MDPI

Article

Exploring Microvariation in Verb-Movement Parameters within Daco-Romanian and across Daco-Romance

Ștefania Costea and Adam Ledgeway *

Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages and Linguistics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB2 1TN, UK; sc2078@cam.ac.uk
* Correspondence: anl21@cam.ac.uk

Abstract: This article reviews some of the principal patterns of morphosyntactic variation within Daco-Romanian and across Daco-Romance in support of a distinction between low vs high V-movement grammars variously distributed in accordance with diatopic variation (Daco-Romance: west vs east, Aromanian: north vs south), diachronic and diagenerational variation (Megleno-Romanian) and endogenous vs exogenous factors (Istro-Romanian). This approach, which builds on the insights of the Borer–Chomsky conjecture, assumes that the locus of parametric variation lies in the lexicon and the (PF-)lexicalization of specific formal feature values of individual functional projections, in our case the clausal heads T and *v* and the broad cartographic areas that they can be taken to represent. In this way, our analysis locates the relevant dimensions of (micro)variation among different Daco-Romance varieties in properties of T and *v*. In particular, we show that the feature values of these two heads are not set in isolation, inasmuch as parameters form an interrelated network of implicational relationships: the given value of a particular parameter entails the concomitant activation of associated lower-order parametric choices, whose potential surface effects may consequently become entirely predictable, or indeed render other parameters entirely irrelevant. In this way we can derive properties such as verb–adverb order, auxiliary selection, retention vs loss of the preterite, the availability of a dedicated preverbal subject position, the distribution of DOM, and the different stages of Jespersen's Cycle across Daco-Romance quite transparently, based on the relevant strength of T and *v* in individual sub-branches and sub-dialects.

Keywords: Romanian; Daco-Romance; Aromanian; Megleno-Romanian; Istro-Romanian; Romance; verb movement; parametric variation; cartography; clause structure; auxiliary selection; subject-positions; differential object marking; Jespersen's Cycle

1. Introduction

Romance boasts an increasingly vast literature on V(erb)-movement, including detailed studies of individual varieties (Lois 1989; Kayne 1991; Cornilescu 2000b, pp. 89–92; Alboiu and Motapanyane 2000, pp. 22–24; Tortora 2002, 2010, 2015; Zagona 2002, pp. 162–24, 168–70; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005; Ledgeway 2009a; 2009b, sct. 21.3.3) and comparative studies across different varieties (Cinque 1999, pp. 142–52; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005, pp. 103–6; 2014; Schifano 2015, 2018). At the macro level, there are some broad similarities in the distribution of V-movement across Romance, inasmuch as all varieties appear to show some degree of raising (though for Brazilian Portuguese, see Tescari Neto 2013, 2019, 2020a, 2020b, 2022a, 2022b; Tescari Neto and Pataquiva 2020; Araújo-Adriano 2020, 2022, 2023), a view widely reported in the literature since Pollock's (1989) and Belletti's (1990) seminal contrastive studies of English, French and Italian (cf. also, Emonds 1978), witness the contrast between (1a) and (1b,c).

(1) a. She $[_{I'}$ $[_{v\text{-VP}}$ already   **knows**   the mayor.]] (Eng.)
     b. Elle $[_{I'}$ **connaît** $[_{v\text{-VP}}$ déjà   ~~connaît~~   le maire.]] (Fr.)
     c. Lei $[_{I'}$ **conosce** $[_{v\text{-VP}}$ già   ~~conosce~~   il sindaco.]] (It.)

Exploiting the fixed positions of VP-adverbs like ALREADY as a diagnostic indicator of the left edge of the *v*-VP, we can distinguish between overt verb-raising languages such as French and Italian, in which the finite verb rises to the 'Infl' position above and to the left of VP-adverbs like ALREADY, and languages such as English where the verb appears to remain *in situ* below and to the right of such VP-adverbs and the Infl position is not overtly lexicalized in the syntax.

This idea has been developed further in more recent work, in which Infl is interpreted as a general label for the rich inflectional area of the clause (the I-domain), which is made up of a series of distinct inflectional projections dedicated to marking various temporal, aspectual and modal categories which can also be identified by the semantically corresponding adverbial modifiers they host (cf. Cinque 1999). By comparing the position of the verb relative to a universally ordered series of adverbs, we can therefore make more subtle distinctions about the extent of V-movement in different Romance varieties. Consequently, at a micro level, we can observe considerable variation across Romance (cf. Schifano 2015, 2018; Ledgeway and Schifano 2022), both synchronically and diachronically (cf. Ledgeway and Schifano 2023), in terms of the role of factors such as finiteness (Groothuis 2020, 2022) and mood (Ledgeway 2009a, 2022b; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2014), ultimately leading Schifano (2018) to relate such variation to the 'paradigmatic instantiation' of aspect, tense and mood in individual Romance varieties. Armed with these assumptions about a universal fixed hierarchy of adverb positions and corresponding functional projections broadly divided into the lower adverb space (LAS) and the higher adverb space (HAS),[1] we can now construct a fine-grained typology of Romance varieties along the lines sketched in (2a–c):

		$[_{IP}$		$Mood_{Irrealis}$		$Asp_{Continuative}$	
(2)	a.			Tal vez		todavía	**entiendo**
	b.			Forse	**capisco**	ancora	~~capisco~~
	c.	Je	**comprends**	peut-être	~~comprends~~	encore	~~comprends~~
		I	understand.1SG	perhaps	understand.1SG	still	understand.1SG

$Asp_{SgCompletive}$ $[_{v\text{-VP}}\dots]]$
completamente   ~~entiendo~~. (Sp.)
completamente   ~~capisco~~. (It.)
complètement   ~~comprends~~. (Fr.)
completely
'Maybe I still completely understand.'

Although in all three varieties exemplified in (2) the finite lexical verb invariably leaves its base position to vacate the *v*-VP complex, witness its position to the left of the very low completive adverb COMPLETELY immediately adjacent to the *v*-VP complex, it raises to different functional projections within the I-domain, as illustrated by its differential position with respect to different adverb classes. For example, in Spanish, the finite verb raises to the head position of the continuative aspectual projection immediately below the low adverb STILL, whereas in Italian it rises higher, to a head position above STILL but below the 'irrealis' modal projection lexicalized by the high adverb PERHAPS (for precise details, see Ledgeway and Lombardi 2005), and in French it rises to the highest available position above all adverb classes.

Now, within this range of variation Romanian represents a somewhat special case, since opinions are divided about the correct classification of verb movement in the language. Following the north–south distinction developed in Ledgeway (2020), in southern varieties such as Spanish (3a) the finite verb is not probed by T, but remains within the lower *v*-domain, as shown by its position to the right of both higher and (many) lower adverbs, whereas in northern Romance varieties such as French (3b), the finite verb rises to a high

position T within the I-domain from where it precedes adverbs contained both in the higher and lower adverb spaces. Our expectation then is that, as a southern variety (cf. La Fauci [1988] 1994, 1991, 1997, 1998; Zamboni 1998, 2000; Ledgeway 2012, chp. 7; 2020), Romanian should pattern with Spanish (3a), and not with French (3b). However, in practice, both the lower (4a) and higher (4b) options are found.

(3) a. El niño [$_{HAS}$ [$_{LAS}$ siempre **llora** [$_{v\text{-VP}}$ ~~llora~~.]]] (Sp.)
　　b. L' enfant [$_{HAS}$ **pleure** [$_{LAS}$ toujours [$_{v\text{-VP}}$ ~~pleure~~.]]] (Fr.)
　　　the child cry.3SG always cry.3SG
　　　'The child always cries.'

(4) a. Copilul [$_{HAS}$ [$_{LAS}$ mereu **plânge** [$_{v\text{-VP}}$ ~~plânge~~.]]] (Ro.$_1$)
　　b. Copilul [$_{HAS}$ **plânge** [$_{LAS}$ mereu [$_{v\text{-VP}}$ ~~plânge~~.]]] (Ro.$_2$)
　　　child.DEF cry.3SG always cry.3SG
　　　'The child always cries.'

