

Grammaticalization of Auxiliaries and Parametric Changes

Gabriela Alboiu and Virginia Hill

1. Introduction

The canonical/neutral word order in the attested Old Romanian (henceforth, OR) and in Modern Romanian (henceforth, MR) is VSO, with alternate word orders derived through movement of subjects and objects to the CP field, as topics or focused constituents (for OR, see Hill & Alboiu 2016; Pană Dindelegan 2016).¹ Also, auxiliary verbs (henceforth AUX) are clitic in both OR and MR, and all the clitic elements are verb-oriented (for OR, see Alboiu et al 2015; for MR, see Ciucivara 2009). Traditional wisdom has it that, unlike Romance languages, which are generally SVO, Romanian displays the VSO word order setting and auxiliary cliticization typical of the Balkansprachbund (Mišeska –Tomić 2006 and references within).

Nevertheless, a careful look at the grammar of 16th century OR texts reveals occasional unexpected syntactic turns (see Todi 2001; Dragomirescu 2013; Pană Dindelegan 2016), unavailable to MR and puzzling for a Balkan VSO/clitic AUX grammar. These peculiarities coincide with the presence of a structure with interpolation, as in (1), where AUX is separated from the verb. This is unusual for OR (and MR), where AUX is clitic and adjacent to the verb moved to T.

- (1) *au scris lăsat că...*
has written left that
'he has left written that...' (FT, 5:1r)

The relevant properties we point out for constructions as in (1) concern the non-clitic status of AUX and consequent linearizations that indicate an argumental position for subjects in Spec,TP and constituent scrambling to the TP middle field. These properties disappear after the complete loss of non-clitic AUXs and the generalization of clitic AUXs, and we argue that this correlation is not coincidental but causal. Hence, this paper looks at how the parametric setting of a grammar may be affected by the cliticization of AUX.

Briefly, our working hypothesis is that non-clitic AUX in OR allowed for a grammar with SAI (i.e., AUX-to-C and the subject in Spec, TP), scrambling and neutral SVO word order, which is not surprising for an older Romance grammar.² The cliticization of AUX triggered AUX-V adjacency and thus destroyed the configuration for the above operations. The transition from one system to another is reflected in constructions with double subjects (allowing preverbal subjects to be reanalyzed as Topics instead of arguments in Spec,TP) and overuse of subject-verb agreement on both AUX and the verb (signalling verb movement above vP). Crucially, the

¹ 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 Harris (1978: 19) suggests that the change from SOV, in Classical Latin, to SVO, in Romance, may have happened in the Vulgar Latin period, by the 4th or 5th century AD. For SAI in Romance, see Roberts (2007) and references therein (e.g. Adams 1988, Roberts 1993, Vance 1997).

generalization of neutral VSO word order does not arise from a change in the directionality parameter, but is an epiphenomenon of AUX cliticization, at least in this language. Furthermore, the shift in the status of AUX triggers a shift in the type of head-to-head verb movement, from argumental T-to-C (considered residual V2 in Rizzi 1996), still present in the 16th century texts, to non-argumental Asp-to-C (Long Head Movement/LHM in Rivero's 1993 terms), of the 17th-18th centuries. The former targets Fin and is not sensitive to discourse effects, while the latter targets Focus and is incumbent on a Focus operator (Alboiu et al 2015; Hill & Alboiu 2016).

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the data, focusing on the properties of non-clitic AUX and related constructions. Section 3 provides tests for the merging site and verb movement levels for both AUX and the lexical verb. The results point to SAI, scrambling and genuine SVO in constructions with non-clitic AUX. Section 4 discusses the changes arising from AUX cliticization, whereas Section 5 summarizes the relevance of our analysis for the theory of diachronic change.

2. Data

The data used for this research come from a variety of texts, written directly in Romanian (DIR, DRH), or translated from different languages (i.e., PO translated from Hungarian; and Coresi texts translated from Church Slavonic - CCat, CEV, C-Tetr.2).³ We also borrowed examples from previous studies on OR verbs (Todi 2001, Zamfir 2007, Dragomirescu 2013, Nicolae 2015).

Philological studies debated whether the use of AUX with interpolation as in (1) is a property of OR or whether it is a syntactic calque from Church Slavonic (e.g., Frâncu 2009). Note that Church Slavonic has C oriented clitics (Pancheva 2005), so a calque analysis would allow us to keep the clitic status for AUX in (1), but change its position, from T to C, which would account for the interpolation. On the other hand, a language internal analysis of (1), with T-oriented clitics, has to account for the interpolation by assigning AUX a non-clitic status, so irrespective of its location, it can be separated from the verb.

More recent studies, especially in formal grammar (but also Zamfir 2007), bring arguments for the language internal origin of (1), with a non-clitic AUX (especially Nicolae 2015). The reasoning involves these criteria: (i) The use of the word order in (1) is not idiosyncratic to a certain translator and the language of the original varies (e.g., Church Slavonic or Hungarian for the texts listed above), which excludes the classification of these constructions as syntactic calques from the source language. (ii) The word order in (1) also appears in documents written directly in Romanian. Thus, the word order in (1) would rather indicate a structure that existed in early OR but for which only traces can be seen in the texts of the 16th century (i.e., the first attested texts).

Quantitative analyses were provided, especially in Dragomirescu (2013), to show that (i) the interpolation structure occurs in documents of different origins (i.e., in documents written directly in Romanian –DIR; in a Hungarian based translation – PO; in Church Slavonic based translations – Coresi); and (ii) the construction is unproductive (e.g., 8, 84% in DIR; 10,31% in PO; 10,88% in Coresi's texts), the default being a linearization with clitic AUX adjacent to the verb in T.

