

Adina Dragomirescu & Alexandru Nicolae

adina_drag@yahoo.com; nicolae_bibi@yahoo.com

“Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti Institute of Linguistics”, Bucharest

University of Bucharest

SYNTACTIC ARCHAISMS PRESERVED IN A CONTEMPORARY ROMANCE VARIETY: *INTERPOLATION* AND *SCRAMBLING* IN OLD ROMANIAN AND ISTRO-ROMANIAN

Abstract

The paper examines the *interpolation* and *scrambling* phenomena attested in Old Romanian and (modern) Istro-Romanian. By applying a coherent set of syntactic diagnostics, it is shown that these phenomena may be given the same analysis in both varieties: the discontinuity of the elements of the verbal cluster is the result of low verb movement of the lexical verb on the clausal spine. In a diachronic Romance comparative setting, the existence of low verb movement phenomena constitutes an important (yet overlooked) piece of evidence for the gradual emergence of V-to-I movement in the Latin-to-Romance transition. For the theory of diachronic linguistics in general, the preservation of interpolation and scrambling in Istro-Romanian shows that archaic phenomena may be preserved in isolated varieties, and that language contact (with Croatian in the case at hand) plays an important role in consolidating archaic features.

Key-words: interpolation, scrambling, old Romance, old Romanian, Istro-Romanian, low verb movement, syntactic archaisms, language contact

1. Background, research questions and aims

1.1 Interpolation and scrambling: Old Romance, old Romanian, Istro-Romanian

A well-known phenomenon attested in the older stages of the Romance languages is the *discontinuity* of the functional elements of the IP-domain, namely the existence of structures like: (A) [pron. clitic – XP – V] (= *interpolation*) (1) / (B) [(pron. clitic –) aux. – XP – lexical V] (= *scrambling*) (2); we will use the term “discontinuous structures” when we refer to both interpolation and scrambling. The phenomenon in (A) was discussed for the first time by the philologist W.H. Chénery (see Poole 2007) with reference to old Spanish; to Chénery we also owe the term *interpolation*. Subsequent research showed that similar phenomena (labelled as (*IP*-)*scrambling*, *intercalation* or *dislocation of compound forms*) exist in most of the other medieval Romance varieties (see Salvi 2001; Martins 2002; Fischer 2003; Poole 2007; Mensching 2012; Poletto 2014; Sitaridou 2012; Dragomirescu 2013 i.a.).

- (1) *E com todas as pertenças que aos ditos casaes* (old Ptg.)
and with all the belongings that to-the mentioned properties
lhes dereitamête pertêçe
them.DAT rightly belongs
‘and with everything which according to the terms of the contract is a part of the
mentioned properties’ (*apud* Martins 2002)

- (2) a. *porque ella non avia las cartas rescebidas* (old Sp.)
 because she not had.3SG the letters received
 ‘because she had not received the letters’ (*apud* Mensching 2012)
- b. *se l'avessi a mente tenuto* (old It.)
 if it-had.SUBJ.1SG in mind kept
 ‘If I had kept it in mind’ (*apud* Poletto 2014)

Interpolation and scrambling are also present in old Romanian (= ORom) (16th – 18th c.) (Dragomirescu 2013, 2015); scrambling [(pron. clitic –) aux. – XP – lexical V] (3) is more frequently attested than interpolation [pron. clitic – XP – V] (4) (Nicolae 2015):

- (3) a. *că ne va pre noi asculta* (ORom)
 that CL.ACC.1PL AUX.FUT.2SG DOM us listen.INF
 ‘that he will listen to us’ (CCat.1560:10^r)
- b. *cum au ei lăsat cu al lor cuvânt*
 how AUX.PERF.3PL they leave.PPLE with AL.M.SG their word
 ‘how they said with their own words’ (DÎ.1599:XXX)
- (4) *Deaca ne noi bolnăvim*
 if CL.REFL.1PL we get.sick.1PL
 ‘if we get sick’ (CC¹.1567:129^v)

These phenomena are also attested in Istro-Romanian (= IstroRom) (Zegrean 2012); the corpora we have examined reveal approximately the same distribution of discontinuous structures, with scrambling (5) being much more frequent than interpolation (6):

- (5) *che n-ŭai mire scutat* (IstroRom)
 because not=AUX.PERF.2SG me.ACC listen.PPLE
 ‘because you did not listen to me’ (TC:7)
- (6) *rei te tu marita dupa mire?*
 AUX.FUT.2SG CL.REFL.2SG you.NOM marry.INF after me
 ‘Will you marry me?’ (AK:338)

1.2 Old Romanian, Istro-Romanian. Corpus examined

ORom represents a period in the history of (Daco-)Romanian roughly stretching from the beginning of the 16th c. to the end of the 18th c. (Gheție 1975; Timotin 2016)¹. ORom was employed in the region roughly corresponding to present-day Romania, the Republic of Moldova and a stretch of land from the southern Ukraine (northern Bukovina), which consisted in the Middle Ages of three (administratively separate) provinces: Transylvania, Wallachia (Rom. *Țara Românească*), and Moldova, which were subject to different linguistic and cultural influences: Hungarian, Old Church Slavonic, Medieval Latin, etc. (Stan 2013:ch. 1). The **corpus** on which our analysis is based consists of original texts (non-translated texts written directly in Romanian) and

¹ The adjective “old” in the phrase “old Romanian” is somehow a misnomer when compared to its usage for other medieval Romance varieties, where “old” denotes a much older timespan; from a Romance perspective, “old Romanian” actually represents an early modern stage of this language (see also the discussion in Hill and Alboiu 2016:ch. 1). The label “old Romanian” is maintained in accordance with traditional scholarship.

translations from the entire area where ORom was used; scholars have stressed the importance of ‘original’ texts, considered to reflect the actual grammar of the language more faithfully than translations.

IstroRom is an eastern Romance variety mainly spoken in Istria, a peninsula in Croatia (Coteanu 1957); the speakers are all bilingual in Croatian (Maiden 2016:91). A large community of IstroRom émigré speakers is found in the New York area (Maiden 2016:91). The most widely accepted hypothesis (see Pană Dindelegan 2013:3–4 and references therein; Maiden 2016) is that IstroRom is a self-standing Romance language traditionally considered a “historical dialect” of Romanian. As shown by their phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical commonalities, the Romanian “historical dialects” (Daco-Romanian, Istro-Romanian, Aromanian, and Megleno-Romanian) once formed a unity (Proto-Romanian/Common Romanian/Primitive Romanian), a stage that can be examined only through comparative reconstruction). Shortly before the 10th c., a great dialectal separation occasioned by the Slavic settlement in the south of the Danube divided this unity into a northern Danubian area (subsequently Daco-Romanian) and a southern Danubian area (the other aforementioned varieties) (Vasiliu and Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu 1986). The full separation of Aromanian is dated before the 11th c., while IstroRom did not undergo the split before the 13th c. (Maiden 2016:91 and references therein). The **corpus** we have examined consists of IstroRom texts from the Istrian Peninsula, all of them collected after 1930; occasionally, material has been drawn from other studies on IstroRom.

1.3 Research questions and aims

Against this background, the aims and research questions of our paper are twofold, descriptive and explanatory.

(i) From a descriptive point of view, we endeavour to delineate **the extension of the phenomena** analysed on the basis of representative ORom and IstroRom corpora.