Putting to one side the question of whether the position of the finite verb is the result of head or phrasal movement, the low V-movement option illustrated in (4a) is reported, among others, by Cinque (1999, p. 152), Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005, p. 101) and Ledgeway (2012, pp. 140–50), whereas scholars such as Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Alboiu and Motapanyane (2000, pp. 15f., 22–24), Cornilescu (2000b, pp. 84–92), Alboiu (2002), Schifano (2015, 2018, pp. 65–68, 192–94), Nicolae (2015, chp. 3; 2019, pp. 13–25) and Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2021, pp. 2f.) have argued for a high V-movement grammar (4b). Now, rather than treat these two positions as competing and incompatible theoretical analyses of the same phenomenon, Ledgeway (2020, p. 54; 2022a, sct. 2) hypothesizes, largely on the basis of Costea (2019, sct. 3.1), that both positions may be correct insofar as they characterize different idiolectal and diatopic varieties of Romanian, varieties no doubt even (partially) present within the same speaker, given widespread literacy and the inevitable exposure today through the media to different varieties of spoken Romanian. Consequently, our fieldwork has revealed, for example, that eastern speakers (e.g., from Muntenia) typically interpret the postverbal position of the low aspectual adverb *mereu* as pragmatically neutral in utterances such as (4b), whereas the preverbal position in (4a) is interpreted as occupying a marked focus position such that the subject *copilul* must necessarily be interpreted as left-dislocated. By contrast, our western informants (e.g., from Oltenia) typically interpret the preverbal position of the same low aspectual adverb in (4a) as pragmatically neutral, with the consequence that the subject *copilul* is also free to be interpreted as a corrective focus, and the adverb can also be preceded by higher modal adverbs such as *cică* 'apparently', *probabil* 'probably' and *poate* 'perhaps' (5).

(5) Copilul [$_{HAS}$ cică / probabil / poate [$_{LAS}$ mereu **plânge** [$_{v\text{-VP}}$ ~~plânge~~.]]] (Ro$_1$)
　　child.DEF apparently probably perhaps always cry.3SG
　　'The child apparently/probably/perhaps always cries.'

Largely similar facts are presented by Boioc Apintei (2021), who, based on a survey of 193 speakers, finds, for instance, that under pragmatically neutral readings preverbal *mereu* 'always' was preferred in 56.2% of cases, with even higher percentages for preverbal adverbs from the higher adverb space such as *probabil* 'probably' (71%) and *poate* 'perhaps' (94.3%). Data like these therefore raise the possibility that uniform characterizations of Romanian verb movement like those proposed, for instance, for French (high) and Spanish (low) are not possible. Rather, the situation is more akin to that found in Italian where, in line with the underlying dialects, northern regional varieties of Italian display high(er) V-movement and southern varieties typically show low(er) V-movement, with the (written) standard aligning more readily with northern usage.

In what follows we therefore explore further and expand on the preliminary evidence discussed in Costea (2019, sct. 3.1), Boioc Apintei (2021) and Ledgeway (2022a) to argue that we must recognize two diatopic varieties of Romanian, one with low (4a) and the other with

high (4b) V-movement, henceforth referred to as Romanian$_1$ (west) and Romanian$_2$ (east), respectively. Given the general consensus in the literature (though see Hill and Alboiu 2016) that old Romanian was a low V-movement language (cf. Nicolae 2015, chp. IV, 2019, chp. 3; Costea 2019, sct. 2.1.1; Boioc Apintei 2021, chp. 5; Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2021, pp. 12f.), it is logical to take Romanian$_1$ to represent a more conservative southern Romance variety, with Romanian$_2$ interpreted as a more innovative grammar, quite possibly the result of Balkan areal contact, a conclusion which will be further substantiated below.[2] In this light, it is quite easy to see how a P-ambiguous string (cf. Clark and Roberts 1993) such as (4a), the output of the southern Romance original low V-movement grammar (6a), could be reanalysed, under the influence of areal contact, as the output of a high Balkan V-movement grammar (cf. Rivero 1994), with the preverbal adverb concomitantly reinterpreted as a focused constituent (6b).

(6) a. [$_{TopP}$ (Copilul) [$_{FocP}$ (COPILUL)   [$_{HAS}$ [$_{LAS}$ mereu plânge [$_{VP}$ ~~plânge~~.]]] (Ro.$_1$)
    b. [$_{TopP}$ <u>Copilul</u> [$_{FocP}$ MEREU   [$_{HAS}$ plânge [$_{LAS}$ ~~plânge~~ [$_{VP}$ ~~plânge~~.]]] (Ro.$_2$)

Indeed, in what follows we shall expand our investigation beyond different diatopic varieties of Daco-Romanian to explore the distribution of competing southern Romance and Balkan grammars more broadly across Daco-Romance to include comparative evidence from Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian and Istro-Romanian.[3] In this way, not only do we offer an original descriptive account of the microvariation attested in the height of V-movement within Daco-Romanian in accordance with a broad west vs east split (cf. Section 3.1), but our analyses will also capture microvariation in the height of V-movement across Daco-Romance (cf. Section 3.2), taking into account both its Balkan and southern Romance dimensions. Finally, we shall show how differences in the setting of the V-parameter across Daco-Romanian and Daco-Romance can be used to throw light on a whole series of apparently unrelated phenomena, including perfective auxiliary selection and the distribution of analytic and synthetic past-tense forms (Section 4), subject positions (Section 5), differential object marking (Section 6) and negation (Section 7).

2. North–South Romance Divide

In contrast to traditional Romance classifications in terms of a west–east axis (cf. Wartburg 1950), more recent work (La Fauci [1988] 1994, 1991, 1997, 1998; Zamboni 1998, 2000; Ledgeway 2012, chp. 7) has argued within a wider Romance typology for a north–south axis which distinguishes between varieties of the northern Romània (*langue d'oïl* and *langue d'oc* varieties, Francoprovençal, Raeto-Romance, northern Italian dialects, and (Tuscan)-Italian) characterized by an active–stative alignment, and varieties of the southern Romània (central-southern Italian dialects, Sardinian, Ibero-Romance varieties, Dalmatian, and Daco-Romance) which display a nominative–accusative alignment. Following ideas first developed in Ledgeway (2020), we argue here that this broad areal difference can be derived from the relative strength and often complementary featural composition and roles of the clausal functional heads T and *v* such that a major dimension of variation between northern and southern Romance concerns the ability of T to probe V. For example, on a par with the French example in (3b), in the Gallo-Romance varieties of Wallon (7a), Provençal Occitan (7b) and Milanese (7c), the finite verb (in bold) raises to a high position within the T-domain, from where it precedes adverbs (underlined) contained both in the higher and lower adverb spaces. In southern varieties, by contrast, T does not probe the finite verb which remains within the *v*-domain, as shown by its position to the right of both higher and (many) lower adverbs in the Sicilian (8a), Valencian Catalan (8b) and European Portuguese (8c) examples, which replicate the pattern already seen above for Spanish in (3a).

(7) a. I   n'   **vinrè**   <u>probâbe</u>   nin   dusc-à   volà. (La Gleize, Wallon)
    he   NEG   come.FUT.3SG   probably   NEG   as.far.as   here
    'He probably won't come as far as here.'
   b. Carlamuso   **se**   **met**   <u>vite</u>   lou   mourre   d' ourse. (Provençal Occ.)
    Carlamuso   REFL= put.3SG   quickly   the   muzzle   of bear
    'Carlamuso quickly puts on the bear's muzzle.'
   c. La   sua   miè   **la**   **cuzina**   <u>minga</u>   el   risot. (Milanese)
    the   his   wife   SCL.FSG   cook.3SG   NEG   the   risotto
    'His wife doesn't cook the risotto.'