³ We were very careful with texts that show heavy calques from Church Slavonic, such as Coresi-*Psaltirea Slavo-română*, which is practically Church Slavonic clause structure with Romanian words.

We adopt these results and proceed to an analysis that provides syntactic tests to confirm the non-clitic status of AUX in (1), and to identify the structural consequences of this morphological property.

1.1. Non-clitic AUX

In OR/MR, the class of AUXs covers *avea* ‘have’, *vrea* ‘will’, *fi* ‘be’. The key examples, introduced in (2) and (3), concern the double status of AUX in OR, as clitic (2) or non-clitic (3). The contrast concerns the linearization of AUX in relation to the complementizer *să* ‘if’ and to the lexical verb: in (2) clitic AUX is adjacent to the lexical verb and separated from the complementizer *să* by other clitics, whereas in (3), non-clitic AUX is separated from the lexical verb (by the subject) but it is adjacent to the same complementizer.

(2) *să i se va tâmpla vreo perire* **default: AUX=V**
 if to.him REFL.3 will.3SG happen any misfortune
 ‘if any misfortune befalls him’ (PO, 158)

(3) *să voiu [eu] tinde afară mâna mea* **marked: AUX>XP>V**
 if will.1SG= I extend outside hand.the my
 ‘if I extend my hand outside’ (PO, 188)

Clitic AUX is by far the most common in texts, and it is the only form preserved to MR. That is why, in this paper, we count as non-clitic AUX only those auxiliaries that are visibly separated from the lexical verb, to be on the safe side, although we are aware that non-clitic AUX may also be coincidentally adjacent to the lexical verb.

Beside the contrastive linearization in (2), (3), further evidence for the non-clitic treatment of AUX in OR comes from constructions with verb deletion, as in (4), and constructions where only the verb is repeated under coordination, as in (5).

- (4) 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)
- c. *de-l va fi mutat sau de nu-l Va fi --*
 if=him= will.3SG be moved or if not=him will.3SG be
 ‘whether he will have moved him or he will have not’ (Prav.1646: 78/ Nicolae 2015:214)
- (5) a. *au rânduie și tocmit*
 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)

c. *va* *fi* *scos* *și* *gonit*
will.3SG be taken.out and chased
‘he will have taken out and chased (him)’ (IL 231: 7/Zamfir 2007: 314)

Unlike (4)/(5), clitic AUX yields ungrammaticality with verb deletion, and must be repeated in the coordinated structures (see also Avram 1999; Avram & Hill 2007).

1.2. Interpolation

Before proceeding with the analysis of non-clitic AUX, we must mention that in some texts we see not only AUX but also object pronouns being separated from the lexical verb, as shown in (6).

(6) *așa* *ne [tare]* *pedepseș<ti>*
like.this us hard
‘you punish us hard’ (FT, 5: 3v; Dragomirescu & Nicolae 2016)

Dragomirescu & Nicolae (2016) argue for a uniform analysis of constructions as in (6) and (3) under an interpolation approach: that is, constituents were able to intervene between AUX/clitics and verb because the verb remained in situ in v, while AUX/clitics are in T, so constituents may merge at the edge of vP and surface in-between them. We do not follow this line of analysis for both empirical and theoretical reasons. Empirically, the pronouns concerned are clitics; e.g., *ne* belongs to the clitic paradigm (in OR and MR), whereas the non-clitic counterpart is *noauă*. If clitics are T oriented in OR, as assumed in Dragomirescu & Nicolae (2016) and demonstrated in previous literature (e.g., Alboiu et al 2015; Nicolae 2015), the clitic lacks a phonological host in (6). Furthermore, if AUX and the pronominal clitic would be equivalent for deriving interpolation, then they must have the same morphological status, that is, they are both clitics, which cannot be the case, since (4) and (5) confirmed the non-clitic status of AUX.

From our observations, examples as in (6) occur sometimes in religious texts that translate or emulate Church Slavonic texts. In Church Slavonic, clitics are C-oriented and are routinely separated from lexical verbs, on the pattern in (6), since there is encliticization on the C head or on CP constituents (Pancheva 2005). Thus, examples as in (6) are calques from Church Slavonic, with clitics in C, which is a grammatical artifact where OR is concerned. Even the clausal negation *nu* is sometimes treated as a C-clitic, on a par with the negation in Church Slavonic. Crucially, there is no evidence that C-oriented clitics are genuine to OR, as amply demonstrated in both philological and formal studies.⁴ So interpolation as in (6) has no consequence for Romanian grammar. On the other hand, interpolation involving non-clitic AUX

⁴ OR displays consistent T-oriented clitics since its earliest attestations. The available data show that Wackernagel’s law and Tobler-Musafia law (which provide for C-oriented clitics) did not apply in the language of these texts (Alboiu et al 2015), unless the translations show calques from Church Slavonic.

is genuine to OR and had a significant impact on language change, as we shall show here. Furthermore, as argued below, the verb could move out of vP in constructions with interpolation, which falsifies the theoretical motivation for (6) in Dragomirescu & Nicolae (2016). Hence, in our view, the interpolations in (6) and (3) arise from different underlying structures: C-oriented clitics for (6) and a non-clitic status for AUX in (3), irrespective of whether AUX is in T or C, or whether the lexical verb remains in v or moves above vP.

1.3. Relevant properties

At the empirical level, we point out that the constructions with non-clitic AUX display some systematic peculiarities that have not been discussed so far, neither in traditional nor in formal studies. Furthermore, the use of non-clitic AUX coincides with the presence in the grammar of syntactic operations that disappear when clitic AUX is generalized. The list of peculiarities and relevant properties is given below:

- Non-clitic AUX is systematically adjacent to C-items, such as *să/de* ‘if’ in (3) and *wh*-phrases in (7), every time C contains clause typing operators.⁵

(7) ***când*** *va* [Domnedzeu] *căuta* *pre* *voi*, *duceți-vă* *afară*
 when will.3SG God search DOM you take.2PL outside
de *aicea* *oasele* *meale*
 from here bones.the my
 ‘when God will search for you, take my bones out of here’ (PO, 179)

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

(8) *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)

- Chronologically, non-clitic AUX coincides with the use of double subjects, as shown in (9a) for topicalization, and in (9b) with correlatives. Such constructions completely 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)

⁵ 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.