From an explanatory perspective, we should provide answers to the following questions:

(ii) What is the **proper syntactic analysis of discontinuous structures** in ORom and IstroRom? Poole (2007:188) compares old Spanish and old Portuguese interpolation and concludes that: “«Interpolation» phenomena exist in other medieval Romance varieties, but seem to have different properties from interpolation in old Spanish, *suggesting that different processes are at work*” (italics AD&AN). Thus, in view of “Poole’s caveat”, the question should be reformulated as follows:

(ii’) Should the ORom and IstroRom data be given a **uniform syntactic analysis** (whatever this analysis is)? Furthermore, should interpolation and scrambling (two phenomena usually kept distinct in the literature) be syntactically analysed as representing the same phenomenon? The syntactic diagnostics we have applied point to this conclusion. This raises two further questions:

(iii) What is **the relation** between ORom interpolation and IstroRom interpolation? Two options present themselves here: (a) we are dealing with **independent convergent developments** in both idioms, or (b) interpolation is an **old Romance phenomenon**, present in a non-attested stage of Romanian prior to the Daco-Romanian / IstroRom dialectal split and initially preserved in both idioms, which died out in the passage from old to modern Romanian, but was preserved as an archaic feature in Istro-Romanian.

(iv) Is **language contact** relevant for interpolation? Due to consistent cultural and linguistic contact with (Old Church) Slavonic and Hungarian (and, to a more limited extent, Medieval Latin and Greek) (Stan 2013:ch. 1) – official administrative and/or liturgical languages in the medieval

Romanian provinces from the north of the Danube –, scholars considered that interpolation and scrambling (usually discussed together) are a “non-Romanian syntactic feature” (e.g. Avram [1975] 2007:94 – Slavonic, Dragoş 1995:37 – Hungarian, i.a.). However, currently, with respect to ORom syntax, there is agreement that language contact actually consolidated the grammatical structure of the target language: “taking into consideration the extensive presence of these learned and «foreign» phenomena in Romanian original texts, we are led to conclude that they actually consolidate structures and constructions present in the grammar of Romanian, affecting their frequency, rather than resulting from a process of wholesale importation of foreign structures into the grammar” (Pană Dindelegan and Dragomirescu 2016:636–637). The rich attestation of interpolation and scrambling in texts directly written in Romanian (Dragomirescu 2013) and their common medieval Romance ancestry (Dragomirescu 2015; Nicolae 2015) represent strong evidence against the “non-Romanian syntactic feature” hypothesis. In the same spirit, with reference to word order in general (not to interpolation/scrambling in particular), it has been claimed that Croatian had an important influence on IstroRom (Kovačec 1971:174).

2. Interpolation in old Romanian and Istro-Romanian

2.1 Framework

We first spell out the minimal theoretical ingredients necessary for the analysis of interpolation and scrambling in ORom and IstroRom. The following set of diagnostics is discussed on the basis of modern (Daco-)Romanian; it will be extended to ORom and IstroRom in the section devoted to their analysis.

2.1.1 The V-raising parameter

In generative thinking, it is generally accepted that the clausal spine is divided into three domains: the ν P-domain, the IP-domain and the CP-domain. We use the label “ ν P-domain” in a broad sense, namely to refer to the lowest domain of the clause, where thematic and predication relations are established. According to many authors, the clause-internal phasal domain – customarily labeled as the ν^* -phase (cf. Chomsky 2001) – contains more material than the minimal ν P projection. Baltin (2012), Rouveret (2012) and Roberts (2013) assume that Voice rather than ν is the clause-internal phasal head. For other authors the clause-internal phase is even larger, e.g. for Harwood (2015), the low Aspect projection (the projection responsible for progressive aspect in English) is also part of the ν^* -phase².

V-raising can target either the IP-domain (e.g. many modern Romance varieties such as French and Italian) or the CP-domain (e.g. V2 in medieval Romance, German, Dutch and mainland Scandinavian), or it can be absent or very low (i.e. targeting heads on the ν P-edge) (e.g. Latin, English) (7) (see Emonds 1978; Pollock 1989 for the English/Romance (French) contrast; den Besten 1983; Koster 1975 for Germanic V2; Salvi 2004; Ledgeway 2012 for Latin³).

² Building on Biberauer and Roberts (2010), Rouveret (2012) considers that the heads from the clause internal phasal domain are actually all varieties of little ν , “each ν is «non-distinct in formal features» from the other ν ’s” (p. 954). (All these heads can be even relabeled as ν_{Voice} , ν_{Asp} , etc.)

³ While root clauses display a mixture of pragmatically (and sometimes syntactically) driven verb fronting and SOV structures, embedded clauses (in which V-to-C is *a priori* potentially blocked) display a more rigid SOV grammar; this has been taken as a strong indication for the fact that the V-raising out of the ν P-domain does not take place in Latin.

- (7) CP-domain > IP-domain > vP-domain
Germanic V2 French, Italian Latin, English

Work in the wake of Cinque (1999) advocated a finer-grained structure of the IP-domain, with the IP being split at least into three distinct fields: IP → MoodP > TP > AspP. Recent research has shown that V-to-I movement is not a uniform phenomenon across Romance, and that V-raising targets distinct positions in the complex split IP-domain (Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005; Ledgeway 2012:140–150; Schifano 2015a, 2015b). Fleshing out this line of inquiry, Schifano identifies four distinct targets of V-to-I movement of *synthetic* verbs in Romance:

- (8) MoodP > TP > Asp
High *clause-medial* *low* *very low*
(Mod.) Romanian N. R. Italian E. Portuguese Spanish
French

While Romance languages behave systematically with respect to the position targeted by the raising of the synthetic verb (Schifano 2015a, 2015b) (cf. (8)), there is a great deal of variation in Romance when it comes to analytic structures: languages patterning the same way in synthetic structures (e.g. French and Romanian, *high verb movement* languages in (8)) display a different behaviour in analytic structures. Witness the following contrast, which indicates that the *lexical* verb has undergone V-to-I movement and clusters together with the auxiliary verb in Romanian, but not in French, where occurrence to the right of modal (9) and manner (10) adverbs and of floating quantifiers (11) indicates that the French lexical verb does not undergo raising to the inflectional domain (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994:8-9; Alboiu and Motapanyane 2000:15; Ledgeway 2015:13-17):

- (9) a. *Il est probablement venu.* (French)
b. *El a (*probabil) venit probabil.* (Romanian)
‘He probably came’
(10) b. *Il a bien mangé.* (French)
b. *El a (*bine) mâncat bine.* (Romanian)
‘He ate well’
(11) a. *Les enfants ont tous vu (*tous) de(s) bons films.* (French)
b. *Copiii au (*toți) văzut toți filme bune.* (Romanian)
‘The children have all seen good movies’

It is also important to mention that the Latin-to-Romance transition is characterised by a mixture between a transitional ‘broad’ V2 grammar⁴ (Ledgeway 2008; 2012; cf. Benincà 1983; Adams 1987), mainly specific to root clauses, and an emerging V-to-I grammar, characterising embedded clauses (Ledgeway 2012). A prediction of this line of reasoning is that variation in the

⁴ Ledgeway (2007:122–123) introduces the distinction between *strict V2 grammars* (the Germanic type) and *broad V2 grammars* (the medieval Romance type); the medieval Romance V2 features V-to-C movement but no ‘bottleneck effect’ (Poletto 2002), hence “whether the verb superficially occurs, for example, in first, second, third, or fourth position, the V2 generalization nonetheless consistently holds, insofar as the verb is invariably assumed to have moved to the vacant C position” (Ledgeway 2007:122)

level of verb movement of the type *low verb movement* vs *V-to-I movement* should occur especially in embedded clauses where V-to-C movement (a syntactic option of old Romance) is *a priori* blocked by the lexicalization of C-elements (Ledgeway *mss*). This prediction is borne out in Martins' (2002) analysis of old Portuguese, where it is reported that scrambling (alongside with the OV order) is mostly attested in subordinate clauses; the analysis herein has similar results (§2.2.2.2).

