves to C, it is argued to do so for reasons having to do with structural requirements that amount to Verb Second (V2), not LHM. In other words, V2 and the second position clitic requirement are in complementary distribution (which is predicted in Wackernagel 1892, and discussed in Anderson 1993).

Rivero identifies two systematic properties for LHM: 1. It is restricted to root clauses only, since subordinate clauses have complementizers, which the clitics can use as phonological hosts; 2. Fronting of phrasal constituents and verb movement are in complementary distribution in LHM, since only one of them can be clause initial.

Technically, for LHM, the word order is either [V > pronouns/Aux > XP], or [XP > pronouns/Aux > V]. EMR shows both orders, as seen in (7).

- (7) a. Pus-**au** și pe trii boiernași de au tras V > clitic
 made-has also dom three lord.like.pl to have push.ind
 'he has also made three minor lords to push'

(Neculce/Iordan 1955: 106)

- b. Aşe **au** încetat turcii de a fugi XP > clitic
thus have stopped Turks.the of to run.inf
'thus the Turks stopped running' (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 284)

This word order indicates the need to investigate the EMR data from the LHM angle, especially because Rivero (1993) includes Romanian in the LHM group, with the inference that the second position clitic requirement applies in this language.

4. EMR, LHM and Wackernagel's law

Most of our data³ come from the Moldavian Chronicles written directly in Romanian in the 17th and the 18th centuries. Comparison with the use of clitics in translated documents will be resorted to as necessary to underline the influence of the Slavonic word order.

The main point of this section is that EMR displays LHM, but no evidence for Wackernagel's law. The arguments for absence of a second position clitic requirement in EMR are as follows:

- (i) Enclitics are not restricted to the second position in the clause. More precisely, LHM and topicalization may co-occur, as shown in (8). This should be ruled out under Wackernagel's law, since either operation can provide the phonological host for the clitic.

- (8) a. [Într- acei păstori ce au nemeritu locul acesta] *fost-au* și
among those shepherds who have found place.the this been-has and
Dragoș, carile au venitu de la Maramoroș,

³ The main source of data is the Moldavian chronicles (complete corpus) because they provide the most extensive texts written directly in Romanian. Other sources (religious, official texts) are used as well, as needed. Note that the clitic morpho-syntax is not subject to regional variation in EMR/MR, so, for this reason, the data may come from either the northern or the southern parts of the country.

Dragos who has come from at Maramures
 ‘Among the shepherds who found this place there was also Dragos, who
 alighted from Maramures.’ (Ureche/Panaitescu 1958: 72, 1359)

b. [Deciia] [Stefan vodă] **strîns-au** boierii țării.....
 so Stefan king gathered-has lords.the country.the.of
 ‘So king Stefan has gathered the lords of the country....’
 (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 91)

c. Pre acest Hrize foarte îl iubea Costandin-vodă,
 dom this Hrize much him loved Costandin-king
 [și] [de taină crediincios] **făcutu-l-au** boiarin,
 and of counsel trustful made-him-has lordship
 (*Letopisețul Cantacuzinesc*/ Onu 1970: 168)

(ii) EMR displays LHM in subordinate clauses as well, as in (9a), although the complementizer *că* ‘that’ is available as host to the clitic. (9b) shows that the complementizer may, indeed, support enclitics. LHM in subordinate clauses goes against the predictions of both Wackernagel and Rivero, and it appears in the early documents, when Wackernagel’s law was supposed to be observed more strictly than in late EMR. For example, in *Dosoftei* (text dating from 1679), *că* ‘that’ may head matrix clauses, providing the clause initial support, but this seems to be orthogonal to the clitic-verb inversion, which may or may not apply (9c, d).

(9) a. Scrie letopisețul nostru [**că** in anii 6947... **intrat-au** în țară oaste tătarască
 writes chronicle.the ours [that in years 6947 gotten-has in country army Tatar
 ‘Our chronicle writes that, in 6947, Tartar army has invaded the country.’
 (Ureche/Panaitescu 1958: 83, 1439)

b. Bine face **că-i** ocărește
 well does that-them scolds
 ‘he does well to scold them’ (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 104)

c. **Că rădica-să-va** de pre pământ viața Lui, totdeauna,
 for rise-REFL-will of from earth life.the His always

acmu și pururea și-n vecii de veci.

now and for.ever and in eras of eras

‘For His life will rise from the earth always, now and for ever.’