(8) a. Sa   mujjeri   <u>mancu</u>   i   **cucina**,   i   vrùcculi. (Mussomeli, Sicily)
    his   wife   NEG   them= cook.3SG the   broccoli
    'His wife doesn't cook broccoli.'
   b. Maria   <u>encara</u>   **recorda**   aquell   dia. (Valencian Cat.)
    Maria   still   remember.3SG   that   day
    'Maria still remembers that day.'
   c. O   convidado   <u>já</u>   **comeu**.   (EuPt.)
    the   guest   already   eat.PFV.PST.3SG
    'The guest has already eaten/already ate.'

Our approach, which locates the relevant dimensions of variation in the properties of individual functional heads, builds on the insights of the Borer–Chomsky conjecture (Baker 2008, p. 353), placing the locus of parametric variation in the lexicon and, in particular, in the PF-lexicalization of formal feature values of individual functional heads (Borer 1984; Chomsky 1995). These feature values are not, however, set in isolation, inasmuch as parameters form an interrelated network of implicational relationships, whereby the value of a particular parameter may entail the concomitant activation or deactivation of associated lower-order parametric choices. Consequently, the setting of a given parameter often entails quite considerable knock-on effects on other functional heads whose force and content either become predictable or are rendered irrelevant. Such is the case, for instance, with T, which Ledgeway (2020, 2022a) shows probes the verb in northern Romance languages and dialects which exhibit high V-movement, a parametric setting that, in turn, accounts for V-Adv orders, the availability of verb-subject inversion, the licensing of Stage II and III negation, the presence of subject clitics and a dedicated preverbal subject-position, and active–stative perfective auxiliary selection. In the varieties of southern Romance, by contrast, all these same options are absent since T fails to attract the verb, which is probed instead by *v*, yielding low V-movement, a parametric choice which explains Adv-V orders, the absence of V-to-C movement, Stage I negation, the use of generalized or person-driven perfective auxiliation, active participle agreement with *in situ* objects, and the availability of differential object marking (DOM).

Building on this approach to Romance variation, in the following sections we shall demonstrate how the differential setting of the V-parameter, in terms of the relative strength of T and *v*, can also offer a principled account of the variation observed not only within Daco-Romanian, but also more broadly across Daco-Romance. In particular, our detailed comparative examination of the V-parameter will not only enable us to identify and formalize some quite substantial similarities and differences between the four principal sub-branches of Daco-Romance, but it will also allow us to discern more subtle differences within Daco-Romanian which have either been entirely overlooked or dismissed in the literature. Thus, rather than assuming Daco-Romance to be characterized by a single homogeneous grammar, the evidence to be reviewed in the following sections will reveal some significant microvariation among different areas and speakers, which will allow us, among other things, to distinguish, on the one hand, a low(er) V-movement grammar typical of western Daco-Romanian varieties and a high V-movement grammar, on the other, typical of eastern Daco-Romanian varieties and the written standard. In a similar fashion, our broader investigations of Daco-Romance will highlight similar low vs high V-movement distinctions across other sub-branches of Daco-Romance in accordance with diatopic varia-

tion (e.g., Aromanian), diachronic and diagenerational variation (e.g., Megleno-Romanian) and endogenous vs exogenous factors (e.g., Istro-Romanian).

3. V-Movement in Daco-Romanian and Daco-Romance

3.1. Daco-Romanian

As noted in Section 1, views in the literature about Romanian V-movement are divided between low and high V-movement analyses, although the actual details and, in particular, microvariational differences between individual speakers and regions have to date largely been overlooked. By contrast, our fieldwork inquiries highlight a striking difference, not only in the placement of the verb, but also in the lexicalizations of different adverb classes employed in western and eastern Romania, roughly corresponding, respectively, to (pockets of) Maramureș, Banat, Crișana and Oltenia on the one hand and Muntenia (Greater Wallachia), Dobrogea, Moldova and Bucovina on the other. While diatopic variation regarding the lexicalization of different adverb classes has been previously noted in the literature (cf. Chircu 2006), it has never been taken into account when evaluating V-movement. Significantly, we have found that when we test V-movement in relation to adverbs taken from the standard language, e.g., *deja* 'already', *mereu* 'always' and *probabil* 'probably', native speakers of Daco-Romanian tend to display analogous patterns of V-movement: oversimplifying somewhat, the tendency is to raise the verb above TP$_{Anterior}$ lexicalized by *deja* 'already' but below MoodP$_{Irrealis}$ lexicalized by *poate* 'maybe' and ModP$_{Epistemic}$ lexicalized by *probabil* 'probably'. However, when we test the same speakers using their local adverbial forms, there emerges a clear east–west divide, ultimately parallel to the broader north–south divide proposed by Ledgeway (2020), with western varieties displaying a lower level of V-movement than eastern varieties.

The local lexicalizations of each of the adverb classes making up the higher and lower adverb spaces in western varieties is given in (9a,b; cf. also *ALR* (V) 1966, 1323, 1384, 1470). Testing of each of the various classes in relation to V-movement reveals that the finite verb remains in the lower adverb space, reaching a position immediately above AspP$_{Proximative}$. This is exemplified in (10) and (11) from the western variety spoken in Sacoșu Mare (Timiș, Banat), where we observe that the finite verb follows not only higher adverbs such as the irrealis *puaci* 'perhaps' (10a), the temporal *dălŭoc* (10b) and volitional *într-ađins* 'deliberately' (10c), but also those adverbs situated in the highest portion of the LAS, namely perfective *tădăuna* 'always' (11a) and retrospective *baș acuma* 'just' (11b), but obligatorily precedes the proximative *dăluoc* 'soon' (11c) and the completive *dă tuot* 'completely' (11d).[4] From this we can conclude that in western Romanian varieties the finite verb raises at least as high as the Asp$_{Retrospective}$ head, but not any higher (12).

(9) a. Higher Adverb Space
[*cică* (Olt.), *șică/zice că* (Ban.), *ici că* (Criș.) 'apparently' Mood$_{Evidential}$ (*ALR* (V) 1966, 1470). [*poate* (Olt.), *puaci* (Ban.), *poce* (Criș.) 'probably' Mod$_{Epistemic}$ [*acu'* (Olt.), *acuma/dălŭoc* (Ban.), *amu'* (Criș.) 'now' T$_{(Past/Future)}$ [*poate* (Olt.), *puaci* (Ban.), *poce* (Criș.) 'perhaps' Mood$_{Irrealis}$ [*dinadins* (Olt.), *bașcă/într-adins* (Ban.), *dinadins* (Criș.) 'intentionally' Mod$_{Volitional}$

  b. Lower Adverb Space
[*to' timpu'* (Olt.), *tădăuna/mireu* (Ban.), *tăt timpu'* (Criș.) 'always' Asp$_{Perfect}$ [*neam*[5] (Olt.) 'hardly/at all' Neg2 [*tomna, adineauri* (Olt.), *baș acuma* (Ban.), *amu'* (Criș.) 'just' Asp$_{Retrospective}$ [*dup'aia* (Olt.), *dăluoc* (Ban.), *minchenaș* (Criș.) 'soon' Asp$_{Proximative}$ [*dă to(t)* (Olt.), *dă tuot* (Ban.), *di tăt* (Criș.) 'completely' Asp$_{SgCompletive(event)}$ [*bine* (Olt.), *bine* (Ban.), *bine* (Criș.) 'well' Voice [*v*-VP ...

(10) a. <u>Puaci</u>   **pluaie**   astară. (Sacoșu Mare)
    perhaps   rain.3SG   this.evening
    'Perhaps it will rain this evening.'

   b. Pră   Mărie   <u>dălŭoc</u>   uo   **sun**. (Sacoșu Mare)
    DOM   Maria   now   her=   call.1SG
    'I'm calling Maria now.

   c. Iel   <u>într-ađins</u>   **dzâșe**   că   nu-i   pasă. (Sacoșu Mare)
    he   intentionally   say.3SG   that   NEG=DAT.3SG=   matter.3SG
    'He intentionally says that he doesn't care.'