2.1.2 The pronominal clitic orientation *parameter*

There is general agreement on the idea that clitics adjoin to the edge of the three functional domains of the clause in (7) above (Benincà and Tortora 2010; cf. also Rivero 1997; Roberts 2010; Tortora 2014b), this hypothesis giving rise to a three-way typology of pronominal clitic orientation⁵: C-oriented vs I-oriented vs v/V-oriented clitics. Clitic orientation is language-specific (Rivero 1997), even construction-specific (Tortora 2014b). In order to distinguish C-oriented cliticization from the other two sites of cliticization, Rivero (1997) and subsequent research proposed the following diagnostics: the position of the clitic with respect to clausal negation and adjacency relations. C-oriented clitics precede clausal negation and are adjacent to complementizers; by contrast, clitics adjoining lower are preceded by clausal negation and establish adjacency relations with the verb. The examples below show that Romanian clitics are I-oriented: clausal negation systematically precedes the clitic and not vice versa (12); the clitic is adjacent to the verb(al complex), not the complementizer (13)⁶.

- (12) *dacă Dumnezeu nu te (*nu) ajută* (Romanian)
 if God not CL.ACC.2SG not helps
 'if God doesn't help you'
- (13) a. *dacă el l-a făcut bine*
 if he CL.ACC.M.3SG=AUX.PERF.3SG make.PPLE well
 'if he did it well'
- b. **dacă-l el a făcut bine*
 if=CL.ACC.M.3SG he AUX.PERF.3SG make.PPLE well

To sum up, (modern) Romanian pronominal clitics are I-oriented; the cliticization site is thus the edge of the IP-domain (Săvescu-Ciucivara 2011), sandwiched between the CP-field, NegP (Zanuttini 1997) and the TAM-projections in the IP-field.

⁵ Older research (e.g. Rivero 1997) generally distinguishes between C- vs I-orientation of cliticization; more recent research (e.g. Tortora 2014a; Ledgeway *current volume*) introduces the distinction between I-oriented cliticization and v/V-oriented cliticization.

⁶ Pronominal clitics may be phonologically adjacent to complementizers if no other element merges in the space between the C-head and the verbal cluster (i); the occurrence of the subject (13) or of any other left-peripheral constituent in-between the C-element and the verbal cluster shows that clitics adjoin to the verb (ii), testifying thus to their I-orientation. It is not clear if phonological encliticization to a C-head has syntactic effects too (Adam Ledgeway, *p.c.*).

- (i) *dacă-l vede*
 if=CL.ACC.M.3SG see.PRES.3SG
 'if she sees him'
- (ii) *dacă atunci / pe Ion l-a văzut*
 if the DOM John CL.ACC.M.3SG=AUX.PERF.3SG see.PPLE
 'if she saw him then / if she saw John'

2.1.3 Summary

1) In modern Romanian, V-raising is cross-paradigmatically high: synthetic verbs raise to the highest TAM-projection in the complex split-IP field; in analytic structures, the lexical verb also undergoes raising to the I-domain.

2) Modern Romanian pronominal clitics are I-oriented.

In what follows, we set the data of ORom and (modern) IstroRom against the diagnostics established so far, with the goal of putting forward a formal analysis of interpolation and scrambling phenomena in these varieties.

2.2 Syntactic analysis: interpolation and scrambling as low verb movement

The following syntactic analyses of interpolation and scrambling have been put forward in the literature: (a) C-orientation of pronominal clitics (Rivero 1997; Poole 2007 for old Spanish); (b) Aux-to-C movement (Mensching 2012 for old Romance); (c) low verb movement (Mensching 2012 for old Romance Aux-XP-Part structures; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005 for interpolation in Cosentino; Nicolae 2015 for ORom interpolation). It is incumbent on us to determine what the proper syntactic analysis of the ORom and IstroRom discontinuous structures is. Our analysis will capitalize on two factors: (i) the parametric settings of ORom and IstroRom relevant for interpolation and scrambling, and (ii) the internal and external distributional properties of these structures.

2.2.1 Parametric features of old Romanian and Istro-Romanian

2.2.1.1 Old Romanian. The TAM system of ORom is very similar to that of modern Romanian (Zafiu 2016); the same analysis can be pursued (§2.1.1 above).

Pronominal clitics are systematically *I-oriented*: the ordering [pronominal clitic-negator-V] is not attested in the corpus analyses of ORom (Nicolae and Niculescu 2015, 2016); in the presence of negation, pronominal proclisis is almost generalized (14); especially in translations from Old Church Slavonic⁷ (15a) (but not only, cf. (15b)), there is pronominal enclisis on the verb is found in sentences with negation (which may reflect a low, *v*P-edge cliticization site);

⁷ One of the anonymous reviewers pointed out the fact that examples like (15a) and (17) are from Church Slavonic translations and “display a word order that is foreign to old Romanian”, and recommended that we should dispense with them. We have also stressed the importance of using texts directly written in Romanian in the diachronic analysis (see §1.2 above). However, we have chosen to keep and use in our argumentation examples of this sort because we believe that their existence actually strengthens the hypothesis that, while the word order of major constituents may be influenced by a foreign word order pattern, the parametric settings of functional elements like pronominal clitics cannot be overridden by language contact. For example, the linearization [pronominal clitic-negator(-V)], attested in Old Church Slavonic texts like *Codex Marianus* (i) (Pancheva 2008), is never found in old Romanian; very rarely and only in translations, pronominal enclisis to the right of clausal negation (i.e. [negator-V-pronominal clitic]), also an option of Old Church Slavonic (ii), is attested (15); however, this option is compatible with an I- or *v*-oriented site for pronominal cliticization, parametric options also reflected by original old Romanian writings (see the main text).

- | | | | | | | |
|------|---|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------|
| (i) | <i>ašte</i> | <i>se</i> | <i>bi</i> | <i>ne</i> | <i>rodilъ</i> | <i>čъъ tъ</i> |
| | if | CL.REFL.3SG | be.COND.3SG | not | born.PPLE.M.SG | man this |
| | ‘if this man had not been born’ (<i>Codex Marianus</i> , <i>apud</i> Pancheva 2008) | | | | | |
| (ii) | <i>Ěko</i> | <i>ne</i> | <i>prěžde</i> | <i>krъsti</i> | <i>se</i> | <i>prъvě oběda</i> |
| | that | not | first | wash.PAST.3SG | CL.REFL.3SG | before meal |
| | ‘that he did not first wash before the meal’ (<i>Codex Marianus</i> , <i>apud</i> Pancheva 2008) | | | | | |

either proclitic or enclitic, clitics are adjacent to the verb(al complex), not the complementizer (16)-(17).

- (14) *nimini de rudele meale nu m-a grijit*
 nobody of relatives my not CL.ACC.1SG=AUX.PERF.1SG take.care.PPLE
 ‘none of my relatives took care of me’ (DÎ.1591–600:VIII)
- (15) a. *să nu bucure-mi-se*
 SĂ_{SUBJ} not enjoy.SUBJ.3SG=CL.DAT.1SG=CL.REFL.3SG
 ‘he should not enjoy me’ (CP¹.1577:62^r)
- b. *n-au ridicatu-să nimeni cu nici o pâra*
 not=AUX.PERF.3SG raise.PPLE=CL.REFL.3SG nobody with no squeal
 ‘nobody raised any squeal (= nobody squealed)’ (AB 279, *apud* Todi 2001:49)
- (16) *că cu dreptate și giudeț adevărat toate le*
 that with justice and judgement right all.F.PL CL.ACC.F.3PL
aduseș asupra de noi
 bring.PS.2SG over of us
 ‘that with justice and right judgement you brought them all upon us’ (DDL.1679:122)
- (17) *Ferecați flămânzii acmu că*
 happy.M.PL hungry.M.PL.DEF now that
sătura-se-vor
 feel.full.INF=CL.REFL.3PL=AUX.FUT.3PL
 ‘The hungry people will be happy, because they will feel full’ (CT.1560–1:126^{r-v})

ORom V-to-C movement exclusively manifests as a “long-head movement” (= LHM) (Rivero 1993) phenomenon: displacement to the C-domain targets exclusively the lexical verb, which moves across the auxiliary/pronominal clitic+auxiliary, giving rise to V-(Cl-)Aux structures (18). In contrast to other older Romance varieties (old French, old Italian, old Spanish; Rivero 1993; Roberts 1994), Aux-to-C is not attested in ORom (Nicolae 2015; Hill and Alboiu 2016).