(Dosoftei/ Ursu 1980: [24])

- d. **Că Ți să** cuvine toată slava, cinstea și închinăciunea,
for to.you REFL befits all glory honor and supplication
‘For You deserve all the glory, honor and supplication.’

(Dosoftei/Ursu 1980: [44])

(iii) After phrasal constituents, short clitic pronouns may occur simultaneously in preverbal and in post-verbal position (i.e., double spell-out of the clitic in two positions), as in (10a). Alternatively, the clitic pronoun may surface only as an enclitic, whereas the auxiliary is proclitic (10b).

(10) a. și **i-au închisu-i**, ...

and them-has jailed-them (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 153)

b. pe alți mulți boieri muntenești **au prinsu-i**...

dom other many lords Wallachian has caught-them

‘He caught many other Wallachian lords’ (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 150)

The clitic in (10a) has a reinforced alternative with prothetic *î*, but the reinforced form is disallowed in this context. Wackernagel’s law cannot accommodate double spelling of clitic pronouns, nor the breaking of the clitic clusters as in (10b). LHM also fails to account for these configurations, since there is encliticization without verb movement to C.

(iv) Translation mistakes from Church Slavonic indicate that Wackernagel’s law was foreign to the grammar of EMR writers. Romanian translators strove to keep as close as possible to the word order of the Slavonic original. Enclitics seem to have made this endeavor very difficult. Consider (11): the entire clitic cluster (i.e., pronoun and auxiliary)

is repeated, once in enclisis, once in proclisis, in addition to allowing it to co-occur with topicalization.

- (11) părinții noștri.... **i-ai** **mîntuitu-i-ai**
parents.the ours CL.3PL.DAT-AUX.2SG bless.PRTC-CL.3PL.DAT-AUX.2SG
'you blessed our parents' (PH.xxi, 5 *apud* Densușianu 1997: 707)

Such confusions indicate hyper-corrections and the translator's lack of intuition in handling the enclitics and, presumably, the Wackernagel's law.

(v) Another example comes from the use of negation. Since negation serves as a phonological host for clitics, clitic-verb inversion does not apply in negative clauses, nor does LHM (Rivero 1991), as in (8) or (9) above. EMR translators, however, show confusion in this respect as well, as seen in (12), where encliticization is uncertain. (12a) shows lack of clitic-verb inversion in the presence of negation, as expected (which also holds for MR), but (12b) shows atypical encliticization, probably under the pressure of Slavonic clitic ordering.

- (12) a. nu **vă** temereți
 not REFL fear.IMP.2PL
 'don't be afraid' (Chivu et al. 1997: 342)
- b. nu ciudireți-**vă**
 not wonder.IMP.2PL-REFL
 'don't wonder' (Chivu et al. 1997: 244)

The examples from (8) to (12) are sufficient to show that Wackernagel's law is not present in EMR, even in its early stages. The way this rule is handled in the century preceding the Moldavian chronicles would be best characterized as hectic. To us, this means that a distinction must be drawn between Wackernagel's law and encliticization, only the latter being attested in the written documents.

That being said, LHM is present in EMR (7a), and so is V1 (finite verb movement to the first position in the clause), see (2a), which yields the encliticization on finite verbs. However, the reason for LHM and V1 is not Wackernagel's law but some other factor, to be determined in the rest of this paper. What we have established so far is that the change in clitic placement from EMR to MR does not concern the loss of Wackernagel's law but the loss of some other parametric setting that has to do with the location of the verb, not with the location of the clitic.

5. Tests for V2 in EMR

If Wackernagel's law does not apply to EMR, then encliticization is not distributionally constrained beyond the availability of an adequate phonological host, anywhere in the clause. Consequently, the alternation between proclitics and enclitics on finite verbs as in (2) cannot be accounted for by the phonological properties of clitics, but by syntactic triggers that concern the location of the verb in the hierarchical structure of the clause. Thus, the next step in our analysis is to account for the factors that trigger LHM and finite verb fronting to CP. In this section, we discuss the possibility of having V2 in EMR, which would explain why finite verbs move so high at the left periphery of clauses.