(11) a. Părinți   <u>tădăuna</u>   **ț-ajută**   la   năcaz. (Sacoșu Mare)
    parents=DEF   always   you.DAT.SG=help.3   at   need
    'Your parents always help you in times of need.'

   b. <u>Baș acuma</u>   **audzam**   că   pliacă   dân   țară. (Sacoșu Mare)
    just   hear.PST.IPFV.1SG   that   leave.3   from   country
    'I've just heard that he'll go abroad.'

   c. **Pliecăm**   <u>dăluoc</u>   la   sat. (Sacoșu Mare)
    leave.1PL   soon   to   village
    'We'll soon be leaving for the countryside.'

   d. Mi   să   **gată**   <u>dă tuot</u>   făńina. (Sacoșu Mare)
    me.DAT=   self=   finish.3SG   completely   flour.DEF
    'I'm running completely out of flour.'

(12) [HAS… T$_{Past/Future}$ Mood$_{Irrealis}$ Mod$_{Vol.}$ [LAS Asp$_{Perf.}$ Neg2 **V**-Asp$_{Retro.}$ Asp$_{Prox.}$ … [$_{v\text{-VP}}$ V̶…]]]

In the east, by contrast, the verb raises higher, reaching the higher adverb space. The local lexicalizations of each of the adverb classes across both spaces are given in (13a-b; cf. also *ALR* (V) 1966, 1323, 1384, 1470), with relevant examples from Grințieș (Neamț, Moldova) in (14) and (15) illustrating the position of the finite verb in relation to higher and lower adverbs, respectively.

(13) a. Higher Adverb Space
    [*cică/să zice că* (Munt.), *șicî/dzis-că/cică* (Mold.), *sî dzisi cî* (Buc.), *cică* (Dobr.) 'apparently' Mood$_{Evidential}$ [*poate* (Munt.), *poate* (Mold.), *poate* (Buc.), *poati* (Dobr.) 'probably' Mod$_{Epistemic}$ [*acu(m)* (Munt.), *acu'/amu'* (Mold.), *acuma* (Buc.), *acu(m)* (Dobr.) 'now' T$_{(Past/Future)}$ [*poate* (Munt.), *poate* (Mold.), *poate* (Buc.), *poati* (Dobr.) 'perhaps' Mood$_{Irrealis}$ [*dinadins* (Munt.), *anume/ispre* (Mold.), *expre* (Buc.), *expre* (Dobr.) 'intentionally' Mod$_{Volitional}$

   b. Lower Adverb Space
    [*mereu* (Munt.), *orișicând/totdeauna/tot timpu'/în tătă vremea* (Mold.), *tot timpu'/mereu* (Buc.), *mereu/tot timpu'* (Dobr.) 'always' Asp$_{Perfect}$ [*acu(m)* (Munt.), *acu'/amu'* (Mold.), *acuma* (Buc.), *acu(m)* (Dobr.) 'just' Asp$_{Retrospective}$ [*acu(m)* (Munt.), *acu'/amu'/numa'dicât* (Mold.), *acuma* (Buc.), *acu(m)* (Dobr.) 'soon' Asp$_{proximative}$ [*dă tot* (Munt.), *di tot* (Mold.), *de tot* (Buc.), *di tot* (Dobr.) 'completely' Asp$_{SgCompletive(event)}$ [*bine* (Munt.), *ghini* (Mold.), *bini* (Buc.), *bini/bine* (Dobr.) 'well' Voice [$_{v\text{-VP}}$ …

(14) a. <u>Poati</u>   **stăm**   di   vorbî. (Grințieș)
    probably   stay.1PL   of   word
    'We'll probably talk.'

   b. O   **sun**   <u>amu'</u>   pi   Maria. (Grințieș)
    her=   call.1SG   now   DOM   Maria
    'I'm calling Maria now.'

   c. Iel   **spuni**   <u>ispre</u>   că   nu-l   interesează. (Grințieș)
    he   say.3SG   intentionally   that   NEG=him=   interest.3SG
    'He intentionally says that he doesn't care.'

(15) a. Părinții   ti-**ajutî**   orișicând la   nevoi. (Grinţieş)
          parents.DEF   you.ACC.SG=help.3 always   at   need
          'Your parents always help you in times of need.'

      b. **Spunea**   amu'   că   pleacă   din   ţară. (Grinţieş)
          say.PST.IPFV.3SG just   that   leave.3 from   country
          'He was just saying that he'll go abroad.'

      c. **Plecăm**   numa'dicât   la   ţară. (Grinţieş)
          leave.1PL   soon   to   country
          'We'll soon be leaving for the countryside.'

      d. Mi   sî   **termină**   di tot   făina. (Grinţieş)
          me.DAT=   self=   finish.3SG   completely   flour.DEF
          'I'm running completely out of flour.'

The contrast between (14a) and (14b,c) shows that the verb raises to a position below the higher epistemic adverb *poati* 'probably', but above the temporal and volitional adverbs *amu'* 'now' and *ispre* 'intentionally', and consequently above all the lower adverbs exemplified in (15a-d). We can therefore conclude that in eastern varieties the finite verb targets the head of MoodP$_{Epistemic}$ in the higher adverb space, as illustrated in (16).

(16) [$_{HAS}$… **V**-Mood$_{Epistemic}$ T$_{Past/Future}$ Mod$_{Vol.}$ [$_{LAS}$ Asp$_{Perf.}$ Neg2 Asp$_{Retro.}$ Asp$_{Prox.}$ ⋯ [$_{v}$-VP V̶⋯]]]

Turning now to analytic past-tense forms, contrasts in the height of V-movement are on the whole less clear-cut, although here too, the east appears to display a higher level of V-movement. For instance, in eastern varieties the verbal complex consisting of auxiliary and participle must occur below the epistemic modal adverb *cre' c'* 'probably' (17a) but to the left of higher temporal adverbs such as *amu'* 'now' (17b), which unambiguously situates it in the head of MoodP$_{Epistemic}$, whereas in the west the verbal complex must occur below these same temporal adverbs (17c). Indeed, the position of the analytic verbal complex is much lower in western varieties, in that it not only surfaces to the right of the volitional adverb *într-ađins* 'intentionally' (18a) situated at the bottom of the higher adverb space, and also below the perfective aspectual adverb *tădăuna* 'always' (18b) situated towards the top of the lower adverb space, but it occurs above the proximative *dăluoc* 'soon' (18c) and the completive *dă tŭot* 'completely' (18d).

(17) a. Cre' c'   **o**   **plouat**   ieri   acasă. (Grinţieş)
         probably   have.3   rain.PTCP   yesterday   at.home
         'It probably rained at home yesterday.'

     b. Maria   **o-nţeles**   amu'   ci   s-o   ntâmplat. (Grinţieş)
         Maria   have.3=understand.PTCP now   what   self=have.3   happen.PTCP
         'Maria has now understood what happened.'

     c. Măriĭě   acuma   **o**   **prăśĕput** śě   s-o
         Maria   now   have.3SG   understand.PTCP what   self=have.3SG
         ntîmplat. (Sacoşu Mare)
         happen.PTCP
         'Maria has now understood what happened.'

(18) a. Iel   într-ađins   i-**o**   **spus**   că   nu   i-o
         he   intentionally   DAT.3SG=have.3SG   say.PTCP   that   NEG   DAT.3SG=have.3SG
         păsat. (Sacoşu Mare)
         matter.PTCP
         'He intentionally told her he didn't care.'

     b. Nŭoĭ   tădăuna   ć-**am**   **ażutat**   la   năcaz. (Sacoşu Mare)
         we   always   you.SG=have.1PL   help.PTCP   at   need
         'We've always helped you in times of need.'

     c. **Or**   **plĭěcat**   dăluoc   la   žŭacă. (Sacoşu Mare)
         have.3PL   leave.PTCP   soon   at   play
         'They soon left to go and play.'

     d. Mi   **s-o**   **gătat**   dă tŭot   făńina. (Sacoşu Mare)
         me.DAT=   self=have.3SG   finish.PTCP   completely   flour.DEF
         'I've completely run out of flour.'