- (18) *Pusu-ne-am și degetele mai jos*
 put.PPLE=CL.REFL.1PL=AUX.PERF.1PL and fingers.DEF more down
 ‘We have put our fingers below’ (DÎ.1579–80:VI)

To sum up, we may safely exclude the C-orientation of clitics and Aux-to-C movement as potential sources of ORom interpolation and scrambling.

2.2.1.2 Istro-Romanian. The TAM system of IstroRom is similar to that of (Daco-)Romanian, yet less rich in certain respects. The analytic structures display an internal structure similar to their old and modern Romanian counterparts: the analytic past tense has the [*have*-auxiliary+past participle] structure, and the analytic future and conditional are based on *want*-auxiliaries plus the infinitive (Caragiu Marioțeanu 1977:223–225).

In the verbal domain, Croatian influence manifests itself especially in the high frequency of V-Aux (i.e. LHM-like) structures (19a), also found in ORom (see §2.2.1.2 above). In Croatian, the V-Aux linearization is due to the Wackernagel status of the auxiliary, a fact which has been taken to extend to IstroRom as well (Giusti and Zegrean 2015). While authors like

Giusti and Zegrean (2015) indicate the V-Aux ordering as the only option “when the sentence only consists in auxiliary and past participle” (p. 126), in the corpora we have examined we have also identified sentence-initial auxiliaries (19b-c); hence, IstroRom auxiliaries do not strictly obey a Wackernagel constraint.

- (19) a. *și murit-a* *ăm vójškă*
 and die.PPLE=AUX.PERF.3SG in war
 ‘and he died in the war’ (HS:96)
- b. *Bire. Ŭam slujit un cesar*
 good AUX.PERF.1SG serve.PPLE an emperor
 ‘Good. I served an emperor’ (TC:10)
- c. – *Veț cumpara cesta gal’ire?*
 AUX.FUT.2PL buy.INF this hen
 ‘Will you buy this hen?’ (TC:84)

IstroRom pronominal clitics display much more freedom of ordering with respect to the lexical verb and the auxiliary than their old and modern Romanian counterparts. The following orderings are attested: (i) Cl-Aux: **Cl-Aux-V** and **V-Cl-Aux** structures (20); (ii) **Aux-Cl-V** (21); and (iii) **Cl-V-Aux** (22).

- (20) a. *Ce ti-ŭam io facut?*
 what CL.DAT.2SG=AUX.PERF.1SG I.NOM do.PPLE
 ‘What did I do to you?’ (TC:8)
- b. *Pus-l’a mărle.*
 put.PPLE=CL.DAT.3SG=AUX.PERF.3SG hands
 ‘He put his hands on him’ (TC:8)
- (21) *Se nu, voi te ucide.*
 if not AUX.FUT.1SG CL.ACC.2SG kill.INF
 ‘If not, I will kill you’ (TC:90)
- (22) *Ontrat pus-a Magdalena ăm bărse*
 suddenly put.PPLE=AUX.PERF.3SG Magdalena.ACC in bag
și vo legat-a. (TC:98)
 and CL.ACC.F.3SG tie.PPLE=AUX.PERF.3SG
 ‘Suddenly, he put Magdalena in the bag and tied her’

Only option (i) is also found in old (and modern) Romanian, while (ii) and (iii) are specific to IstroRom. This distribution indicates that IstroRom pronominal clitics are subject to a mixed parametric setting of the type identified by Rivero (1997) for old Spanish: option (i) points to the I-orientation of clitics, while option (iii) signals that pronominal clitics are C-oriented (the cliticization site is above V-Aux inversion, analysed as V-to-C movement), an option specific to (Serbo-)Croatian (Rivero 1997).

Furthermore, option (ii) points towards the existence Aux-to-C movement, another option specific to IstroRom (and other older Romance varieties), but not to old (and modern) Romanian.

To conclude, the higher degree of freedom in the placement of clitics and auxiliaries in IstroRom indicates that C-orientation of pronominal clitics and Aux-to-C movement cannot *a priori* be excluded as sources for interpolation.

The next section will determine which syntactic analysis properly accounts for IstroRom and ORom interpolation and scrambling.

2.2.2 The syntax of discontinuous structures

In this section, we submit the ORom and IstroRom discontinuous structures to a set of syntactic diagnostics which indicates that this phenomenon can be analysed in a unitary fashion in both varieties: the lexical verb (the synthetic verb in interpolation (type A); the lexical verb in scrambling (type B)) does not undergo V-to-I movement – hence being confined to the ν P domain; XPs interposed between the Aux / Cl / Cl+Aux and the lexical verb either occupy their base-generation position or are accommodated by Belletti's (2004) "low IP-area", i.e. the periphery of the phasal head ν^* (Chomsky 2001; 2008).

2.2.2.1 Internal properties

Interpolated/scrambled XPs are systematically bordered, **to their left**, by a functional element – Aux (23)-(24)/Cl (25)-(26) – or a cluster of functional elements – Cl–Aux (27)-(28) – and, **to their right**, by the lexical verb:

- (23) *eu încă am pre el botezat* (ORom)
 I alreadyAUX.PERF.1SG DOM him baptize.PPLE
 'I have already baptized him' (CM.1567:258^f)
- (24) *io n-am bire-nteles* (IstroRom)
 I not=AUX.PERF.1SG well-understand.PPLE
 'I did not understand (it) well' (SF:168)
- (25) *să ne prentu eale ispăsim* (ORom)
 SUBJ CL.ACC.1PL for them atone.SUBJ.1PL
 'that we should atone for them' (CCat.1560:5^f)
- (26) *Me tu conoști?* (IstroRom)
 CL.ACC.1SG you.SG.NOM know.PRES.2SG
 'Do you know me?' (TC:8)
- (27) *mă vor cu pietri împrôșca* (ORom)
 CL.ACC.1SG AUX.FUT.3PL with stones splatter.INF
 'they will throw stones at me' (PO.1582:235)
- (28) *tu t-er dupa me fil'e*
 you.SG.NOM CL.REFL.2PL=AUX.FUT.2SG after my daughter
ănsura (IstroRom)
 marry.INF
 'You will marry my daughter' (TC:14)

The interpolation/scrambling position is not **specialized**; the XP may be: a subject (29)-(30), another argument (DO in (23) above, IO in (31)-(32) below), and adjuncts (a PP in (27) above, an adverbial in (35)-(39) below).

- (29) *cum au și Hristos iubit sfânta besearecă* (ORom)
 how AUX.PERF also Christ love.PPLE holy.DEF church
 'how Christ also loved the holy church' (CM.1567:261^f)

- (30) *Când a cesaru dozneit* (IstroRom)
 when AUX.PERF.3SG emperor.NOM find.out.PPLE
 ‘when the emperor found out’ (TC:23)
- (31) *carele am mie săpat* (ORom)
 which AUX.PERF.1SG me.DAT dig.PPLE
 ‘which I have dug for myself’ (PO.1582:177)
- (32) *morta s-a lu Martin rugat* (IstroRom)
 death.NOM CL.REFL.3SG=AUX.PERF.3SG DAT Martin
 pray.PPLE
 ‘death prayed to Martin’ (TC:17)

Multiple XPs may also be interpolated:

- (33) *prince ție au Domnedzeu toate aceastea arătat* (ORom)
 by-what you.DAT AUX.PERF.3SG God all these show.PPLE
 ‘how God showed you all these things’ (PO.1582:143)
- (34) *c-ăuț voi mire și me fil’ privarit* (IstroRom)
 because=AUX.PERF.2PL you.PL.NOM me.ACC and my son cheat.PPLE
 ‘because you cheated me and my son’ (TC:9)

Recall from §2.2.1.2 above that the mixed parametric settings of IstroRom pronominal clitics and auxiliaries leave open the possibility that interpolation in IstroRom (but not in ORom) may also result from Aux-to-C movement. However, in IstroRom examples like (28) or (32) featuring interpolation we observe that the only linearization is Cl-Aux. Actually, in an extensive corpus analysis of the relation between the variation between Cl-Aux/Aux-Cl and interpolation and scrambling in IstroRom (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016), we show that the Aux-Cl linearization is never available with discontinuous structures. These considerations rule out the possibility that interpolation/scrambling may result from Aux-to-C movement.

