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Background. The typology of verb (V) movement in Old Romance is still under debate. Studies inspired by Benincà (1984 and further work) and Roberts (1993) developed V2 analyses for this language group. Rivero (1993) supplants the V2 analysis with Long Head Movement (LHM) of the non-finite verb stem in pro-drop languages, in specific environments. The justification for LHM is the requirement for second position clitics (Wackernagel law), which is also claimed to have been active in Old Romance. Recently, both views came under scrutiny in studies that integrate discourse pragmatic features in their accounts on V movement, clitic placement, and the organization of the left periphery of clauses (Cruschina & Sitaridou 2009; Fischer 1993; Martins 1995).

Case study. Old Romanian (OR) is absent from this debate, so its integration in the comparative paradigms is long overdue. This paper is a first attempt to bridge that gap. We do so by testing the level of V movement in the Moldavian chronicles (17th-18th c.), which are the first literary texts written in Romanian (vs translated). The aim is to account for the higher V movement in OR than in Modern Romanian (MR), in specific environments, and to identify the relevant parametric switch.

Framework. The assessment is done in the cartographic framework (Rizzi 1997), where V2 and LHM involve V-to-Force. Following Kroch & Taylor’s (1997) tests on OE, we consider the clitics (pronouns and AUX) in T (Kayne 1994) to mark the border between TP and FinP (= CP field). Thus, V-to-T yields proclitics, V-to-Fin/Force - enclitics.

Data. High V movement in texts occurs optionally in declaratives (but with discourse effects), is obligatory in yes-no questions, and never applies in wh-questions. When it occurs, both finite and non-finite verb forms undergo the movement (1). The targeted head is the same across the board, i.e., lower than TopP (2).

Analysis. First, we establish that LHM is present in texts, but its trigger is not the Wackernagel law since it occurs with Topics (e.g. 2, 3). Then, we identify the features that trigger V movement in OR: i.e., discourse features associated with focus, such as yes-no interrogation (i.e., verum focus, Höhle 1992) and narrative emphatic focus (see contrast in 4). Cruschina & Sitaridou (2009) have already analyzed Old Romance constructions with focus related V movement, so we adopt their basic insight that [focus] triggers a Spec-Head configuration (the Criterial approach), and that [focus] is realized on V itself, unlike in V2 or clitic based LHM. However, within Minimalist parameters, we distinguish between a strong Criterial requirement (in OR) and a weak Criterial requirement (in MR). Crucially, the relevant discourse operators always occupy their cartographic position (i.e. Spec,FocusP) but V-to-Focus only operates under a strong Criterial requirement. The ensuing prediction, confirmed for OR in (5) is: V-to-Focus will not apply if the relevant focus or wh-operator dislocates from within the structure (i.e. internal Merge). Thus, the overall pattern is that V-to-Focus occurs only in the absence of wh-phrases in interrogative clauses and in the absence of lexical narrative operators in declarative clauses. In MR, this requirement has been reanalyzed as weak and is satisfied by long distance Agree between Focus and V[focus] in T.

Conclusions: In light of the debate on V movement in Old Romance, OR does not provide evidence for either V2 or clitic based LHM. Rather V-to-Focus is triggered by a strong Criterial requirement (i.e. Spec-Head) on discourse features and affects both finite and non-finite V stems equally as the [focus] feature probed for is a property of V.
(1) a. **Rămasu-i- au pomană în țară mănăstirea** ...

[- finite] V form

left- of.him-has memory in country monastery-the

‘In the country a monastery has been left to his memory.…’

(Costin apud Panaitescu 1979: 33)

b. **Cunosti-ma pre mine, au ba?**

[+ finite] V form

know.2SG-me PRT me or not

‘Do you know me or not?’

(Neculce apud Iordan 1955: 120)

(2) **Acest domn…după doi ani.. rădicatu-s au de la Tara**

this king after 2 years risen- REFL-has of from Country-the

Muntenească cu multă …oaste..

Munteneasca with much army

‘After two years, this king alighted from Vallachia with a big army.’

(Ureche apud Panaitescu 1958: 19 v p 90)

Translator mis-handles the second position clitics from Slavonic

(3) **părinții noștri…i- ai mîntuitu-i-ai**

parents.the theirs-REFL-have blessed-them-have (hypercorrection)

‘you blessed our parents’ (Densuşianu 1997: 707 – PH.xxi, 5)

(4) a. **Gasitu-s- au atunce si un urs mare groaznic. Si…**

beginning of story

found- REFL-has then and a bear big terrible and (LHM – enclitics)

‘It was also found, at that time, a big terrible bear. And…’

(Neculce apud Iordan 1955: 213)

b. **L-au prinsu si i-au scos ochii,**

him-has caught and to.him-has scooped eyes-the

dupa ce au domnitu tara amindoi sapte ani. end of story

after that have governed country.the both seven years (proclitics)

‘He caught him and took his eyes out after they had co-governed the country for seven years.’

(Ureche apud Panaitescu 1958: 83)

(5) a. în dooă-trei rînduri au trimis să vadză, adverat au sosit?

in two-three times has sent to see truly have arrived

‘he sent [someone] two-three times to see, did they really arrive?’

(Costin apud Panaitescu 1979: 118)

b. **Si ce i-ar lipsi, fiindu ca si un domnu in tara lor, ….?**

and what to.him-would lack being as if a king in country.the theirs

‘And what does he lack of, when he’s like a king in their country?’

(Costin apud Panaitescu 1979: 76)

c. întrebîndu pre domnii, **apuca-se-vor ei să margă amindoi asupra lui Racoții?**

asking PRT kings start-REFL- will they to march both against the Racotzi

‘…asking the kings whether they will both start marching against Racotzi’

(Costin apud Panaitescu 1979: 161)