- 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, as in (10).

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

These observations point us towards tests that aim at SAI, scrambling to the middle field and change in the status of preverbal positions available to subjects.

2. Verb movement

In this section, we establish the merging sites and level of movement for AUX and the lexical verb. Knowing the exact location of AUX and of the lexical verb helps us identify the location for the constituent that separates AUX from the verb.

The clause hierarchy we use for this purpose is borrowed from cartography (Rizzi 1997) and has the representation in (11a). The curled brackets around Mod and Asp indicate that these are fields that can be split over various projections as in Cinque (1999). We do not resort to the finer-grained hierarchy in this paper.

(11) a. Force > Top > Focus > Fin > Neg > Agr/T > {Mod}>{Asp} > v > V

We also assume that discourse features may also have narrow scope over vP and be projected immediately above vP, as in Belletti (2008), and as shown in (11b).

(11) b. {Asp} > Top > Focus > v

Previous studies confirm the validity of (11a, b) for the clause structure of OR, and we just follow suite (Nicolae 2015; Hill & Alboiu 2016; Pană-Dindelegan 2016 a.o.).

2.1. Merge and/or Move for AUX in Old Romanian

There is a split in the group of AUX elements with respect to the site for their direct merge: *avea* ‘have’ and *va* ‘will’ merge high, whereas *fi* ‘be’ merges low in the TP field.⁶

We begin with ‘have’ and ‘will’: These AUXs are inflected for subject-verb agreement, but not for tense, and this applies to both clitic and non-clitic AUXs. Following Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) for clitic AUX in MR, we consider that lack of tense inflection indicates the direct merge of AUX ‘have’ and ‘will’ in the Agr component of T (see also Hill & Alboiu 2016 for OR, Alboiu 2002 a.o. for MR). The extension of this analysis to non-clitic AUXs is justified by the fact that, on a par with their clitic counterpart, they cannot change their form to indicate tense. For example, *am* ‘have.1’ does not have an auxiliary version *aveam* ‘have.1PAST’ to match the auxiliary alternations *have/had* or *j’ai/j’avais* in English and French, respectively. Thus, ‘have’

⁶ The conditional auxiliary *ar* is also considered to originate from the ‘will’ root (Zamfir 2007: 295)

and ‘will’ display a high degree of grammaticalization in OR since the earliest texts, even in their non-clitic version, and merge directly in the T head (or, rather, in AgrS in a split Infl analysis).

The strict adjacency between AUX and clitic pronouns, as in (2) can then be explained by the sharing of phi-features; that is, phi-subject for auxiliaries and phi-object for pronouns (Ciucivara 2009 proposes a Person projection for clitics). This would follow from the feature inheritance theory: Languages with T oriented clitics have two sets of phi-features transferred from C to T, whereas languages with C oriented clitics have only the subject agreement set transferred to T. This matches claims made more generally for Romance, where clitics are argued to reside in Infl (Kayne 1991) or high in the IP (Sportiche 1995). Predictably, AUX ‘have’ and ‘will’ occur in complementary distribution, since they compete for the same position, as captured in (12). This is verifiable for both clitic and non-clitic AUX versions in OR.

(12) [TP have/will [AspP...]]

The situation is different for *fi* ‘be’. The non-clitic version of this AUX carries values for aspect, tense, Agr contrasts, as shown in (13). The non-clitic status of AUX *fi* ‘be’ is determined by the fact that various XPs may intervene between this AUX and the verb.

- (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)
- b. *de-ai hi dommiata sârguit b.’ 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)
- c. *Ș-am vădzut și noi stâlpîi 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)

In (13a), *era* ‘be’ displays tense (imperfect) that matches the tense marking of the coordinated verb *cugeta* ‘reflected’. This AUX is also inflected for subject-verb agreement and entails aspectual features since it can discriminate, upon selection, between a gerund verb form in (13a) and a past participle form in (13b/b’, c). Furthermore, *fi* ‘be’ itself changes its form according to the aspectual value, as shown in (13b) with infectum forms *fi* versus (13c) with perfectum form *fost*. Accordingly, *fi* ‘be’ merges in an Asp head in (11), and may move up the hierarchy, to C (yielding V1) in (13a) or to T (lower than C- *să* in (13b’). The low merge site allows *fi* ‘be’ to co-occur with the other AUXs, which are merged higher, as it may stay in its in situ Asp position; see (13c) where *fi* ‘be’ lexicalizes in its in situ Asp position, while ‘has’ is in T. The variation in the level of lexicalization for AUX *fi* ‘be’ is summarized in (14).

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

MR has only preserved the invariable use in (13b), and *fi* ‘be’ cannot be separated from the verb by XPs, as it is systematically a V-oriented clitic.⁷ Notably, the cliticization of *fi* ‘be’ results in the elimination of its tense inflected form as in (13a), of its perfective form in (13c), and of its inflection for subject-verb agreement seen in (13b’/14b’).

Transitional stages in the cliticization of *fi* ‘be’ are attested in texts; for example, the cooccurrence of forms inflected or not inflected for subject-verb agreement, as seen in the same sentence in (13b/b’). Another transitional indication comes from the possibility of having optional inflection of the past participle for subject-verb agreement, as in (10) and further in (15).