Let us now turn to the syntactic diagnostics that verify the hypothesis that discontinuous structures are based on a syntax involving low verb movement.

First of all, the lexical verb occurs to the **right** of adverbials from the *high* (35)-(36) and *low* (37)-(38) adverb spaces, and of adverbials of manner (39) (cf. Cinque 1999, Schifano 2015b):

- (35) *că vei acmușu muri* (ORom)
 that AUX.FUT.2SG now die.INF
 ‘that you will now die’ (FT.1571–5:1^v)
- (36) *Tu-i sigurno pročiteit čuda libri.* (IstroRom)
 you=AUX.PERF.2SG certainly read many books
 ‘You have certainly read many books’ (*apud* Zegrean 2012)
- (37) *ce se pururea pomeneaste* (ORom)
 which CL.REFL.3SG always mention.PRES.3SG
 ‘which gets always mentioned’ (Prav.1581:258^f)

- (38) *che n-a* *zaino* *vezut* *soldatu* (IstroRom)
 that not=AUX.PERF.3SG immediately see.PPLE soldier.ACC
 ‘that he did not immediately see the soldier’ (TC, 21)
- (39) a. *scutat-a* *cum a* *cela pul’* (IstroRom)
 listen.PPLE=AUX.PERF.3SG how AUX.PERF.3SG that birdie
mușat *cântat*
 beautifully sing.PPLE
 ‘she listened to that nestling singing beautifully’ (TC:43)
- b. *io* *n-am* *bîre-nțeles* (IstroRom)
 I not=AUX.PERF.1SG well-understand.PPLE
 ‘I did not understand (it) well’ (SF:168)

Secondly, the lexical verb occurs to the **right** of subject floating Qs (and floating reflexives, (41b)):

- (40) *cându are* *fî* *toți* *mâncându*
 when AUX.COND.3PL be.IRR all eat.GER
din mâncările păgânilor (ORom)
 of dishes.DEF pagans.DEF.GEN
 ‘when they would all be eating from the pagans’ dishes’ (DVT.1679-99:318^r)
- (41) a. *Și o zi iel’* *s-av* *toți*
 and one day they.NOM CL.REFL.3PL=AUX.PERF.3PL all.M.PL
pus *scupa* *ân se seliște (...)* (IstroRom)
 start.PPLE together in their village
 ‘And one day they all started together in their village...’ (TC:149)
- b. *Ușa_i se* *va* *ânșă_i* *rescl’ide*
 door CL.REFL.3SG AUX.FUT.3SG itself open.INF
 ‘The door will open by itself’ (TC:25,26,27)

Consider also example (42) from IstroRom which features an interpolated *wh*-element; the element sandwiched between the reflexive clitic and the lexical verb is the interrogative adverbial *cum* (‘how’), whose surface position reflects either its base-generated position (*wh*-in-situ) or a(n intermediate) landing site on the *v**-edge. Whatever the exact position of *cum* (‘how’), we can be sure that the lexical verb has not undergone V-to-I movement in (42).

- (42) *La voi* *se* *cum zîce?* (IstroRom)
 at you.PL CL.REFL.3SG how say.PRES.3SG
 ‘How do you say it in your language?’ (SF:72)

Finally, both ORom and IstroRom present Aux-licensed VP-ellipsis (43)-(44a) and pseudogapping (44b), elliptical phenomena specific to English-type languages displaying low verb movement (Giusti and Zegrean 2015 for IstroRom, Nicolae 2015 for ORom). The clitic nature of the auxiliary verb may be superseded by co-licensing (licensing by multiple auxiliaries) (43).

- (43) *de-l* *va* *fi* *mutat* (ORom)
 if=CL.ACC.M.3SG AUX.FUT.3SG AUX.IRR moved.PPLE
sau de nu-l *va* *fi* ✓
 or if not=CL.ACC.M.3SG AUX.FUT.3SG AUX.IRR
 ‘whether he will have moved him or not’ (Prav.1646:78; Stan 2013)
- (44) a. – *Ŭai* *dus?* (IstroRom)
 AUX.PERF.2SG go.PPLE
 – *Ŭam* ✓. (TC:8)
 AUX.PERF.1SG
 ‘– Did you go? – I did’
- g. – *Cum ŭai* *sta nopte durmit?*
 how AUX.PERF.2SG this night sleep.PPLE
 – *Ŭam* ✓ *bire.*
 AUX.PERF.1SG well
 ‘– How did you sleep this night?/ I have [slept] well.’ (TC:57)

Another important piece of evidence in favour of the hypothesis that discontinuity does not derive from a syntax based on V(Aux)-to-C movement or from the C-orientation of pronominal clitics in the varieties we are investigating comes from the fact that these phenomena are also attested in negative clauses. It is well-known that clausal negators block V-to-C movement in the Romance languages (Pollock 1989; Rivero 1993; Roberts 1994; Isac and Jakab 2004); the prediction of this line of reasoning is that scrambling would not be available in negative clauses if its syntax were based on Aux-to-C movement, contrary to fact as shown in (45), (46).

- (45) *deaca nu va omul pre ceastă lume*
 if not AUX.FUT.3SG man.DEF on this world
în viața sa, purta grije (ORom)
 in life.DEF his bear.INF worry
 ‘if man were not worried in this world, in his life’ (CC¹.1567:241^r)
- (46) *N-ău de mânt’e lucrât* (IstroRom)
 not=AUX.PERF.3SG before work.PPLE
 ‘He didn’t work before’ (SF:86)

Similarly, interpolation is available in negative clauses, with pronominal clitics occurring to the right of negation (hence, being IP-oriented) (47), (48).

- (47) *și nu-șu pre niminea prepunea elu,*
 and not=CL.REFL.3SG DOM nobody suspected he
numai pre păcatele lui (ORom)
 only DOM sins.DEF his
 ‘he wasn’t suspecting anyone, just his sins’ (CC².1581: 57)
- (48) *Nu se nîcad iăvî* (IstroRom)
 not CL.REFL.3SG never showed
 ‘He never showed himself’ (SF, 80)

These observations neatly correlate with the results from Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2016) (reported above) where it is shown that the Cl-Aux ordering (an option of IstroRom) is actually never available in the presence of scrambling.

Taking stock of all the properties investigated above, we may conclude that, in structures with interpolation/scrambling, the lexical verb is placed in the *v*P-domain and does not undergo raising to the I-domain.