The theoretical background for this discussion will be extended from the CP > IP hierarchy to the cartographic representation of the CP. In particular, Rizzi (1997) points out that discourse pragmatics is encoded in the left periphery of clauses, in the same area where complementizers occur for clause typing. Thus, he splits the CP field to accommodate the operations at the left periphery, as shown in (13b), with TopP being potentially recursive. In (13a), we provide an example from MR to illustrate the word order.

- (13) a. Zice [că la mare cu Ion până la urmă să se ducă, nu cu Maria.]
says that to sea with Ion up to end SUBJ REFL go not with Maria
'He says that, in the end, she should go to the seaside with Ion, not with Maria.'

- b. ForceP > TopP > FocP > ModP > FinP (>NegP) > TP > vP
 that > to the sea > with Ion > in the end > SUBJ > (nu) REFL.go >...

The illustration in (13) resorts to an embedded clause⁴. Root clauses may display the same word order, but do not have a specific complementizer in Force in declaratives. However, the existence of ForceP is attested in interrogative clauses when the interrogative word (*wh*-word) is fronted to that level.

With respect to the position of clitics within the cartography in (13b), they are located in T, the head of TP, which equates IP in our theoretical background in the previous sections. This follows the more economical Minimalist system (Chomsky 1995). In this hierarchy, most inflectional features are associated with T (e.g., mood, tense, agreement). Kayne's (1991) location of clitic pronouns in Romance can now be converted to T. This extends to EMR, since clitics are hierarchically lower than negation, and their host is the verb, not the negation (which is not a clitic; see Isac & Jakab 2004). Clitic auxiliaries were shown to be in Agr/I in the Government-Binding clause hierarchy (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994); since [agr] features are associated with T in (13), auxiliaries are also in T. Therefore, in our tests V > clitic (pronoun and/or auxiliary) order indicates verb movement above TP, which could be to Fin or to a higher head.

The word order in (13) applies in the syntax of EMR as well, every time the constructions have proclitics on verbs. This is illustrated in (14).

(14) Matrix clause = TopP > FocP > FinP/IP

- a. Iar Vasilie-vodă nici cu un megiieș, precum am apucatu
 but Vasilie-king.TOP not with one citizen.FOC as have witnessed
 și noi aceia domnie, viață bună n-au avut,...

⁴ For more tests and information on the cartography of Romanian clauses see Alboiu (2002) and the references therein.

and I that reign life good not-has had
 ‘But king Vasilie, there was not one single citizen he pleased, as I myself
 witnessed during that reign.’ (Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 89)

Embedded clause = ForceP > TopP > FocP > FinP/IP

- c. Țara Muntenească, într-acesta anū, vara, la mare
 Kingdom Vallach.top in this year.TOP summer.TOP at great
 răutăți era de turci, că din doao părți avîndu oști
 damage.FOC was by Turks for of two sides.FOC having army
 Impărăția Turcului asupra Crăiei Ungurești, o samă de oști
 Empire Turk.the.of against Kingdom Hungarian a some of army
 despre Buda, iară altă oaste asupra Ardealului avè,
 towards Buda and another army towards Ardeal had
 [că și împăratul nemțescū oștile lui într-acolea
 because.FORCE and king.the German.TOP armies his.TOP there.TOP
 împotriva turcilor era orînduite.]
 against Turks-FOC were positioned
 ‘That year, in the summer, the Kingdom of Wallachia suffered great damage
 from the Turks, for the Ottoman Empire had his army against the Hungarian
 Kindgom, split in two: some of it was directed against Budapest, some of it
 was directed against Ardeal, because it was against the Turks that the
 German king had his army there positioned as well.’
 (Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 18)

Rivero’s LHM means verb movement to Force, since LHM occurs in
 complementary distribution with V2. Therefore, for the alternation between proclitics and

⁶ We have already mentioned that syntacticians consider ‘and’ to be neutral for
 Wackernagel’s law. One may object that ‘and’ qualifies as a phonological host, and should,
 therefore, count for the application of Wackernagel’s law or of encliticization in general.
 This is true for those languages where Wackernagel’s law applies and involves the level of

enclitics on EMR verbs, (13) tells us that the verb could either stay lower in the hierarchy (in I) or move higher up. MR lost the high verb movement option in most environments.