- (15) a. *ceia* *ce* *vor* *fi* *botedzați* *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_k* *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)

The inflected past participle forms in (15) are active, not passive, since a direct object is present. Also, the agreement mark on these forms concerns the subject, not the objects, the latter having different phi-features. Notably, in these constructions *fi* ‘be’ is adjacent to the past participle, indicating that a clitic analysis is likely at work, but in a transitional stage. For example, (15b) has *fi* ‘be’ followed by two past participle, which is rather a clue for non-clitic AUX (see tests in (5)), whereas the agreement on these past participles and the adjacency to the verb indicate an attempt to reanalyze this AUX as clitic. Indeed, out of 25 examples of subject-verb agreement

⁷ There is a strict specialization of *fi* ‘be’ for irrealis in MR (Avram & Hill 2007), indicating that once this AUX grammaticalizes to a clitic, it loses its ability to check tense features and can no longer lexicalize either tense or agreement. A more ample discussion of this change is beyond the aim of this paper.

forms of this type listed in Zamfir (2007: 210), only one shows non-adjacency between AUX ‘be’ and past participle. The construction in (15c) disappeared after the generalization of the clitic status for AUX ‘be’, indicating that the cliticization attempt on *fost* ‘been’ failed.

A possible analysis for data with agreement patterns as in (15) is to assume a Distributed Morphology account involving fission. In particular, availability of several adjacent Infl heads could allow for Agr node adjunction after Spell-Out (Halle & Marantz 1993, Embick & Noyer 2007) on both T and Asp, with subsequent fission of the gender feature from the latter onto the past participle verb. Notably, [gender] can never be spelled out on verbs in T, but only on Asp (on past participle) when applicable. Once cliticization is stabilized, subject agreement systematically associates exclusively with T for spellout at the PF and the gender agreement disappears.

Basically, the marked agreement option in (15) arises at a time when both *fi* ‘be’ and *fost* ‘been’ are tried for cliticization. Only *fi* underwent the process successfully, whereas *fost* failed to become a clitic and has been eliminated from the grammar in its active/perfective function.

2.2. Merge and Move for lexical verbs selected by AUX

We use two criteria for assessing the level of verb movement: the position of in situ subjects (i.e., in Spec, vP) and the position of constituents moved to the discourse field above vP (see 11b). Whenever the verb precedes any of these items, it must have moved out of vP.

In the presence of clitic AUX, the lexical verb moves systematically out of vP. That is, subjects in situ are lower than the verb, as in (16). We know that the subject is in situ because it may be a bare quantifier that requires an argumental position in narrow syntax. That is, because of restrictions at LF, the bare quantifier must occupy an A position (Cinque 1990, Erteschik-Shir 1997), unless contrastively focused.

- (16) *s-ară* *fi* *grăit* *aimintrea* [_{vP} *cineva* *păntru* *noi*]
 if=would.3 be spoke otherwise someone for us
 ‘if someone would have spoken differently for us’ (DIR XLIV, 5,1600)

In the presence of non-clitic AUX, the default operation is also verb movement out of vP, as shown in (17) and (18). In (17), the verb precedes XPs fronted to the discourse field above vP, whereas in (18), the verb is higher than subjects in situ (i.e., in Spec, vP).

- (17) a. *Acesta* *va* [*ca cu* *seacerea*] *răteza* [*de pre* *lume*] [_{vP}pre *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* [*aciia*] [_{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)

- (18) a. *se-au* [*de voe*] *datu* [_{vP} *elū* *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] șzând [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)

There are some exceptions to this rule with non-clitic AUX, shown in (19), indicating the option of leaving the verb in v (also noticed in Nicolae 2015). For example, (19) displays a proclitic, signalling that AUX is in T, hence, the subject is low (not in Spec, TP). Given that the subject is a non-focused bare quantifier, it follows that it is in the argumental Spec,vP. Hence, the verb is lower, within vP.

- (19) *să-i va [vP cineva mânia]*
 if=them will someone upset
 ‘if someone will upset them’ (Pr.G. 66:18-19; Zamfir 2007: 304)

In the context of the foregoing analysis, the verb is always responsible for the checking of aspectual features (i.e., Asp head) since it can vary its inflection between perfective past participle (18a) and progressive gerund (18c). As with auxiliary *fi* ‘be’, we may consider that the lexical verb moves to Asp but its spellout location varies between Asp (i.e. high copy) and v (i.e. low copy), perhaps being optional as long as the auxiliary is not a clitic that needs phonological support. Note that (11) counts on a finer-grained analysis of the Asp field, so the fact that AUX *fi* ‘be’ and the lexical verb may cooccur in the inflectional domain, as in (18c) is not problematic, since each merges in a different Asp head.⁸

3. Word order

Having established the location of AUXs and verbs in the clause hierarchy, we turn now to linearization options available around these items. In this respect, we argue that non-clitic AUX could undergo SAI, preverbal subjects move to an argumental Spec, TP, and scrambling of XPs to the middle field applies in addition to fronting to CP or above the vP edge.

A general observation is that the word order is sensitive to clause type. The discussion is organized accordingly, starting with declarative clauses, and following with conditionals, interrogatives and relatives, pointing that C ‘that’ with non-operator status in declaratives does not trigger AUX-to-C as the other Cs with an operator feature do.

⁸ The exact locations for *fi* ‘be’ and the past participle are not important for this analysis, so we do not proceed to tests of word order in relation to adverbs. In Cinque’s hierarchy, we may suppose that the *fi* ‘be’ merges in T-anterior, which is in the middle of {Asp}-field, while the past participle merges in Asp-perfective. We do not commit ourselves to these positions though.