One of the reviewers argues against the low verb movement analysis proposed here on the basis of ORom examples like (49) below (also available in IstroRom, (50)), in which postverbal subjects are available in structures with scrambling:

- (49) *până vor mai bine înțeleage creștinii* (ORom)
 until AUX.FUT.3PL more well understand.INF Christians.DEF
 ‘until the Christians will have a better understanding’ (CM.1567: 263’)
- (50) *De mânt’e s-au la noi așa purtât ómeri* (IstroRom)
 before CL.REFL.3PL=AUX.PERF.3PL at us like.this
 behave.PPLE people
 ‘people have always behaved like this at us (= in our community)’ (SF:58)

We believe that examples of this sort are not counterarguments to the proposed analysis. To begin with, witness in (49) the position of the manner adverbial (*mai bine* ‘better’): ever since Cinque (1999), it has been largely accepted that manner adverbs mark the boundary between the IP-domain and the lowest clausal domain. Secondly and more importantly, under the dynamic phase approach (e.g. den Dikken 2007, Gallego 2010, Harwood 2015) adopted here, the clause internal phase labelled as the *v**-phase contains more material than the minimal *v*P. As explained in §2.1.1 above, there are authors who consider that the low phasal domain extends up to Voice (with VoiceP > *v*P) (Baltin 2012; Rouveret 2012; Roberts 2013), and even authors who extend the phasehood of the clause internal phase up to (low) Aspect (Harwood 2015) – theoretical analyses like Gallego’s (2010) “phase sliding” or den Dikken’s (2007) “phase extension” naturally permit the extension of the low clausal domain. What is however important is that the verb is situated on the edge (Voice/(low)Asp) of the *v*P-phase in order to satisfy the *Phase Impenetrability Condition* (Chomsky 2001) and is accessible for probing by the IP-related heads.

One remaining point of divergence between ORom and IstroRom is the mixed parametric setting of pronominal clitics in IstroRom. The C-orientation of clitics in IstroRom – resulting from language contact with Croatian – may be one of the sources of interpolation in this idiom. The fact of the matter is that in interpolation without auxiliaries, pronominal clitics display a genuinely P(arametrically)-ambiguous grammar (Clark and Roberts 1993), being compatible with a grammar with both C-orientation and I-orientation.

2.2.2.2 External properties

In previous works on interpolation and scrambling it has been noticed that these phenomena overwhelmingly occur in embedded clauses (old Portuguese, Martins 2002; old Spanish, Poole 2007).

The very same is also true of interpolation and scrambling in ORom and IstroRom. The table below captures the numerical distribution of discontinuous structures in main *vs* embedded

clauses in a few representative texts from our ORom and IstroRom corpora. Since interpolation is extremely rare, our statistics is based on scrambling (i.e. with Aux/Cl-Aux structures).

Text		Total number	Main clause	Embedded clause
ORom	DÎ	5	2	3
	<i>Texte</i>	13	3	10
	PO.1582	29	3	26
Total ORom		47 (100%)	8 (17%)	39 (83%)
IstroRom	TC	933	451	482
	AD	105	27	78
	AK	92	39	53
Total IstroRom		1130 (100%)	517 (46%)	613 (54%)

Table 1: Interpolation in main vs embedded clauses

Recall from §2.1.1 above that the Latin-to-Romance transition is characterized by two phenomena in the area of V-raising: a transitional ‘broad’ V2 grammar, mainly specific to main clauses, and an emerging V-to-I grammar, characterising embedded clauses (where V-to-C is generally blocked by the lexicalization of C-elements, Ledgeway 2012; *mss*). Importantly, in main clauses, interpolation occurs mostly in *wh*-interrogatives; this is, once more, a situation in which V-to-C movement is bled by *wh*-movement to the CP-domain. It has been observed that in both ORom (Hill and Alboiu 2016) and IstroRom (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016) V-to-C movement (irrespective of its trigger) and *wh*-movement are generally in complementary distribution. The predominant occurrence of interpolation and scrambling – analysed here as involving low verb movement – in clauses in which V-to-C movement is potentially blocked represents an important (yet often overlooked) piece of evidence for gradual emergence of V-to-I movement in the Latin-to-Romance transition.

2.2.2.3 Convergence and divergence in Istro-Romanian and Croatian

The preservation of interpolation and scrambling in IstroRom is atypical from a Romance comparative perspective. Naturally, intensive Istro-Romanian/Croatian bilingualism probably played a role in the preservation of these archaic Romance phenomena in IstroRom.

The parallel Croatian/IstroRom texts in Kovačec (1998) allow us to analyse, at least partially, the degree to which Croatian influenced IstroRom with respect to interpolation and scrambling. The exhaustive analysis of Kovačec’s corpus (AK) has revealed four situations:

1) Discontiguity is found only in IstroRom; the verbal form in Croatian is synthetic:

- (44) a. *cum mi-ai* *tu* *zis* (IstroRom, AK:324)
how CL.DAT.1SG=AUX.PERF.2SG you.SG.NOM say.PPLE
- b. *kao što mi ti rekla* (Croatian, AK:325)
how what me you say.PAST
‘how you said (this) to me’

2) Discontiguity is found only in IstroRom; the verbal form in Croatian is also analytic, but does not display interpolation:

- (45) a. *cân a fare iesút* (IstroRom, AK:323)
 when AUX.PERF.3SG outside go.out.PPLE
 b. *kada su izašle van* (Croatian, AK:324)
 when is.AUX go.out.PAST outside
 ‘when he went out’

3) Discontiguity is found in both IstroRom and Croatian with the same interpolated constituent:

- (46) a. *ke s-a cosítele pletút* (IstroRom, AK:327)
 that CL.REFL.3SG=AUX.PERF.3SG ponytails braid.PPLE
 b. *si je pletenice plela* (Croatian, AK:328)
 CL.REFL.3SG is.AUX ponytails braid.PAST
 ‘that she braid her ponytails’

4) Discontiguity is found in both IstroRom and Croatian, but the interpolated constituent is not the same:

- (47) a. *e ie zis-a ke-l’* (IstroRom, AK:328)
 and he say.PPLE=AUX.PERF.3SG that=CL.DAT.3SG
va cu sabl’a capu tal’a
 AUX.FUT.3SG with sword head cut.INF
 b. *a on je rekao da*
 and he is.AUX say.PAST that
ce joj sabliom odsjeći glavu (Croatian, AK:328)
 AUX.FUT.3SG her.DAT with.sword cut head
 ‘and he said that he will cut her head with the sword’

The four situations identified above indicate that, while Croatian influences IstroRom to a certain degree, IstroRom does not perfectly mimic Croatian word order. Rather, as often happens in language contact, overlapping options consolidate features of the language being influenced which elsewhere disappear (Heine and Kuteva 2005:50 and *passim*).

3. Conclusions: interpolation and scrambling in a broader diachronic and comparative perspective

- 1) The ORom and IstroRom data may be analysed in a uniform fashion: in both idioms, interpolation and scrambling result from the fact that V-to-I raising of the lexical verb does not take place (i.e. low verb movement).
- 2) Interpolation and scrambling may be added to the list of phenomena found in ORom which became extinct in the passage to modern Romanian⁸, but were preserved in IstroRom (e.g. V-

⁸ In modern Romanian, the verbal cluster may be broken only by the clitic adverbials *mai, cam, prea, tot, and și*. However, these elements have been analysed as heads (X⁰-elements) which incorporate into the structure of the

(Cl-)Aux structures, §§2.2.1.1, 2.2.1.2 above; auxiliary omission, non-clitic doubled and non-differentially marked DOs, analytic datives introduced by the preposition A, etc. – see Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2016 for the inventory of ORom/IstroRom convergent phenomena). A common old Romance and proto-Romanian ancestry may be invoked for the existence of interpolation and scrambling in both ORom and IstroRom. However, mixed Romance and Slavic (i.e. Croatian) parametric options have favoured the preservation of interpolation and scrambling, as well as of other syntactic archaisms, in a modern isolated speech community, IstroRom. This indicates that, in the domain of syntax, one of the effects of language contact is the consolidation of archaic features which otherwise become extinct.

3) From a diachronic Romance perspective, the existence of low verb movement phenomena in syntactic contexts in which V-to-C movement is potentially blocked (e.g. embedded clauses; main clauses with *wh*-movement) indicates that the Latin-to-Romance transition in the domain of verb movement is actually characterised by two distinct transitional processes: a ‘broad’ V2 grammar, specific especially to main clauses in which V-to-C movement is potentially free, and a gradual transition from a grammar with low verb movement to a grammar with V-to-I movement, found in contexts in which V-to-C movement is potentially restricted, i.e. in embedded clauses (by the lexicalization of C-elements) or in main clauses with *wh*-movement.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our gratitude to the audiences of the Stony Brook *Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* (March 31 – April 3, 2016) and of the Bucharest *Formal Approaches to Romance Microvariation* workshop (November 25 – 26, 2016) where parts of the paper were presented, and to Adam Ledgeway, Martin Maiden, Ionuț Geană and the two anonymous reviewers who read our manuscript, made valuable suggestions and asked important questions which helped improve it. Remaining errors are, of course, ours.