Let us now consider the possibility that the order [V > clitic] follows from a requirement on V2 in EMR. This exercise is necessary because we ruled out Wackernagel's law, which might rule in V2. In (13), V2 in declarative clauses means movement of the verb to Force, plus the presence of a preceding constituent in ForceP (e.g., in German). Such co-occurrence is possible in EMR (see 15b V2), but it is neither obligatory nor systematic. That is, the verb may also occur as V1 (no preceding constituent) or V3 (two preceding constituents) in similar contexts (15a, b).

- (15) a. **Asemă-nă-se** acel boiar cu Iuda care au vândut pre domnu-său. V1
 liken-REFL that lord with Juda who has sold DOM master-his
 'That lord resembles Juda who sold his master.'

(*Letopisețul Cantacuzinesc/Onu 1970: 157*)

- b. [Și] [într-acea vreme lăcuind el acolo], [pre 2 din frați
 and in-that time living he there DOM 2 of brothers
 carei mersese cu dânsul], **trimise-i** cătră Dumnezeu, V3
 who went with him sent-them to God
 iar [pre al treilea] **lăsă-l** să meargă în cetatea Solunului. V2
 while DOM the third let-him SUBJ go to fort.the Solun.the.of
 'And during that time, when he was living there, he sent to God two of the
 brothers who came with him, and the third, he let him go to the Solun fort.'

(*Letopisețul Cantacuzinesc/Onu 1970: 161*)

A further mismatch between EMR word order and V2 appears in *yes-no* interrogatives, as in (16). In V2 languages, these constructions display the verb in clause initial position, without a preceding constituent. EMR has the same restriction on the

location of the verb, but it extends the restriction to non-finite verb stems (i.e., LHM in 16b, c), on a par with the finite stems (16a).

- (16) a. **Cunoști-mă** pre mine, au ba?
know.2SG-me DOM me or not
'Do you recognize me or not?' (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 120)
- b. ...sta în cumpene și să mira ce or face, **fugi-or**,
stayed in doubts and REFL wondered what should do run-should
au **spune-or** lui Grigorie- vodă?
or say-should to Grigorie-king
'they were in doubt and wondered what they should do: should they run or should they tell king Grigorie?' (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 343)
- c. **Pus-au** oamneii săi și pușcile au ba?
put-has men.the his and guns.the or not
'Did he install his men and guns, or did he not?'
(Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 124)

V2 acts on finite verbs only, so the free alternation with LHM, as in (16), indicates that despite the location of the verb in the clause initial position, the trigger and, possibly, the level of verb movement must be different from what happens in V2 constructions.

The data in (15) and (16) indicate that the order $V >$ clitics in EMR does not follow from a V2 pattern. In particular, what we see in these data is a general fronting of the verb, on an optional basis (see examples in (2)), irrespective of its finite or non-finite stem. The result of this general verb fronting is encliticization, which may misleadingly suggest the application of Wackernagel's law.

6. Verb movement in EMR

If neither Wackernagel's law nor V2 justify high verb movement in EMR, what other factor can explain it, while also accounting for its optional occurrence, as shown in (2)? The answer we provide in this section is that EMR verb movement targets the Focus head in (13), not Force, as in Rivero (1993). Verb movement to Focus is triggered for discourse purposes, not as a structure-preserving device. That is why the movement is optional, depending on whether certain discourse features (i.e., a focus operator feature optionally associated with the CP field) are present or not in the derivation.

Our analysis will cease to distinguish between LHM and V1, since both verb forms seem to behave similarly for the purpose of movement. Instead, we shall attempt to provide a unified analysis for the instances where the word order is [V > clitic], and also, for the conditions that allow the [clitic > V] order. In this respect, we first survey the distribution of the [V > clitic] order in root clauses, according to the clause type involved.

Declarative clauses display an optional [V > clitic] order, as shown in (2). On the other hand, interrogative clauses differ, as the [V > clitic] order is either obligatory (i.e., with *yes-no* interrogatives, as in (16)) or systematically excluded (i.e., with *wh*-interrogatives, as in (17)).

- (17) **Cum ar hi** împăratu să hie drag tuturorora?
 how would be king.the SUBJ be dear all.DAT
 'How should the king be to be loved by all?'

(Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 33)

Negation systematically disallows the [V > clitic] order, even in the contexts where such order is otherwise obligatory (i.e., *yes-no* questions). This is shown in (18): in (18a) *nu* 'not' precedes a proclitic cluster at the beginning of an assertive clause; in (18b) it does the same in a *yes-no* interrogative; in (18c) the negation and clitics follow a *wh*-word.