3.1. Declarative clauses: Scrambling

In declarative clauses, AUX can be preceded by the negation *nu* ‘not’, which is a free morpheme (Isac 2015 for MR; Hill & Alboiu 2016 for OR), and by clitic pronouns:

- (20) a. *și nu-l va [numai] proslăvi [vP Dumnezeu pre cea]*
 and not=him will.3 only bless God DOM that
 ‘and God will not only bless that one’ (CEV, 246)
- b. *ne-au [în har] slobozitu*
 us=has in happiness freed
 ‘he freed us in happiness’ (FT, 5: 3r)
- c. *N-ai [neci] lăsat să sărut feciorii și featele mele*
 not=have.2SG neither allowed SUBJ kiss.1SG sons.the and girls.the my
 ‘You neither allowed me to kiss my sons and daughters’ (PO, 106)

The word order in (20) confirms that AUX is in Agr/T (i.e., lower than negation and proclitics). Furthermore, the lexical verb precedes the in situ subjects, as in (20a), so it is somewhere in the Asp field. It follows that the constituent intervening between AUX and verb occupies a position in the middle of the inflectional field, supposedly Spec,AspP. That is, these constituents are not located in the discourse field above vP but undergo **scrambling**.

Any type of constituent may undergo scrambling. However, Zamfir (2007) reports a preference for adverbs. In declarative clauses, subjects are either low, as in (20a), or higher than AUX, as in (21). If adverbs appear between AUX and verb, as in (21b), we have no way to check whether they are fronted above vP or scrambled. In both cases, the reading involves some emphasis or prominence. The same applies to (21a). That is why we do not rely on this type of word order for our analysis, but look for constructions with more hierarchical clues, as in (20a).

- (21) a. *eu încă am [pre el] botezat*
 I even have.1 DOM him christened
 ‘I have even christened him’ (CM, 258r)
- b. *ačastă breaslă s-au [foarte] micșoratu*
 this guild REFL.3=has very.much decreased
 ‘this guild decreased a lot’ (CG, 269)

Nevertheless, these data indicate the following: (i) scrambling involves a type of movement that is compatible with adverbs, which points to an A’ position; and (ii) scrambling targets a Spec position versus adjoining to AspP, because only one constituent may intervene between AUX and the verb moved to Asp (i.e. there is a uniqueness constraint reminiscent of quantificational chains; this does not hold for adjunctions to XPs, which can be multiple).⁹

⁹ We did not find any exception to the rule established here for declarative clauses, but one may presume that for those structures that keep the verb in vP, more than one constituent may intervene between AUX and such verb, since there are other positions above vP available to Topic/information Focus constituents (see Belletti 2008); in fact, Alboiu (2002) shows that movement to a vP-related low IP position has A-properties rather than A’ properties.

The results of this section are summed in (22), which captures the word order of a declarative clause with non-clitic AUX, on the basis of the word order in (20a).

(22) [CP C [TP AUX [AspP **XP** [Asp verb [vP (DPsu) <verb>]]]]]

In the presence of clitic AUX, Spec, AspP for scrambling is not available, since adjacency between clitic and verb would be obligatory.

3.2. Conditional clauses: SAI and Scrambling

In OR, the conditional operator is signalled by the complementizers *să* or *de* located in Force in (13a) (Hill & Alboiu 2016). In the presence of non-clitic AUX, we notice obligatory adjacency between the conditional complementizer and AUX, as well as between AUX and the subject, which follows to its right, as in (23a). A scrambled XP may also be present in this structure, as in (23b, c).

- (23) 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)
- b. *nece să arî [cineva] [PP din morți] învie, nu va avea credinți*
 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)
- c. *S-au [neștire] [PPde întâiul ceas] lucratu, să ia astăzi*
 if=has someone from first.the hour worked subj take today
plată dereaptă
 pay deserved
 ‘If someone worked since dawn, he should receive the deserved pay today’
 (C-PS, VII 63v)
- 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)

The word order in (23) indicates that another position, beside Spec,AspP for phrasal movement, is available in conditional clauses, and this extra position is compatible with subjects. Furthermore, the subject can be a bare quantifier, as in (23b, c), which means that it occupies an argumental position that is preverbal, therefore different from Spec,vP. In other words, OR has not only Spec, vP as an argumental subject position (yielding VSO), but also Spec,TP with the same status (yielding genuine SVO). The bare quantifier freely alternates with other types of DPs in Spec, TP, such as pronouns (23a) and possessive constructs (23d).

Movement to this discourse field involves non-quantificational chains in the case of Topics, so it should not exclude scrambling (unless fronting to Focus occurs).

Accordingly, AUX is in C, since it is higher than Spec,TP. Taking into account the location of the conditional complementizer in Force, it follows that AUX is in Fin (i.e., there are no discourse features that would justify AUX in Top or Focus). Thus, conditional clauses display Subject-AUX Inversion (**SAI**). AUX-to-Fin can be motivated by the presence of a modal feature in Fin that acts as probe (see also Isac 2015 for the modal probe in *să*-imperatives).^{10, 11}

The conclusion is that non-clitic AUX allowed for genuine SVO (i.e. the subject is in A-related Spec,TP), as seen in other Romance languages. The underlying structure of a conditional clause is provided in (24).

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

Confirmation for SAI in clauses with C-operators comes from the contrast of word order between (23) and (25), the latter displaying declarative C-‘that’ with no operator feature. Although both clause types have their complementizers in Force, only the declarative allows for fronted material to intervene between the complementizer and AUX, as shown in (25), whereas the conditionals in (23) require adjacency.