Thus, on a par with simplex finite verbs, in the east the auxiliary + participle complex raises at least to the Mood$_{Epistemic}$ head in the higher adverb space (cf. 16), from where it precedes temporal adverbs. In the west, by contrast, the analytic complex surfaces in the lower adverb space where it raises at least to the Asp$_{Restrospective}$ head (cf. 12), from where it follows all higher adverbs as well as the lower perfective adverb ALWAYS, but precedes proximative and completive adverbs. More precise evidence regarding the position of the verbal complex in the west can be adduced from minimal pairs such as the Oltenian examples from Valea Mare (Vâlcea) in (19a,b). As previously suggested in the literature (cf. Schifano 2018, p. 78), in low(er) V-movement varieties, postverbal adverbs typically receive a focalized reading, inasmuch as they are forced to occur in the lower left periphery (Belletti 2004). Such is the case in (19a), where our informants reported that the only possible reading of the simplex finite verb preceding the negative adverb *neam* 'not (at all)' is that in which the adverb is focalized. This follows straightforwardly from our observation above, that the finite lexical verb in the west raises to a position below NegP2, viz. Asp$_{Retrospective}$ (cf. 12). Consequently, an example such as (19a') with a focalized postverbal subject proves ungrammatical, since there can only be one focus per sentence, either the negative adverb or the subject, but not both. By contrast, examples such as (19b) containing a compound verb preceding *neam* were judged pragmatically unmarked by the same informants. This must imply that *neam* in such cases occurs in its base position in the clausal spine with the verbal complex moving above it, presumably raising to the head of AspP$_{Perfective}$, since complex verbs follow adverbs such as ALWAYS (cf. 18b). Indeed, this is confirmed by the observation that in such cases *neam* can now be followed by a focalized subject (19b'), since the negative adverb occurs *in situ* and not in the lower focus position, which is free to host the postverbal subject.

(19) a.   Nu   [$_{AspPRetro.}$ **merge** [$_{FocP}$ [$_{Spec}$ NEAM!] [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ ~~merge!~~]]] (Valea Mare)
            NEG   go.3SG   at.all
            'It's not working AT ALL!'
      a.'* Nu   [$_{AspPRetro.}$ **merge** [$_{FocP}$ [$_{Spec}$ NEAM   TELEVIZORUL] [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ ~~merge~~]]],nu
            NEG   go.3SG   at.all   television.DEF   NEG
            mașina   de   spălat. (Valea Mare)
            machine.DEF of   wash.SUP
            'THE TELEVISION is not working AT ALL, not the washing machine.'
      b.   N- [$_{AspPPerf.}$ a   mânca' [$_{NegP2}$ [$_{Spec}$ **neam**] [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ ~~a mânca'.~~]]] (Valea Mare)
            NEG=   have.3SG   eat.PTCP   at.all
            'He did not eat at all.'
      b'.   N- [$_{AspPPerf.}$ a   mânca' [$_{NegP2}$ [$_{Spec}$ **neam**] [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ [$_{Spec}$ MARIUS] ~~a mânca'~~]]],
            NEG=   have.3SG   eat.PTCP   at.all   Marius
            nu   Ștefania. (Valea Mare)
            NEG   Ștefania
            'It was MARIUS who did not eat at all, not Ștefania.'

We conclude therefore that, whereas in the east both simplex and compound finite verbs invariably raise to the head of MoodP$_{Epistemic}$ (20a), in the west, V-movement proves sensitive to the distinction between simplex and compound verb forms (20b); the former raise to the head of AspP$_{Retrospective}$ but the latter raise slightly higher, to the head of AspP$_{Perfective}$.

(20) a.   [$_{HAS}$...**V(+Ptcp)**-Mood$_{Epist.}$ T$_{Past/Fut}$ Mod$_{Vol.}$ [$_{LAS}$ Asp$_{Perf.}$ Asp$_{Retro.}$ Asp$_{Prox.}$... (east/Ro.$_2$)
      b.   [$_{HAS}$...Mood$_{Epist.}$ T$_{Past/Fut}$ Mod$_{Vol.}$ [$_{LAS}$ **V+PtcP**-Asp$_{Perf.}$ **V**-Asp$_{Retro.}$ Asp$_{Prox.}$... (west/Ro.$_1$)

3.2. Daco-Romance

Variation in the height of V-movement is by no means limited to Daco-Romanian, but equally characterizes other Daco-Romance varieties. Beginning with Aromanian, we can observe a split between southern and northern varieties (henceforth Aromanian$_1$ and Aromanian$_2$), with the former displaying lower V-movement than the latter. For example, in southern dialects lexical verbs surface below the perfective aspectual adverb *tută dzua/dzua tută* 'always', lexicalizing one of the lower positions within the lower adverb space (21a). In northern Aromanian varieties, by contrast, this same class of adverbs usually occur after the

lexical verb in pragmatically unmarked sentences (cf. 21b),[6] highlighting how the lexical verb raises to one of the higher positions within the lower adverb space, a behaviour which we interpret as a syntactic borrowing from Greek, which displays high(er) V-movement (Mavrogiorgos 2010, p. 182).

(21) a. și   <u>dzua tută</u>   **se-agiuca**   cu   nâs. (Aro.₁, Veria/Verroia)
      and always   self=play.PST.IPFV.3SG with him
      'and she was always playing with him.' (Papahagi 1905, p. 352)
   b. Ți **fățea**   <u>tută dzua</u>:   si   scula.
      what do.PST.IPFV.3SG always   self= awake.PSTP.IPFV.3SG
      di-cu-dimineață... (ARo.₂, Crușova/Kruševo)
      early.morning
      'What she's always done: wake up early in the morning...' (Papahagi 1905, p. 71)

A similar development is also found in Megleno-Romanian varieties. Although it has not been possible to identify any clear generalizations about diatopic variation (Megleno-Romanian is today mainly spoken in the Meglen region split between Northern Macedonia and Greece), there do seem to be consistent idiolectal options in Theodor Capidan's (1928) corpus and in present-day recordings (e.g., the VLACH project, https://www.oeaw.ac.at/vlach/collections/meglen-vlach (accessed on 28 December 2023)). In particular, speakers consistently display either high V-movement to the left of $TP_{Past/Future}$, lexicalized by temporal adverbs such as *cmo* 'now' (22), or lower V-movement to the right of the same functional projection and its associated adverb (23).

(22) Io <u>cmo</u> **mor**   și   fitšoril'   ca   si   rămǫnă (MRo.₁, Oșani/Ossiani)
     I   now die.1SG and   sons=DEF after that.SBJV remain.SBJV.PRS.3PL
     'I am now dying and my sons will remain after me.' (Capidan 1928, p. 80)
(23) și nu   mă   **vuăr**   <u>cmo</u>. (MRo.₁, Liumnița/Skra)
     and NEG me.ACC=want.3PL now
     'and now they don't want me.' (Capidan 1928, p. 123)

This is the traditional situation evidenced in older materials (henceforth, MRo.₁). However, an examination of contemporary data such as the VLACH recordings from Oșani/Ossiani made in 2015 reveals a diachronic development whereby the variation between high and lower V-movement observed in the past (cf. 22–23) is today increasingly replaced by a more consistent low(er) V-movement grammar across all speakers (henceforth MRo.₂). This can be seen in (24) below, taken from 2015 VLACH recordings from Oșani/Ossiani, where the lexical verb typically occupies a low position below, for example, *tucu* 'always' (viz. $SpecAspP_{Perfect}$).

(24) <u>Tucu</u> ne **ra**   frica. (MRo.₂, Oșani/Ossiani)
     always us= be.PST.IPFV.3SG fear.DEF
     'We were always wary' (VLACH, *The snake and the flute*, 04.09)

Superficial oscillations in the level of V-movement apparently occur also in Istro-Romanian, witness the position of the finite lexical verb to the left and to the right of the manner adverb *bire* 'well' in (25a-b), respectively. However, in this case, optionality is only apparent, inasmuch as speakers, who are all bilingual with Croatian, seem to be able to access both a conservative, Daco-Romance-style higher V-movement grammar (henceforth IRo.₁) in which the verb raises to the left of lower adverbs such as *bire* 'well' (25a),[7] as well as an innovative Croatian-style lower V-movement grammar (henceforth IRo.₂) in which the verb follows lower adverbs such as *bire* 'well' (25b; cf. Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2021). The difference between (25a) and (25b) is therefore to be captured in terms of language contact, with verb-raising above and below VoiceP in accordance with competing Daco-Romance and Croatian parametric options available to all speakers.