OLD ROMANIAN CORPUS

- AB = *Istoria Țării Românești de la octombrie 1688 până la martie 1717*, ed. by Mihail Gregorian, *Cronicarii munteni*, II, 273-352. (apud Todî 2001)
- BB.1688 = *Biblia*. Ed.: *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului și Noului Testament*, tipărită întâia oară la 1688 în timpul lui Șerban Vodă Cantacuzino, Domnul Țării Românești, Bucharest, Editura Institutului Biblic, 1977.
- CC¹.1567 = Coresi, *Tâlcul Evangheliilor*. Ed.: Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Române, 1998, 31–187.
- CCat.1560 = CCat.1560 = Coresi, *Catehism*. Ed. Al. Roman-Moraru, in: *Texte*, 101–105.
- CM.1567 = Coresi, *Molitvenic*. Ed.: Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc*, ed. Vladimir Drimba, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Române, 1998, 189–211.
- CP¹.1577 = Coresi, *Psaltire slavo-română*. Ed.: Coresi, *Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 și din 1589*, ed. Stela Toma, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1976, 35–662.
- CT.1560–1 = Coresi, *Tetraevanghel*. Ed.: *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi. Brașov 1560 – 1561*, comparat cu *Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănăstirea. 1574*, ed. Florica Dimitrescu, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1963.
- DDL.1679 = Dosoftei, *Dumnezeiasca liturghie*. Ed. N. A. Ursu, Iași, Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei, 1980, 3–313.
- DÎ = *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, text stabilit și indice de Gheorghe Chivu, Magdalena Georgescu, Magdalena Ioniță, Alexandru Mareș, Alexandra Roman-Moraru, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1979.
- DVT.1679-99 = *O traducere inedită a Vechiului Testament din secolul al XVI-lea*. Ed. C. Dima, Bucharest, Editura Universității din București, 2009, 110–217.

lexical verb (see Giurgea 2011; Mîrzea Vasile 2015; Nicolae 2015). Therefore, they are not of interest for interpolation/scrambling, phenomena which involve the interposition of XPs.

FT.1571–5 = *Fragmentul Todorescu (Carte de cântece)*. Ed. Ion Gheție, in: *Texte*, 336–343.
 PO.1582 = *Palia de la Orăștie*. Ed. V. Pamfil, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1968.
 Prav.1581 = *Pravila ritorului Lucaci*. Ed. I. Rizescu, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1971, 161–183.
 Prav.1646 = *Carte românească de învățătură*. Ed.: *Carte românească de învățătură. 1646*, ed. Colectivul pentru vechiul drept românesc condus de acad. Andrei Rădulescu, Bucharest: Editura Academiei, 1961, 33–106.
Texte = Ion Gheție (coord.), *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. I. *Catehismul lui Coresi*; II. *Pravila lui Coresi*; III. *Fragmentul Todorescu*; IV. *Glosele Bogdan*; V. *Prefețe și Epiloguri*, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1982, 101–105.

ISTRO-ROMANIAN CORPUS

AD = Dianich, Antonio, *Vocabolario istroromeno-italiano. La varietà istroromena di Briani ('Bărșcina)*, Pisa, Edizioni ETS, 2010.
 AK = Kovačec, August, *Istrorumunjsko-hrvatski rječnik (s gramaticom i tekstovima)*, Pula, 1998.
 HS = „*Harta sonoră*” a graiurilor și a dialectelor limbii române, ed. by Maria Marin, Marilena Tiugan, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Române, 2014.
 SF = Sârbu, Richard, Vasile Frățilă, *Dialectul istroromân. Texte și glosar*, Timișoara, Editura Amarcord, 1998.
 TC = *Texte istroromâne* culese de Traian Cantemir, Bucharest, Editura Academiei, 1959.

REFERENCES

- Adams, M., 1987, *Old French, Null Subjects, and Verb Second Phenomena*, PhD dissertation, UCLA.
 Alboiu, G., V. Motapanyane, 2000, “The generative approach to Romanian grammar: an overview”, in: V. Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1–48.
 Avram, M., [1975] 2007, “Particularități sintactice neromânești în diferite momente ale evoluției limbii române literare”, in: *Studii de sintaxă a limbii române*, Bucharest, Editura Academiei Române, 93–103.
 Baltin, M., 2012, “Deletion versus pro-forms: an overly simple dichotomy?”, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 30, 2, 381–423.
 Belletti, A., 2004, “Aspects of the low IP area”, in: L. Rizzi (ed), *Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 16–51.
 Benincà, P., 1983, “Un’ipotesi sulla sintassi delle lingue romanze medievali”, *Quaderni Patavini Di Linguistica*, 4, 3–19.
 Benincà, P., C. Tortora, 2010, “On clausal architecture: evidence from complement clitic placement in Romance”, in: V. Torrens, L. Escobar, A. Gavarró, J. Gutiérrez (eds), *Movement and Clitics: Adult and Child Grammar*, Newcastle, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 219–237.
 Biberauer, T., I. Roberts, 2010, “Subjects, tense, and verb movement”, in: T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts, M. Sheehan (eds), *Parametric variation: Null subjects in minimalist theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 263–302.
 Caragiu Marioțeanu, M., 1977, “Dialectul istroromân”, in: M. Caragiu Marioțeanu, Ș. Giosu, L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, R. Todoran, *Dialectologie română*, Bucharest, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 213–230.
 Chomsky, N., 2001, “Derivation by phase”, in M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 1–52.
 Chomsky, N., 2008, “On phases”, in: R. Freidin, C. P. Otero, M. L. Zubizarreta (eds), *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 133–166.
 Cinque, G., 1999, *Adverbs and Functional Heads*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
 Clark, R., I. Roberts, 1993, “A computational approach to language learnability and language change”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 24, 2, 299–345.
 Coteanu, I., 1957, *Cum dispăre o limbă: istroromâna*, Bucharest, Societatea de Științe Istorice și Filologice.
 den Besten, H., 1983, “On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules”, in: W. Abraham (ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 47–61.
 den Dikken, M., 2007, “Phase Extension Contours of a theory of the role of head movement in phrasal extraction”, *Theoretical Linguistics*, 33, 1, 1–41.
 Dobrovie-Sorin, C., 1994, *The Syntax of Romanian*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
 Dragomirescu, A., 2013, “O schimbare parametrică de la româna veche la româna modernă în sintaxa formelor verbale compuse cu auxiliar”, *Limba română*, 62, 2, 225–239.