(25) a. *că* [_{TopP} *voi*] [_{FocP} *încă*] *ați* [_{AspP} *aceasta*] *cerut*
 that you again have.2PL this required
 ‘that you required this again’ (PO 120)

b. *Dumnezeu* *făgăduitu-ne-au* *că* *ne va* [_{pre} *noi*] *asculta*
 God promised=to.us=has that us=will DOM us Listen
 ‘God promised us that he will listen to us’ (CCat, 9v–10r)

In (25a), Topic and Focus constituents precede AUX, whereas in (25b) a proclitic pronoun is also present with AUX. The combination of these indications leads us to conclude that non-clitic AUX is in Agr/T in the presence of ‘that’, but moves to Fin in the presence of conditional *să*.

Furthermore, the fact that negation and clitics are absent in *să*-conditionals with non-clitic AUX may also be taken as a clue that AUX-to-Fin applies in these structures. The interference between negation and V-to-C has been thoroughly documented cross-linguistically (see Rivero & Terzi 1995, Isac 2015 for Balkan languages), since Neg qualifies as a goal for the modal probe feature in Fin and moves there instead of the verbal element.

Another typical indication for AUX-to-Fin would be the presence of enclitics versus proclitics, on the assumption that clitics occupy a head in TP, and are thus left behind by AUX in C. This is not available in OR, but at the same time, proclitics are absent as well, although they are routinely seen in declaratives with non-clitic AUX, as in (20a) and further in (26).

(26) *mă vor* [_{cu} *pietri*] *împroșca*.
 me=will.3PL with stones assault
 ‘they will assault me with stones’ (PO 235)

¹⁰ In the presence of clitic AUX, the modal feature of Fin is checked by *să* ‘if’ which may or may not move to Force. The tendency to leave *să* in Fin resulted in its reanalysis as a subjunctive irrealis complementizer (Hill & Alboiu 2016) and its replacement with *de* in conditional clauses.

¹¹ Note that this does not contradict Alboiu et al (2015) who argue against V-to-Fin and for V-to-Foc in OR; the timeline is different, as previously mentioned, as is the clause-type and trigger.

We take this absence to indicate that Spec, TP projects as an A-position, thus blocking the required clitic-AUX adjacency with SAI. More precisely, Spec,TP is projected and it intervenes between AUX and the Clitic Phrase, while also not qualifying as a host for the clitics. Hence, the fact that enclitics are not available in our data indicates that, at this point in time, the subject obligatorily moves to Spec, TP in clauses with C typing operators and non-clitic AUX. Arguably a grammar with non-clitic AUX goes hand in hand with the presence of a nominal feature (i.e. EPP) on T. Since AUX had mostly cliticized at this time (i.e. clitic AUX is the default option), their presence is ruled out in these constructions, as is typical of canonical SVO.¹²

3.3. Interrogative clauses

The presence of clause operators in the CP of interrogative clauses entails the same constraints on word order as in conditionals: AUX is obligatorily adjacent to the preceding *wh*-phrase, and the subject is adjacent to AUX on its right side. The peculiarity of this structure is the absence of scrambling, so only the subject intervenes between AUX and verb, as in (27).

- (27) *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)

The absence of scrambling can be justified by assuming that *wh*-movement out of vP occurs cyclically through A'-Specs with operator features, and that includes the relevant Spec, AspP. If Spec, AspP is occupied with a scrambled XP, then *wh*-movement is blocked. This analysis finds confirmation in an example as in (28): *amu* ‘now’ is a temporal adverb directly merged in TP (e.g., Spec, TP-present in Cinque 1999), so it is not scrambled. Hence, it does not interfere with the *wh*-movement of *ce* ‘what’. That is, constituents are allowed in the middle TP field of interrogative clauses as long as they are not scrambled.

- (28) *Ce va [amu] fi noao?*
 what will now be for.us
 ‘What will be for us now?’ (CEV, 220)

SAI in interrogative clauses is captured in (29a), whereas the interference between scrambling and *wh*-movement is schematized in (29b).

- (29) a. $[\text{ForceP/FocP } \mathbf{WH} [\text{FinP AUX } [\text{TP DP}_{\text{SU}} [\text{T} \langle \text{AUX} \rangle [\text{AspP V } [\text{vP} \dots]]]]]]]$
 b. $*[\text{ForceP/FocP } \mathbf{WH} [\text{FinP AUX } [\text{TP DP}_{\text{SU}} [\text{T} \langle \text{AUX} \rangle [\text{AspP } \mathbf{XP} [\text{Asp V } [\text{vP} \dots]]]]]]]$

¹² The alternative would be for AUX to move to C as a complex head with the proclitics (e.g., as in French *le lui a-t-il donné?* ‘Did he give it to him?’), which, for some reason, does not occur in OR. However, that would also entail the absence of non-clitic constituents in Spec, TP (e.g., Fr. **le lui a Jean donné?* ‘Did Jean give it to him?’).

3.4. Relative clauses

So far, we have established that non-clitic AUX allows for scrambling to Spec,AspP and that this operation applies any time it does not compete with *wh*-movement. Also, we showed that AUX-to-Fin takes place in the presence of clause typing operators, which may result in SAI. Crucially, SAI does not exclude scrambling unless it conflicts with *wh*-movement (e.g., it can occur in conditionals but not in interrogatives).

Following from this analysis, clauses with C-operators are expected to display variation with respect to scrambling, depending on whether *wh*-movement is at work or not. Relative clauses stand out in this respect, since OR can derive relatives in two ways: with or without *wh*-movement (i.e., either a raising or a matching structure). In OR, any relevant *wh*-phrase could enter either type of derivation in relatives (Sevcenco 2015), while in MR the situation is sorted out: interrogative/relative pronouns trigger raising (e.g., *cine* ‘who’, *ce* ‘what’), whereas the exclusively relative pronouns (e.g., *care* ‘which’) trigger matching. The latter is D-linked in the sense of Pesetsky (1987) (see Dobrovie-Sorin 1990 for MR).

