

(Non)Clitic Status of Auxiliaries and A versus A-bar Head Movement

Gabriela ALBOIU (YorkU, galboiu@yorku.ca) and Virginia HILL (UNB, mota@unb.ca)

Introduction. The canonical word order has always been VSO in the attested Old and Modern Romanian (OR & MR), with alternate word orders derived through movement of mainly subjects and objects to CP. The traditional wisdom is that, unlike most of Romance, which is SVO, Romanian displays the Balkan Sprachbund setting for word order. However, a careful look at the grammar of 16th century OR reveals occasional unexpected syntactic turns, unavailable to MR and puzzling for a Balkan VSO grammar; these are: (i) subject-Aux inversion (SAI), (ii) phrasal movement/scrambling within TP and not just to CP, and (iii) subject doubling with strong pronouns. Here, we argue that these properties are not random but specific to an earlier SVO parametric setting, active during the Romanization period and correlated to the non-clitic status of auxiliaries and to the change in the type of verb movement, from A to A-bar.

Data. (i) *SAI* is usually seen in SVO languages, where Aux-to-C leaves the preverbal subject in Spec,TP (Rizzi 1982). In OR, this inversion coincides with short *wh*-movement (1) or the presence of conditional operators (6).

(1) meargeți la Iosif și ce va el dzice voao aceaia faceți
go.IMP.PL to Iosif and what will.3SG he say to.you that do.IMP.PL
'go to Joseph and do what he tells you' (PO,145)

(ii) *Scrambling*. Constituents front within TP, between Aux and the verb. V is in the TP field as it precedes vP related adverbs and in situ subjects (for the latter see 2).

(2) așa se-au tare puternicit [v_ffoametea t_v în pământul Canaanului]
thus REFL=has strongly accrued hunger.the in land.the Canaan.the.GEN
'thus the hunger strongly accrued in the lands of Canaan' (PO, 166)

(iii) *Doubled subjects*. This peculiarity shows a gradation: in 16th c. texts, the doubled subjects are *wh*-phrases/relative pronouns undergoing short *wh*-movement and yielding a correlative construction (3). In 18th c. texts, the correlative construction is phased out and the subject is left dislocated, but it is resumed by a strong pronoun (4). (Romanian lacks subject clitics).

(3) Carii rămănu în păcate de duhul svânt ei 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 – Chivu 162)

(4) că darurile celealalte eale să numără între daruri cele mai slabe
for gifts.the other they REFL=count.3 among gifts those more weak
'for the other gifts count among the less important gifts' (SA 75 – Chivu 348)

Analysis. We assume evidence of verb movement within TP (e.g., to a Participle (Part) head as in Kayne 1989; see 2), throughout, and of non-clitic instantiations of auxiliaries in the above data. Notably, in 16th c. texts, the free and clitic treatment of auxiliaries can be seen in the same sentence, indicating variable parametric setting for the same speaker, despite clitic status as default (statistically shown in Dragomirescu 2014). We note that SAI arises in indirect interrogatives, conditionals and free relatives, indicating remnant V2 as in Rizzi (1996), but does not arise in declarative clauses, where Aux remains in T (it follows Neg). Crucially, Aux-to-C/Fin occurs to check the [modal] feature of Fin associated with [+qu] C/Force (on the identical feature content in C for conditional and interrogatives, see Kayne 1991, and conditional and free relatives, see Bhatt & Pancheva 2005). In declaratives, subjects typically precede Aux, and scrambling of other constituents may occur between Aux and V in Part. These observations amount to the configuration in (5), where two TP internal positions for constituent movement are visible: one in Spec,TP, for subjects; one in Spec,PartP for any other XP constituent.

(5) [_{CP} [_{TP} **Subject** [_T **Aux** [_{PartP} **XP** [_{Part} **V** [_{VP}...]]]]]

We propose that, in (5), *Spec,TP is an A-position, whereas Spec,PartP is an A'-position*.

Evidence comes from data showing that interrogatives/relatives allow for the merging of subjects between Aux and Part, but not of other constituents. This is unsurprising since A-movement does not interfere with A-bar movement. Scrambling, on the other hand, is found only in declarative clauses (there are no examples where fronting to contrastive focus co-occurs with scrambling), which points to interference with other operator-variable chains (e.g. *wh*-movement) and supports the A-bar nature of this movement. Conversely, the status of Spec,TP as an A-position is confirmed by the presence of bare quantifier subjects in SAI contexts (see 6).

(6) s-ară neștine grăi cuvântul Zeului s-ară neștine sluji
if=would.3 someone speak word.the God.GEN if=would.3 someone toil
'if someone would speak God's word, if someone would toil...' (Coresi L 171)

Furthermore, scrambling is phased out to the benefit of left dislocation to CP. The doubling of subjects in (3)-(4) shows a transition in the type of subject fronting for discourse purposes (from A- to A-bar movement), whereby the Topic/operator status of the subject (versus its preverbal A-position) is recognized only if a lower copy of the same item is spelled out in Spec,TP (A-position). Once the CP related analysis of the subject stabilizes, the doubling procedure becomes superfluous and the evidence for Spec,TP as an A-position is lost. Crucially, the generalization of the clitic auxiliary coincides with the generalization of VSO. *In fact, SAI, scrambling, and subject doubling all disappear as the clitic status of auxiliaries is fully stabilized*. Furthermore, the evidence presented here indicates a change in linearization from SVO (and *not* SOV) to VSO, with SOV order derived by scrambling to Spec,PartP and V in Part (versus V in situ).

Implications and Conclusions. First, this analysis explains why there are isolated cases of SVO in MR where Spec,TP is arguably an A-position. In derivations with bare quantifier subjects, as in (7) where the subject follows a Topic>Focus sequence, Motapanyane (1994) argues for A-status of Spec,TP as bare quantifiers cannot be doubled and analyzed as left dislocated to TopicP: (7) traces the older TP-internal SVO linearization option.

(7) [_{TOPP}Noaptea], [_{FOCP}în mod sigur] cineva se va împiedica de scară.
night.the in way certain someone REFL=will stumble on stair
'It is certain that during the night someone will stumble on the stairs.'

Second, this analysis entails that the setting for VSO does not arise from a parametric switch per se, but is an epiphenomenon of other changes in the grammar, notably, the cliticization of auxiliaries. The natural consequence of the changes discussed is that, in MR, contrastive topic or *wh*-movement precludes subjects in a preverbal A-position, indicating that the concurrent availability of an A and an A-bar preverbal position is lost. Lastly, perhaps the most interesting theoretical implication is that, *on par with phrasal movement, syntactic T to C movement is equally split into A- versus A-bar movement*. In particular, Aux to C/Fin (V2) is akin to an A-movement option (from T to C/Fin in OR), while Long Head Movement (LHM), as in Rivero (1993), where a participial/infinitival V moves to C to license an operator in OR - see (8) with a null interrogative operator - is an instance A-bar movement (i.e. Part to Focus movement).

(8) Grijit-au bine cetatea Hotinului Vasilie-vodă?
cared-has well fort.the Hotin.the.GEN Vasilie-king
'Did king Vasilie take good care of the Hotin fort?' (Costin 124)

In the same vein, Roberts (2001, 2010) defines locality of head movement based on head type: operator versus non-operator head. Further support for this claim comes from loss of T to C head movement for operator licensing in MR more generally.