- (18) a. **Nu i-au mai** trebuit istoric strein,

not to.him-has more needed historian foreign

‘He no longer needed a foreign historian’

(Neculce/Iordan 1955: 104)

b. **Nu v-am** spus ca acesta om de boierie nu este?

not to.you-have said that this man of lordship not is

‘Haven’t I told you that this man is not worthy of lordship?’

(Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 65)

c. Dară cui nu ieste urît a muri, **cine n-ar** **pofti** să viețuiască?

but to.whom not is hateful to die who not-would like SUBJ live

‘But who does not hate dying, who wouldn’t want to live?’

(Ureche/Panaitescu 1958:191)

Constituents with a topic reading may occur in front of the [V > clitic] string in declaratives, as in (15b). In *wh*-interrogatives, such constituents must precede the *wh*-phrase, as shown in (19); however, these constructions always have a [clitic > V] order.

- (19) [după sutele de ani] **cum** să vorū putea ști
after hundreds of years how REFL will can know
poveștile adevărate, de afîtea vacuri?
stories.the true of so.many centuries
(Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 189)

The evidence considered up to this point allows us to determine the target for verb movement by using the hierarchy in (13). More precisely, the [V > clitic] order indicates that the verb moves out of TP/IP (i.e., it is higher than the location for clitics). Although topic constituents can precede the [V > clitic] string, the landing site for the verb cannot be Top, because V-to-Top entails sequences such as V > *wh*-word, which are ungrammatical in EMR/MR (i.e., ‘yesterday came how he?’). That leaves us with two possible targets for verb movement: either Fin or Foc.

FocP in (13) is associated with contrast and other type of foci that involve operators and propositional scope. In this respect, we do not expect information focus in this position. Studies in the semantics of focus identify four types of focus operators: contrastive focus (CF), verum focus (VF), question focus (QF) and emphatic focus (EF) (Höhle 1992; Krifka 2007; Richter & Mehlhorn 2006). All these types of focus are present in EMR, some being realized through constituent fronting, some through verb movement, as we shall see in (20) to (23). The point is that structurally, a constraint that precludes two items to fill out the Focus phrase (because only one item can check the operator feature and link the variable) triggers a configuration where either constituent fronting to FocP or verb movement to Foc head may occur, but not both at the same time. This complementary distribution applies systematically in our constructions, and provides a sure indication that the verb targets the Foc head, not Fin, because the latter would have allowed for co-occurrence of contrastive focus constituents and [V > clitic] order.

The following examples provide evidence for the way in which FocP is lexicalized in EMR. First, consider *wh*-questions, such as presented in (18c), (19) and further in (20).

- (20) Deci trei domnii câte 500-600 de pungi de bani la
 so three reigns.TOP each 500-600 of purses of money at
 înnoituri, tot într-un anu, *cum* au putut hi bine?
 deadlines.top all in one year.top how.QFOC has could be well
 ‘So during three reigns, 500-600 purses of money for each, per year, at
 deadlines, how could that be well?’ (Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 100)

In (20), topic constituents precede the *wh*-phrase *cum* ‘how’, the latter checking the QF operator. Since the *wh*-phrase is in FocP, verb movement will not take place. Indeed, [clitic > V] is the only acceptable order in these constructions.

Next, the CF operator involves constituent fronting, as in (21). The word order is the same as in (20), with a topic constituent preceding the constituent with contrastive

focus. Predictably, the CF constituent occupies the same structural position as *cum* ‘how’ in (20) and systematically entails a [clitic > V] order.

- (21) De care lucru cunoscînd Stefan vodă cã ajutoriul **nu de aiurea**
of which thing knowing Stefan king that help.the not of anywhere.CFOC
i-au fost, ci numai de la Dumnezeu si de la Preacurata Maica sa,
to.him-has been but only of from God and of from Pristine Mother his...
‘Knowing king Stefan from this that help did not come from nowhere, but only
from God and his beloved Mother...’(Ureche/Panaitescu 1958: 95)

The VF operator triggers the derivation of *yes-no* questions. Generally, there is no phrasal constituent fronted to FocP for the purpose of VF, so the derivation resorts to verb movement to Foc, as shown in (16), which is another way of checking the operator. Hence, the [V > clitic] order is systematic, as mentioned for those examples. However, when a compatible constituent is used to check the VF operator, instead of verb movement – e.g., *adeverat* ‘truly’ in (22) - the word order reverts to [clitic > V]. Such examples are edifying for the mapping of verb movement, since they match the predictions arising from the syntactic constraints applying to the other types of foci operators.