Returning to the topic of this article, the word order in the presence of non-clitic AUX varies insofar as scrambling may or may not be present, as in (30). We take the presence of scrambling in (30b) to denote a directly merged *ce* ‘what’ with a matching chain. SAI is, however, systematic.

- (30) 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)
- 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)

This is unsurprising given the anaphoric chain analysis for operators on Spec,ForceP (versus Spec,FocusP) proposed in Rizzi (1997), as well as the observation in Bhatt & Pancheva (2005) whereby conditionals and free relatives have identical feature content.

3.5. Section summary

The data discussed in this section indicate the following word order properties in the presence of non-clitic AUX:

- There is AUX-to-C 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 C. This subject cannot be in Spec,vP, because it is higher than V in Asp.
- AUX-to-C and subject in Spec,TP linearizes as SAI.
- Descriptively speaking, the non-adjacency between non-clitic AUX and V in Asp creates a space available for scrambling; technically, this amounts to availability of Spec,AspP for A’ scrambling.

- Scrambling occurs in complementary distribution with *wh*-movement because it involves A' movement of quantificational type.

These observations are formally summarized in (31), where two TP internal positions for constituent movement are visible: one in Spec,TP, for subjects; the other in Spec,AspP for any other XP constituent.

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

The hierarchy in (31) represents a declarative clause, with AUX in T. Any other clause type has the same hierarchy, but non-clitic AUX moves from T to Fin in the presence of clause typing operators, and the scrambled XP in (31) is blocked vP internally in the presence of *wh*-movement to CP.

4. Diachronic change

In this section, we review the areas affected by the cliticization of AUX with the aim of identifying the points where parametric settings have shifted. We identify and discuss the following three changes:

- (i) The suppression of Spec,AspP for scrambling left the CP domain as the only target for fronting constituents with wide scope discourse effects.
- (ii) AUX-to-C is replaced with V-to-C in a way that introduces LHM in the language.
- (iii) The loss of Spec,TP as an argumental position results in the reanalysis of preverbal subjects as Topics in the CP domain.

4.1. Loss of scrambling

Obligatory adjacency between clitics (including AUX) and verbs eliminated Spec,AspP to which scrambling took place (see (31)). Indeed, no XP can intervene between clitics (be they pronouns, AUX or short adverbs) and the verb stem. Thus, fronted constituents may either precede or follow the clitic>Verb string as a whole. Accordingly, such constituents are analyzed either in the discourse area above vP (if they have narrow scope) or in the CP field (if they have wide scope).

Short-lived constructions with subject-verb agreement on the past participle, as pointed out in (15) and further in (32), attest to the loss of Spec,AspP.

(32) *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)

In (32), the phi-features associated with 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 (Distributed Morphology; Siddiqi 2009). The exploitation of this option in (32) is an indication for the learner that *fi* ‘be’ is adjacent to the verb, with no intervening Spec position, therefore, a clitic. Once the clitic status of *fi* is stabilized, this double Agr marking disappears, and the heads are fused at PF.

4.2. From T-to-C to Asp-to-C

We next consider what happens with V-to-C when AUX becomes an unambiguous clitic, since clitic AUXs do not qualify for movement to C (hence, LHM in Rivero 1993 and previous work). That is, clitic AUX in OR is always in the TP field.

In this respect, 16th century OR texts display V-to-C, whereby either non-clitic AUX or the simple form of the lexical verb moves to Fin (Zafiu 2014; Nicolae 2015). While AUX-to-Fin could be fairly easily predicted, V-to-Fin is less systematic in its application. AUX-to-Fin has been shown above in constructions with clause typing operators, while V-to-Fin, illustrated in (33a), applies in similar but also in other environments. Furthermore, (33b) shows what happens in the presence of a clitic AUX: AUX belongs to the clitic cluster and remains attached to T, whereas the infinitive verb form (i.e. the lexical modal verb *putea*) undergoes LHM.

- (33) a. *[_{FocP} până când [_{TopP} păcătoșii [_{FinP} laudă [_{TP} -se?]]]]*
 until when sinners.the boast -themselves
 ‘until when will sinners keep boasting?’ (CEV, 24)
- 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)

In (33a, b), V-to-Fin is indicated by the word order: constituents with contrastive focus or topic reading precede the verb (either finite or non-finite), while the clitic cluster follows it.

Recent studies argue that the non-systematic application of V-to-Fin in the 16th century arises from the loss of clues for its triggers (considered to be V2 in Nicolae 2015, but [modal] in Hill & Alboiu 2016, the latter changing to long distance Agree with T), and that reanalysis takes place by which the trigger is re-identified as the Focus operator in the CP domain. Thus, in 17th century texts, V-to-Fin becomes V-to-Focus. However, V-to-Focus only applies in the presence of null, base-generated operators in Spec,FocusP; that is, verb movement is in complementary distribution with *wh*-movement, fronting to Focus and negation (Alboiu et al 2015). Crucially, this movement is not due to some discourse feature on V (i.e. the lexical verb is not focused) but applies to AUX as well (in response to a probe in Focus) as long as AUX is not a clitic.¹³ This is shown in (34), where *fost* ‘been’ is still present in the grammar as a free morpheme.

- (34) *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)

In (34), we see that the highest non-clitic Infl head (i.e. Asp, or Neg when available) in the hierarchy qualifies for head movement to-Focus, irrespective of its lexical status. That is, although *fost* ‘been’ is an AUX, it is, however, a free morpheme and undergoes LHM. As

¹³ 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 AUX and NEG could be probed (whichever head was closer to the probe).

already mentioned, *fi* ‘be’ became a clitic, while *fost* ‘been’ failed the process and was shortly eliminated from the paradigm of AUX in the language.

