

## A Criterial Analysis of V-movement in the Moldavian Chronicles

Gabriela Alboiu (York University) & Virginia Hill (UNBSJ)

**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 (17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> 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...dupa 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** TopP + LHM + proclitics  
 parents.the ours them-have blessed-them-have (hypercorrection)  
 ‘you blessed our parents’ (Densușianu 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 domni, **apuca-se-vor** ei să margă amîndoi asupra lui Racotzii?  
 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)