- (22) în dooă-trei rînduri au trimis să vadzã, **adeverat** au sosit?
in two-three times has sent subj see truly -VFOC have arrived
‘he sent [someone] two-three times to see, did they TRULY arrive?’
(Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 118)

Finally, the EF operator may also be labeled *narrative focus*, and occurs in declarative sentences. In general, this happens when a new event is introduced in the story, as in (23a). It may also occur any time the narrator needs to highlight an event, as in (23b). As shown in (23a), the [V > clitic] order occurs in the introduction of the new event, but not in the following coordinated clause. The coordinated verb is only elaborating on the introduced event, and displays the [clitic > V] order⁶. In (23b), LHM is not motivated on a

grammatical basis, since there are constituents preceding the clitic, but only on pragmatic grounds: the inverted verb needs highlighting for the interpretation. In these environments, the verb stem moves to Foc, as argued for the [V > clitic] order in general.

- (23) a. Decia Stefan vodă **strîns-au** boierii țării [...]
 therefore Stefan king gathered-has lords country.the.of
 și **i-au** **întrebatu** pre toți
 and them-has asked DOM all
 ‘Therefore, king Stefan gathered the lords of the country and asked them all’ (Ureche/Panaitescu 1958: 91)
- b. Pentru-acea vrăjmășie și groază ce-i împlusă
 for that enmity and terror which-him poured
 inema diavolul de lăcomia ce avè, **urît-au** toți pre Duca-vodă.
 heart.the Devil.the of greed.the that had hated-have all DOM Duca-king
 ‘Because of that enmity and terror which the Devil poured into his soul, everybody HATED king Duca.’ (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 155)

To sum up, all four types of operator foci are realized in EMR. Two of them are realized through constituent movement to FocP (i.e., CF and QF), making the operator visible; the other two (VF and EF) are realized through verb movement to Foc, the operator being null. The negation, illustrated in (18) is able to take over the operator checking function, and move to Foc, instead of the verb. That is why in the presence of the negation the only possible order is [clitic > V]. This analysis shows that the [V > clitic] order in EMR does not involve real LHM or V2, in the sense that such movements target Force, whereas the EMR verb movement targets Foc. The former are justified through structure preserving constraints, the latter through the presence of discourse features with operator properties. The structure preserving movement is obligatory, the discourse driven movement is optional (insofar as the introduction of the respective pragmatic features in the derivation is optional).

7. Conclusions: Diachronic change

This paper aimed to demonstrate that Wackernagel's law is not operative in EMR. What EMR has is encliticization on verbs, arising from syntactic triggers. We identified these triggers as being the focus feature with operator properties, encoded high in the left periphery of clauses which, in certain contexts, trigger verb movement above the location for clitics. A host of peculiarities concerning the word order were accounted for in this way, while it was also shown that the nature of verb movement in EMR is different from LHM, V1 or V2 (which are all structure preserving operations).

In terms of diachronic changes, MR lost the [V > clitic] order in declaratives and in *yes-no* questions, as shown in (24a, b).

- (24) a. **Te- ai dus** la mare? vs. ***dusu-te-ai** la mare?
REFL have gone to sea gone-REFL-have to sea
'Did you go to the sea?'
- b. Din cauza asta, toată lumea **l-a URÂT** pe voievod.
from cause this all people him-has hated DOM king
'Because of this everyone hated the king.'
- c. **Bătu-te-ar** norocul!
beat-REFL-would luck.the
'What a scoundrel!' (let the luck beat you)

The loss of the V > clitic order in matrix clauses has nothing to do with Wackernagel's law. This change concerns the loss of verb movement to Foc in the respective configurations, and the interpretation corresponding to the lost syntactic operations is now recuperated from prosody only. Some traces of [V > clitic] order survive in idiomatic exclamatives, as in (24c).