(25) a. **Spalåm**   <u>bire</u>. (IRo.₁, Žejane)
          wash.1PL well
          'We wash [it] well.' (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 117)
      b. Ea   <u>bire</u>   **zasluje**. (IRo.₂, Žejane)
          she   well   gain.PST.IPFV.3SG
          'She was being paid well.' (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 149)

While synthetic verbal forms such as the present, past imperfective and the preterite allow us to make specific generalizations about V-movement, the same cannot be said about analytic past tenses. Deliberately oversimplifying, both Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian display an analytic past tense consisting of the auxiliary HAVE and an invariable form of the past participle to encode iterative aspect and/or events with present relevance (Capidan 1925, pp. 167, 205; 1932, p. 463). However, the default past-tense form in both varieties is the preterite, with which the analytic past is in free variation, even in contexts such as (26a-b) (Tomić 2006, pp. 377–79, 384–86). Thus, given the sporadic attestations of the analytic past in Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian in both oral and written corpora, it has not been possible to reach any significant conclusions regarding the default position of auxiliary and participle in relation to adverbs.

(26) a. Me-**am**   **dusă**   tu   aistă politie multe or. (Aro.)
          me.ACC=have.1SG lead.PTCP in   this   city   many   times
          'I've been to this city more than once.' (Tomić 2006, p. 385)
      b. Mi-**am**   **dus**   prin   toati cătunili. (MRo.)
          me.ACC=have.1SG lead.PTCP through all   villages.DEF
          'I've been through all the villages.' (Atanasov 2011, p. 485)

Istro-Romanian, on the other hand, has generalized an analytic past tense consisting of the auxiliary HAVE and the invariable past participle (Kovačec 1971, p. 147; Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 30). Interestingly, Istro-Romanian speakers seem once again to permit a dual syntactic interpretation of the auxiliary: on one hand it may pattern with Croatian and occupy the second position in the clause,[8] but on the other it can also replicate the Daco-Romance pattern and lexicalize various I-related positions.[9] Now, for some speakers the default position of past-tense auxiliaries is immediately below (Spec)TP_Anterior, lexicalized by *vet"* 'already' (cf. 27a) in the lower adverb space. However, for most speakers who today have Croatian as their dominant language, they can also move the auxiliary to the second position in the clause, as we see in (27b) where raising of the finite auxiliary to a very high position—variously interpreted in the literature as involving movement to a high position within the I-domain (Bošković 1997; Migdalski 2006, pp. 71, 180f.) or to the C-domain (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2021)—places it to the left of the pronominal subject *voi* 'you' and immediately left-adjacent to the deictic adverbial *aș* 'thus'.

(27) a. <u>Acmo</u>   <u>vet"</u>   **a**   murit. (IRo.₁, Žejane)
          now   already have.3SG die.PTCP
          'He has now already died.' (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 167)
      b. C-aș-**åț**   voi   <u>acmo</u> åț verit (IRo.₂, Žejane)
          that=thus=have.2PL you   now   come.PTCP
          'Thus you came now' (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 160)

3.3. Interim Summary

Our investigations of V-movement have revealed a picture involving some quite significant microvariation, which makes it impossible to talk of a single setting for the V-parameter across Daco-Romance. In particular, we have seen that there is notable diatopic variation within Daco-Romanian, with varieties from the west (Romanian₁) displaying lower placement of the finite lexical verb and the analytic compound past than those spoken in the east (Romanian₂). Similar degrees of variation have also been observed for the other major branches of Daco-Romance, with Aromanian showing a low vs high opposition in

accordance with a respective south vs north distinction (viz. Aromanian$_1$ vs Aromanian$_2$); Megleno-Romanian traditionally displaying free variation between different speakers (Megleno-Romanian$_1$), though with a tendency in more recent times for all speakers to converge towards a low V-movement grammar (Megleno-Romanian$_2$); and Istro-Romanian apparently alternating between a conservative inherited higher low V-movement grammar (Istro-Romanian$_1$) and a Croatian-style very low V-movement grammar (Istro-Romanian$_2$). This is the situation with finite lexical verbs, whereas the picture with the analytic past has been less clear: the periphrasis proves so infrequent in Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian that reliable data are not available, but the frequency of the periphrasis in Istro-Romanian allowed us to identify once again two competing patterns, a Daco-Romance-style placement in the higher portion of the lower adverb space (Istro-Romanian$_1$) and a Croatian-style movement of the auxiliary to the high I-domain or the C-domain (Istro-Romanian$_2$). These facts are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. V-movement across Daco-Romance.

	Romanian		Aromanian		Megleno-Romanian		Istro-Romanian	
	West (Ro.$_1$)	**East (Ro.$_2$)**	**South (Aro.$_1$)**	**North (Aro.$_2$)**	**(MRo.$_1$)**	**(MRo.$_2$)**	**IRo.$_1$**	**IRo.$_2$**
V$_{Lex}$	LAS	HAS	LAS	HAS	LAS/HAS	LAS	higher LAS	lower LAS
V$_{Aux}$	LAS	HAS	–	–	–	–	LAS	HAS

Finally, we must note that our investigations have highlighted that, across Daco-Romance in general and in Daco-Romanian in particular, it is not always possible to test V-movement in relation to particular adverb classes of the standard language. This is because the adverbs in question are simply not lexically available in some of the non-standard varieties and the relevant modal, temporal and aspectual categories have to be licensed, not through the internal merge of an adverb in the specifier of the relevant functional projection, but rather through raising of a particular verb form to the head of the same functional projection. This is the case, for example, in some of the western Daco-Romanian varieties spoken in Oltenia, Crişana and (Serbian) Banat, which lack a local retrospective aspectual adverb corresponding to the standard *tocmai* 'just', but mark this aspectual category with the preterite, which is raised to the head of AspP$_{Retrospective}$ (28a). That the verb sits in the head of AspP$_{Retrospective}$ in examples such as (28a) is clearly demonstrated by examples where the verb obligatorily follows the immediately higher continuative *încă* 'still' (28b) and perfective *to' timpu'* 'always' (28c) adverbs, but precedes the completive adverb *dă tot* 'completely'. Similarly, in the Boyash variety of Daco-Romanian currently spoken in Hungary there is no local habitual aspect adverb corresponding to standard *de obicei* 'usually' (cf. Kahl and Nechiti 2019); by the same token, we can therefore assume that habitual aspect is licensed in this variety by the erstwhile pluperfect raising to the head of AspP$_{Habitual}$ (29). Another notable example comes from Megleno-Romanian where evidential modality is lexicalized, not through the external merge of an adverb in SpecMoodP$_{Evidential}$ (cf. Ro. *aparent* 'apparently'), but by raising of the so-called 'inverted analytic past' to the head of MoodP$_{Evidential}$ (30a),[10] as partially indicated by examples such as (30b), where the verbal complex is correctly predicted to precede adverbs of the lower adverb space such as the repetitive aspectual adverbs *de câtiva or* and *ară* 'again'.