Accordingly, we can establish that, in 16th century texts, AUX/V-to-Fin involved T-to-Fin, whereas LHM, which emerges after the cliticization of AUX, involves Asp-to-Fin. In the 17th century, the loss of non-clitic AUX weakens the evidence for T-to-Fin, while the evidence for LHM/Asp-to-Focus remains stable. Hill & Alboiu (2016) notice that very few examples of simple verb forms are seen in C in the 17th century (i.e., T-to-Fin is in decline), the bulk of V-to-C consisting of LHM operations.

The generalization of Asp-to-Focus indicates that the type of chain arising from the head-to-head movement of the verb has also changed: while T-to-Fin concerns two argumental positions (insofar as they are associated with phi-features and tense/finiteness), Asp-to-Focus concerns two non-argumental positions (insofar as they are associated with operators). Interestingly, OR displays a shift from A to A’ verb movement to C, indicating that, on par with phrasal movement, syntactic head movement is equally split into A- versus A’- movement.

4.3. SVO to VSO

VSO is an option in OR, attested from the most ancient texts, and, according to this paper, so is genuine (versus topic triggered) SVO. This double option for word order is not surprising, as it occurs in most Romance languages (Ordóñez 1998 for Spanish, a.o.). However, even in OR, VSO rather than SVO is the default option (see statistics in Nicolae 2015), and it becomes the only linearization for subjects in A-positions in MR.

According to our analysis, SVO depends on the evidence for Spec,TP, which comes mainly from SAI constructions. The cliticization of AUX triggers the loss of SAI (i.e., clitic AUX cannot move to C), hence the loss of clues for the existence of Spec,TP. Transitional stages for this loss are attested in texts, and they show the gradual reanalysis of high subjects as topics, instead of argumental. This can be seen in (35), in constructions with double subjects that involve topicalization or correlatives.

- (35) 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, staroste de Camenită, ...]_j [el]_j au intrat...*
 Volodjovsky clergyman.the of Camenita he has entered
 ‘Volodjovsky, the clergyman from Kraskow, entered’ (N, 45)
- 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)

In (35), the aboutness reading of the first constituent containing the subject (be it a DP or a relative CP) is signalled by the insertion of the subject pronoun in argumental Spec,TP. These constructions provide two clues: (i) the spelled out pronoun provides evidence for Spec,TP; however (ii) it also provides evidence that the doubling phrase is a topic. Gradually, only the analysis as topic remains, so any preverbal subject is directly associated with a topic reading,

without the need of further prompting from a resumptive element in Spec,TP. These constructions are lost by the 19th century (Frâncu 2009), much after the generalization of clitic AUX, which is expected considering that the snow-balling effects of parametric switches take long up to full stabilization.

Crucially, the completion of this change triggered a further reanalysis of the functional projections in order to accommodate bare quantifier subjects that need to be clause initial for certain wide scope readings. That is, when left in Spec,vP, bare quantifiers take narrow scope (Alboiu 2002). On the other hand, positions at the left periphery provide wide scope and are restricted to quantifiers “indentifying without exclusion” (É. Kiss 1998: 252), or else they would not be able to bind a TP-internal variable. What we notice is that, since Spec,TP is unavailable, these quantifier subjects target Spec,FinP in MR. This position is clarified in the presence of the subjunctive complementizer *să* directly merged in Fin (Hill & Alboiu 2016; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 as the C/I mixed head). The bare quantifier precedes the complementizer, as in (36a). Predictably, Topic and Focus constituents may precede this subject, as in (36b).¹⁴

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

The use of Spec,FinP as an argumental position is a marked option available cross-linguistically, if we consider the data discussed in Rizzi & Shlonsky (2007) and the properties of their SubjP. Furthermore, Fin has been shown to have mixed A/A’ properties allowing for DP-movement across reduced CPs (=FinP) selected by raising verbs in Balkan languages (Bošković 2007). We assume that, in both 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). In sum, loss of Spec, TP as the neutral A-position for subjects has led to the following subject positions in MR:

- Spec,vP as the neutral A-position (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 a.o.);
- Spec,FinP = A-position for quantifiers with wide scope;
- 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.

¹⁴ For an analysis of preverbal bare quantifier subjects in argumental positions see Motapanyane (1994), Hill (2002).

5. Theoretical implications

This paper argued that the cliticization of AUX snow-balled into a series of changes in the grammar. The shift from both SVO & VSO as permissible linearizations for subject A-positions to exclusively VSO is one of them. According to our analysis, this particular change does not involve a switch in the setting of the directionality parameter but is an epiphenomenon of AUX cliticization, entailed by the loss of Spec,TP. In the same vein, AUX cliticization eliminated the Spec,AspP position for scrambling and triggered the generalization of fronting to the CP field, further entailing the shift of this grammar to complete discourse configurationality (in terms of É. Kiss 1998).

These changes also affected the type of verb movement: In the 16th c. T-to-C (SAI) of either V or AUX extends the Infl field in the presence of clausal operators. In the 17th c. Fin replaces T as the host for quantificational subjects and T-to-C is gradually phased out in favour of LHM, where the A'-Asp head moves to Focus. An asymmetry thus emerges between T-to-C/Fin and Asp-to-C/Focus with interesting theoretical implications: since Agr/T is an A Head, T to C movement resembles A-movement in these contexts, while the Asp head undergoes A' Head movement. This brings independent support for the analysis in Roberts (2001, 2010), where locality of head movement is defined according to the head type: operator versus non-operator head. However, Roberts keeps the labels domain specific: Op for C, non-Op for Infl, while OR shows that both C and Infl can host either type. Nonetheless, on par with phrasal movement, syntactic T to C head movement is equally split into A- versus A'- movement, potentially a non-trivial observation for linguistic theory.

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.; 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, Ž. 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, A. 2000. The Double Subject Construction in Romanian. In *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.
- 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 rumânesc*. 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, Letopiseșul 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.