Abbreviations

AUX: auxiliary, CL: clitic, DAT: Dative, DOM: differential object marker, FOC: focus, IMP: imperative, PL: plural, PRTC: past participle, REFL: reflexive, SG: singular, SUBJ: subjunctive, and TOP: topic.

References

- Alboiu, Gabriela (2002) *The Features of Movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: EUB.
- Anderson, Stephen (1993) Wackernagel's revenge. *Language* 69 (1): 68-98.
- Bošković, Željnek (2001) *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Browne, Wayles (1974) On the problem of enclitic placement in Serbo-Croatian. In Richard D. Brecht & Catherine V. Chvany (eds), *Slavic transformational syntax*. pp. 36- 52. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials, vol. 10.
- Chivu, I. & al. (ed.) (1997) *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche (1532-1780)*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Densușianu, Ovidiu (1997/1901) *Histoire de la langue roumaine*. Bucharest: Editura Grai și Suflet – Cultura Națională.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1994) *The Syntax of Romanian: Comparative Studies in Romance*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fischer, Susan (2003) Rethinking the Tobler-Mussafia Law. *Diachronica* 20 (2): 259-288.
- Frâncu, Constantin (2009) *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521-1780)*. Iași: Demiurg.
- Franks, Steven (2000) Clitics at the Interface. In Frank Beukema & Marcel den Dikken (eds), *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Höhle, Tilman (1992) Über Verum Fokus in Deutschen. *Linguistische Berichte Sonderheft* 4: 112–141.
- Jordan, I. (ed.) (1955) *Ion Neculce, Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. Bucharest: Editura de Stat.

- Isac, Dana & Jakob, Edith (2004) Mood and force features in the languages of the Balkans. In Olga Mišeska-Tomić (ed), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, pp. 315-338. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kayne, Richard (1991) Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:647-687.
- Krifka, Manfred (2007) Basic Notions of Information Structure. In Caroline Fery; Gisbert Fanselow & Manfred Krifka (eds.), *Interdisciplinary Studies of Information Structure* 6, pp. 1-12. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag Potsdam.
- Mareş, A. & al. (eds.) (1994) *Crestomația limbii române vechi*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei.
- Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm (1890) *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*. Leipzig: Reisland.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof (2006) *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Mussafia, Alfredo (1888) Enclisi o proclisi del pronome personale atono quale oggetto. *Romania* 27: 145-6.
- Onu, L. (ed.) (1970) *Cronicari munteni*. Bucharest: Editura Stiintifica.
- Panaiteacu, P. P. (ed.) (1958) *Grigore Ureche, Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. Bucharest: Editura de Stat.
- Panaiteacu, P. P. (ed.) (1979) *Miron Costin, Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. Bucharest: Editura Minerva.
- Pancheva, Roumyana (2005) The Rise and Fall of Second-Position Clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23 (1), 103-167.
- Radanović-Kocić, Vesna (1988) The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective. Ms. University of Illinois, Urbana
- Richter, Nicole & Mehlhorn, Grit (2006) Focus on contrast and emphasis: Evidence from prosody. In Valeria Molnar & Susane Winkler (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus*, pp. 347-373. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rivero, Maria Luisa (1991) Long Head Movement and Negation: Serbo-Croatian vs Slovak and Czech. *The Linguistic Review* 8: 319-351.
- Rivero, Maria Luisa (1993) LHM vs V2 and null subjects in Old Romance. *Lingua* 89:

217-245.

- Rizzi, Luigi (1997) The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, pp. 281-339. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Sandfeld, Kristian (1930/1968) *Linguistique balcanique: problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Klincksiek.
- Slawski, Franciszek (1946) *Miejsce enklityki odmiennej w dziejach języka bułgarskiego* [The Place of the Inflected Enclitic in the History of Bulgarian]. Krakow: Polska Akademia Umiejetnosci.
- Tobler, Adolf (1875/1912) *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik*. Erste bis fünfte Reihe. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- Todi, Aida (2001) *Elemente de sintaxă românească veche*. Iași: Editura Paralela 45.
- Tomić, Olga Miseska (1996) The Balkan Slavic Clausal Clitics. *NLLT* 14 (4): 811-872.
- Ursu, N. A. (ed). (1980) *Dosoftei, Dumnezăiasca liturghie (1679)*. Iași: Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei.
- Wackernagel, Jacob (1892) Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333-436.