(28) a. [AspPRetro. **Vorbii** [vP v̶o̶r̶b̶i̶i̶.]] (Ro.₋₁, Olt.)
　　　　　　　talk.PRT.1SG
　　　　'I've just talked.'

　　b. El [AspPCont. <u>încă</u> 　nu [AspPRetro. **înțeleasă** 　<u>dă tot</u> 　dă ce 　vă
　　　　he 　　　　still 　　NEG 　　　　understand.PRT.3SG completely why 　you.PL=
　　　　supărarăți. (Ro.₋₁, Olt.)
　　　　get.angry.PTR.2PL
　　　　'It's still the case that he hasn't just understood entirely why you got angry.'

　　c. Azi 　　<u>to' timpu'</u> **rămăsăi** 　　<u>dă tot</u> 　　　fără 　　ciorbă, o 　fi
　　　　today 　always 　　remain.PRT.1SG completely 　　without 　soup 　FUT be.INF
　　　　mai 　　bine 　　mâine. (Ro.₋₁, Olt.)
　　　　more 　　well 　　tomorrow
　　　　'I've just kept on running out of soup, things will hopefully be better tomorrow.'

(29) El [AspPHab. **lucrasă** [vP l̶u̶c̶r̶a̶s̶ă̶.]] (Boyash)
　　　he 　　　　　work.PLUPF.3SG
　　　'He used to work.' (Kahl and Nechiti 2019, p. 85)

(30) a. Ei [MoodPEvid. **știut(-)au** 　　　　[vP ș̶t̶i̶u̶t̶(̶-̶)̶a̶u̶.]] (MRo.)
　　　　they 　　　　know.PTCP=have.3PL
　　　　'They have apparently found out.' (Tomić 2006, p. 380)

　　b. Țista 　　ăl 　　　**ăntribat-ău** 　　<u>de 　cătiva 　or.</u> (MRo.)
　　　　he 　　　him= 　　ask.PTCP=have.3PL of 　some 　times
　　　　'He apparently asked him again.' (Atanasov 2011, p. 488)

　　c. Si 　　**fat-au** 　　　　<u>ară</u> 　　isan. (MRo.)
　　　　self= 　make.PTCP=have.3PL again 　　human
　　　　'They apparently became human again.' (Capidan 1928, p. 102)

In all three cases in (28)–(30) we see a mismatch between the traditional value of the relevant morphological verb forms (viz., preterite, pluperfect and present perfect) and the syntactic positions in which they surface, highlighting how the aspectual and modal values of each are transparently licensed, not by their form, but by the functional projections they lexicalize.

4. Auxiliary Selection and Past-Tense Forms

4.1. Daco-Romanian

As hinted in Section 2, following Ledgeway (2020, sct. 3.4, sct. 4.1), a further correlation deriving from the variability of V-movement concerns perfective auxiliary selection.[11] In particular, in most northern Romance varieties, which uniformly display a high V-movement grammar, we see the continuation of an original active–stative split, whereby predicates with AGENT subjects select auxiliary HAVE (31a) and predicates with UNDERGOER subjects select auxiliary BE (31b).

(31) a. Il 　　**a** 　　　　souri. (Fr.)
　　　　he 　　have.3SG 　smile.PTCP
　　　　'He smiled.'

　　b. Il 　　**est** 　　　mort. (Fr.)
　　　　he 　　be.3SG 　die.PTCP
　　　　'He died.'

In southern Romance, by contrast, this active–stative distribution has in most cases been replaced by a nominative–accusative alignment variously involving the generalization of a single auxiliary, whether HAVE (32a) or BE (32b), or, alternatively, by a person-based system, as in (32c), which generally contrasts BE in the first and secondperson with HAVE in the third person.

(32) a. **He** / **Has** / **Ha**... comido / venido. (Sp.)
    have.1SG   have.2SG   have.3SG eat.PTCP   come.PTCP

    b. **sɔŋgə** / **si** / **ɛ**... maɲˈɲɛɐtə/ məˈnuːtə. (Pescolanciano, Molise)
    be.1SG be.2SG be.3SG eat.PTCP   come.PTCP

    c. **So** / **Si** / **A**... magnate/ minute. (Arielli, eastern Abruzzo)
    be.1SG   be.2SG   have.3 eat.PTCP come.PTCP

    'I have/you have/(s)he has eaten/come.'

Now, in traditional work on active–stative patterns of auxiliary selection within the Unaccusativity Hypothesis (cf. Perlmutter 1978; Burzio 1986), it has been assumed that auxiliary BE represents the superficial reflex of a co-indexation relation between T and V in accordance with the idea that unaccusative structures involve raising of the object to the surface subject position, as formalized in (33).

(33) Auxiliary BE is selected whenever (Spec)T is indexed with V(,DP)

In northern Romance, verbs overtly raise to T, an operation that automatically results in the co-indexation of V and T which, in accordance with (33), produces the observed sensitivity of the perfective auxiliary to the active–stative distinction. By the same token, we now also have a natural and principled explanation for the typical absence of active–stative auxiliation patterns in southern Romance, since verbs do not raise to T in the south but, rather, remain within the *v*-domain.[12] It follows from the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) that T and V will never be co-indexed and auxiliary BE will never therefore surface as the result of an unaccusative structure.

These facts find further confirmation in our dialectal investigations, in which the low V-movement grammars of western Daco-Romanian varieties align with a more conservative (Balkan-style) nominative–accusative pattern, in contrast to eastern high-V-movement varieties within which we witness a partial move away from the traditional nominative–accusative alignment towards an innovative active–stative split in the perfective auxiliaries. Beginning with western varieties, these operate a nominative–accusative split, reminiscent of (older) Balkan varieties, whereby a single auxiliary, usually *avea* 'have', is selected with both transitives (34a) and intransitives (34b) (cf. also *ALR* (VII) 1972, 1801, 1997), and the participle remains invariant. Now, alongside this widespread pattern, there is also a further pattern with auxiliary *fi* 'be', which is increasingly obsolescent today, although it is residually preserved in some frozen structures. On a par with many Balkan (Slavonic) languages (Lambova 2003, p. 4; Migdalski 2006, p. 82), this obsolescent use of *fi* 'be' in western varieties also occurs with transitives (35), where, crucially, the participle always agrees with the subject, a further syntactic reflex of a nominative–accusative alignment.[13]

(34) a. **O** chemat pă tăţ copiii. (Checea, Timiş, Ban.)
    have.3SG call.PTCP DOM all children.DEF
    'He called all the kids.'

    b. Acasă **am** venit. (Frânceşti, Gorj, Olt.)
    home   have.1SG come.PTCP
    'I came home.' (Cazacu 1967, p. 153)

(35) Nu ieşim afară că **suntem** făcuţi baie. (Valea Fetei, Olt, Olt.)
    NEG exit.1PL outside that be.1PL make.PTCP.MPL bath
    'We're not going out because we've taken a bath'

By contrast, perfective auxiliation in eastern varieties seems to display the early stages of an emerging active–stative alignment, as evidenced by an increasing use of the resultative periphrasis with auxiliary *fi* 'be' in conjunction with unaccusative participles (36a; cf. Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2013, p. 343). Marin (1985, p. 462), too, discusses the phenomenon, remarking that it is frequent in all Daco-Romanian dialects; however, all her examples of resultative *fi* 'be' come from the area that we labelled above as 'eastern',

namely from Buzău, Teleorman and Mureș. Furthermore, our own corpus study of dialectal texts (e.g., Cazacu 1967, 1975; Cohuț and Vulpe 1973) also reveals an undeniably greater preference for this construction in the east than in the west, witness the eastern example in (36b) from Vrancea county. Analogous conclusions also emerged from our interviews with informants from western and eastern areas. More specifically, western speakers from Banat and Oltenia, for example, described examples such as (36a-b) as 'Greater Wallachian' or 'literary', failing to recognize them as part of their own dialect,[14] whereas eastern speakers from Muntenia such as Giurgiu county, for instance, immediately recognized them as part of their own colloquial registers.