- Dragomirescu, A., 2015, “Există trăsături slavone în sintaxa limbii române? Două studii de caz / Are there Slavonic features in the syntax of Romanian? Two case studies”, *Diacronia* 1, 1, [doi:10.17684/11A3ro](https://doi.org/10.17684/11A3ro); [doi:10.17684/11A3en](https://doi.org/10.17684/11A3en).
- Dragomirescu, A., A. Nicolae, 2016, “O trăsătură sintactică a românei vechi păstrată în istororomână: interpolarea”, *Limba română*, 65, 4, 454–464.
- Dragoș, E., 1995, *Elemente de sintaxă istorică românească*, Bucharest, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Emonds, J., 1978, “The verbal complex V'-V in French”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 9, 2, 151–175.
- Fischer, S., 2003, *The Catalan Clitic System. A Diachronic Perspective on its Syntax and Phonology*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gallego, J. Á., 2010, *Phase Theory*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
- Gheție, I., 1975, *Baza dialectală a românei literare*, Bucharest, Editura Academiei.
- Giurgea, I., 2011, “The Romanian verbal cluster and the theory of head movement”, in: J. Herschensohn (ed.), *Romance linguistics 2010. Selected Papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Linguistics (LSRL), Seattle, Washington, March 2010*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 271–286.
- Giusti, G., I. Zegrean, 2015, “Syntactic protocols to enhance inclusive cultural identity. A case study on Istro-Romanian clausal structure”, *Quaderni di linguistica e studi orientali/Working papers in linguistics and oriental studies*, 1, 117–138.
- Harwood, W., 2015, “Being progressive is just a phase: celebrating the uniqueness of progressive aspect under a phase-based analysis”, *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 33, 2, 523–574.
- Heine, B., T. Kuteva, 2005, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hill, V., G. Alboiu, 2016, *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Isac, D., E. Jakab, 2004, “Mood and Force features in the languages of the Balkans”, in: O. Mišeska Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 315–338.
- Koster, J., 1975, “Dutch as an SOV Language”, *Linguistic Analysis*, 1, 111–136.
- Kovačec, A., 1971, *Descrierea istororomânei actuale*, Bucharest, Editura Academiei.
- Ledgeway, A., 2007, “Old Neapolitan word order: some initial observations”, in: A. L. Lepschy, A. Tosi (eds), *Languages of Italy. Histories and Dictionaries*, Ravenna, Longo Editore Ravenna, 119–146.
- Ledgeway, A., 2008, “Satisfying V2 in Early Romance: Merge vs. Move”, *Journal of Linguistics*, 44, 2, 437–470.
- Ledgeway, A., 2012, *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, A., 2015, “Romance auxiliary selection in light of Romanian evidence”, in: G. Pană Dindelegan, R. Zafiu, A. Dragomirescu, I. Nicula, A. Nicolae, L. Esher (eds), *Diachronic Variation in Romanian*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 3–31.
- Ledgeway, A., A. Lombardi, 2005, “Verb movement, adverbs, and clitic positions in Romance”, *Probus*, 17, 1, 77–101.
- Ledgeway, A., *current volume*, “Parallels in clausal and nominal structures: Romanian clitic placement”.
- Ledgeway, A., *mss*, “Late Latin verb second: the sentential word order of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*”, *mss*, University of Cambridge.
- Maiden, M., 2016, “Romanian, Istro-Romanian, Megleno-Romanian, and Aromanian”, in: A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 91–125.
- Martins, A. M., 2002, “The loss of IP-scrambling in Portuguese: clause structure, word-order variation and change”, in: D. Lightfoot (ed.), *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 232–248.
- Mensching, G., 2012, “Parameters in Old Romance word order: a comparative minimalist analysis”, in: C. Galves, S. Cyrino, R. Lopes, F. Sandalo, J. Avelar (eds), *Parameter Theory and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 21–42.
- Mîrzea Vasile, C., 2015, “The position of the light adverbials *și*, *cam*, *mai*, *prea*, and *tot* in the verbal cluster: synchronic variation and diachronic observations”, in: G. Pană Dindelegan, R. Zafiu, A. Dragomirescu, I. Nicula, A. Nicolae, L. Esher (eds), *Diachronic Variation in Romanian*, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 385–416.
- Nicolae, A., 2015, *Ordinea constituenților în limba română. O perspectivă diacronică. Structura propoziției și deplasarea verbului*, Bucharest, Editura Universității din București.
- Nicolae, A., D. Niculescu, 2015, “Pronominal clitics in old Romanian: the Tobler-Mussafia Law”, *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 60, 2–3, 223–242.
- Nicolae, A., D. Niculescu, 2016, “Pronominal clitics: clitic ordering, clitic clusters”, in: G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 52–70.

- Pană Dindelegan, G., 2013, "Romanian – a brief presentation", in: G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1–7.
- Pană Dindelegan, G., A. Dragomirescu, 2016, "Conclusions". in: G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 629–637.
- Pancheva, R., 2008, "Head-directionality of TP in Old Church Slavonic", in: A. Antonenko, J. Bailin, and C. Bethin (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 16: the Stony Brook meeting, 2007*, Ann Arbor, Michigan Slavic Publications, 313–332.
- Poletto, C., 2002, "The left periphery of a V2-Rhaetoromance dialect: a new perspective on V2 and V3", in: S. Barbiers, L. Cornips, S. van der Kleij (eds), *Syntactic Microvariation. Proceedings of the Workshop on Syntactic Microvariation, Amsterdam, August 2000*, Amsterdam, Meertens Institute, 214–242.
- Poletto, C., 2014, *Word Order in Old Italian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Pollock, J.-Y., 1989, "Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20, 3, 365–424.
- Poole, G., 2007, "Interpolation and the left periphery in Old Spanish", in: M. Hussein, M. Kolokante, C. Wright (eds), *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics*, 13, 188–216.
- Rivero, M.-L., 1993, "Long head movement vs. V2, and null subjects in old Romance", *Lingua*, 89, 2–3, 217–245.
- Rivero, M.-L., 1997, "On two locations for complement-clitic pronouns: Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and Old Spanish", in: A. van Kemenade, N. Vincent (eds), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 170–206.
- Roberts, I., 1994, "Two types of head movement in Romance", in: D. Lightfoot, N. Hornstein (eds), *Verb Movement*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 207–242.
- Roberts, I., 2010, *Agreement and Head Movement. Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Roberts, I., 2013, "Some speculations on the development of the Romance periphrastic perfect", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, 58, 1, 3–30.
- Rouveret, A., 2012, "VP ellipsis, phases and the syntax of morphology", *Natural language & Linguistic Theory*, 30, 3, 897–963.
- Salvi, G., 2001, "The two sentence structures of Early Romance", in: G. Cinque, G. Salvi (eds), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, Amsterdam – London – New York – Oxford – Paris – Shannon – Tokyo, Elsevier, 297–312.
- Salvi, G., 2004, *La formazione della struttura di frase romanza. Ordine delle parole e clitici dal latino alle lingue romanze antiche*, Tübingen, Niemeyer.
- Săvescu Ciucivara, O., 2011, *A Syntactic Analysis of Pronominal Clitic Clusters in Romance. The View from Romanian*, Bucharest, Editura Universității din București.
- Schifano, N., 2015a, "The paradigmatic instantiation of TAM. A novel approach to Romance verb-movement", in: E. O. Aboh (ed.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2013. Selected Papers from 'Going Romance' Amsterdam 2013*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 83–102.
- Schifano, N., 2015b, *Verb Movement: A Pan-Romance Investigation*, PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.
- Sitaridou, I., 2012, "A comparative study of word order in Old Romance", *Folia linguistica*, 46, 2, 553–604.
- Stan, C., 2013, *O sintaxă diacronică a limbii române vechi*, Bucharest, Editura Universității din București.
- Timotin, E., 2016, "Presenting the corpus: typologizing, dating, and locating the texts", in: G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1–7.
- Todi, A., 2001, *Elemente de sintaxă românească veche*, Pitești, Editura Paralela 45.
- Tortora, C., 2014a, *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanerese*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Tortora, C., 2014b, "Clausal domains and clitic placement generalizations in Romance", in: K. Lahousse, S. Marzo (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2012: Selected papers from 'Going Romance' Leuven 2012*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 1–36.
- Vasilu, E., L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, 1986, *Limba română în secolele al XII-lea – al XV-lea (fonetică – fonologie – gramatică)*, Bucharest, Tipografia Universității din București.
- Zafiu, R., 2016, "The syntax of moods and tenses", in: G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 14–52.
- Zanuttini, R., 1997, *Negation and Clausal Structure. A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Zegrean, I. G., 2012, *Balkan Romance: Aspects of the Syntax of Istro-Romanian*, PhD dissertation, Università Ca'Foscari Venezia.