(36) a. de   vo   două zile   **sunt** venită   de   la   stân(ă). (Nehoiașu,
        of   some   two   days   be.1SG come.PTCP.FSG from at   sheepfold
        Buzău, Munt.)
        'I returned from the sheepfold some two days ago.' (Marin 1985, p. 462)
     b. L-an   luat   pă   urma   care   **iera**   dus
        it=have.1PL   take.PTCP after trace.DEF which   be.PST.IPFV.3SG lead.PTCP
        la   culcare. (Beciu, Vrancea, Munt.)
        at   sleep
        'We tracked it down by the footprints it left when it had gone to sleep.' (Cazacu 1975, p. 391)

The emergence of a stative *fi* 'be' periphrasis in conjunction with UNDERGOER subjects is paralleled in the west by the concomitant emergence of an active resultative periphrasis with *avea* 'have'. Marin (1985, p. 464) discusses this type of structure as well, but does not offer any further details with respect to dialectal variation. However, all of the examples that she provides come again from the east, namely, Argeș and Suceava. Oversimplifying somewhat, it seems to be the case that speakers who display the *fi* 'be' periphrasis are more prone to accept, and indeed, to actively employ, the *avea* 'have' resultative periphrasis. For instance, structures such as (37) were readily accepted by our eastern informants from Giurgiu county, while the same structures were described as, at best, marginal by western speakers from Olt county (e.g., Slatina).

(37) **Am**   lucrate   patru zile   săptămâna asta. (Giurgiu, Giurgiu, Munt.)
     have.1SG   work.PTCP.FPL   four   days.F week.DEF   this
     'I have had four days of work this week.'

In contrast to western varieties, we thus see in eastern varieties the presence of an active–stative auxiliary split in the resultative construction with HAVE selected in conjunction with AGENT subjects and BE with UNDERGOER subjects. This development towards an active–stative split in the auxiliary system is arguably also reflected in the loss of the preterite in the east (cf. *ALR (VII) 1972*, 1981) since the latter is a reflex of a nominative–accusative alignment.[15] It is therefore unsurprising that the preterite is preserved in western varieties spoken in Oltenia, Banat and Crișana (Rosetti 1955, pp. 69–73; Moise 1977, pp. 91–93; Pană-Boroianu 1982, pp. 423–24; Neagoe 1985, pp. 172–76; Havu and Știrbu 2015, pp. 144–47; cf. also *ALRR (Banat) 2005*, 674), although its values and distribution are not uniform across western varieties (cf. Chitez 2010). For example, in Crișana (or more generally 'Transylvania' in Chitez's terms) the preterite is used to refer to both events that took place in a distant past (38a),[16] and events that took place during the same day (38b),[17] while in Oltenia (39a) and Serbian Banat (39b) its use is exclusively hodiernal.[18]

(38) a. **Făcui**   așa   și   anu'   trecut. (Valea de Jos, Bihor, Criș.)
        do.PRT.1SG   thus   too   year.DEF last
        'Last year I did the same thing.'
     b. O   **văzui**   azi   pă   mama. (Valea de Jos, Bihor, Criș.)
        her=   see.PRT.1SG today   DOM   mum
        'I've seen mum today.'

(39) a. **Veni**   Maria? (Râmnicu Vâlcea, Vâlcea, Olt.)
     come.PRT.3SG Maria
     'Has Maria come?'
  b. Sora   mea   **fu**   la mine măi   nainte. (Straža, Serbian Banat)
     sister.DEF   my   be.PRT.3SG at me   more before
     'My sister has visited me before.' (Marin 2023, p. 144)

4.2. Daco-Romance

Above, we noted that Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian display internal variation with respect to the height of V-movement, the former in accordance with a south–north split (viz. Aromanian$_{1/2}$) and the latter traditionally in accordance with inter-speaker variation (viz. Megleno-Romanian$_1$), despite a more recent tendency towards a consistent low V-movement grammar across all speakers (viz. Megleno-Romanian$_2$). As already briefly noted above, we interpret the high V-movement option in these two varieties, at least in our corpora, as a direct consequence of contact with Greek. Now, given our assumptions, low V-movement varieties are predicted to consistently display a nominative–accusative alignment in their verb system, hence their use of a single generalized auxiliary for past-tense forms and the retention of the preterite. And this is indeed what we find in both Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, which appear to pattern largely with western Daco-Romanian in this respect: auxiliary HAVE (viz. Aro. *av(e)are* and MRo. *veari*) invariably occurs with both transitives (40a-b) and unaccusatives (cf. 26a-b), and the preterite is currently employed to refer to all kinds of past events, with or without present relevance (41a-b).

(40) a. Nu   l-**am**   **vidzută** (Aro.)
     NEG   him=have.1SG see.PTCP
     'I haven't seen him / I didn't see him.' (Tomić 2006, p. 385)
  b. U-**am**   **cǎntat**   țeastǎ carti. (MRo.)
     it.F=have.1SG read.PTCP   this   book
     'I (have) read this book.' (Tomić 2006, p. 378)

(41) a. Nu   **strigași**   'oh'?   Mine   'oh'   mi   cl'amǎ. (ARo.,
     NEG   shout.PRT.2SG oh   me   oh   me.ACC=call.3SG
     Crușova/Kruševo)
     'Haven't you shouted *oh*? My name is *oh*.' (Papahagi 1905, p. 212)
  b. Anʲ   **cǎdzu**   glʲemu,   glʲemu   ditot (MRo.,
     me.DAT=fall.PRT.3SG knitting.yarn.DEF knitting.yarn.DEF all
     Oșani/Ossiani)
     'My knitting yarn dropped on the floor, all the knitting yarn fell on the floor' (VLACH, *Scented Coat* 01.49)

On a par with lexical verbs that can target higher positions, auxiliary verbs may also occupy similar positions. While this development cannot be tested by comparing the position of analytic past-tense forms with respect to the relevant adverbs (cf. Section 3.2), it can be indirectly verified by analysing the availability or otherwise of (emergent) active–stative tendencies in auxiliary selection which we independently know to be correlated with higher V-movement (cf. 33). Now, in both Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, speakers often make use, albeit inconsistently, of auxiliary BE (Aro. *h'ire*, MRo. *iri*) with unaccusatives.[19] For example, Megleno-Romanian speakers from Capidan's (1928) corpus coming from Oșani/Ossiani (Greece) employ *iri* 'be' significantly more frequently with unaccusative participles (42) than speakers from Uma/Huma (present-day Northern Macedonia).[20] In the case of Aromanian, the split seems to involve, as expected, the distinction between high-V-movement northern varieties and low-V-movement southern varieties (cf. also Capidan 1932, p. 541): the former (viz. Aromanian$_2$) optionally, though by no means exclusively, use *h'ire* 'be' with unaccusative participles, whereas such structures are absent in Papahagi's corpus, which predominantly includes southern varieties (viz. Aromanian$_1$) from, for example, Avela/Avdella, Mețova/Metsovo, Samarina and Perivole/Perivoli.

(42) Io **sam**   **vinit**   di un lucru. (MRo.₂, Oșani/Ossiani)
I   be.1SG come.PTCP of a   thing
'I've come for a thing.' (Capidan 1928, p. 80)

Somewhat differently, Istro-Romanian has lost the preterite and generalized the analytic past formed from auxiliary *(a)vę* 'have' and an invariant form of the participle to refer to all types of perfective past events, whether with or without present relevance. Moreover, similarly to Croatian (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 33) and old Daco-Romanian (Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2021), Istro-Romanian allows for various constituents to intervene between the auxiliary and past participle. The tendency among speakers to increasingly treat the auxiliary as a Wackernagel clitic, in line with what is observed in Croatian, is a consequence of generalized bilingualism. However, the fact that the auxiliary seems to display a dual behaviour, sometimes being treated as a Wackernagel element but at other times not, points towards the fact, already noted above (cf. Section 3.2), that Istro-Romanian speakers have access to two grammatical systems: one which is closer to the rest of Daco-Romance (cf. the lack of Wackernagel auxiliaries in Daco-Romanian, Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian), and one which is closer to Croatian. Thus, what may appear an optional syntactic mechanism should, rather, be interpreted as a case of exogenous 'PAT(tern)' replication (cf. Matras and Sakel 2007, p. 847) from Croatian, enriching the grammar. Nevertheless, it must be noted that Istro-Romanian speakers have adapted the original Croatian pattern, since, unlike what happens in Croatian (cf. Migdalski 2016, pp. 152f.), auxiliaries come to occupy a high (T-related) position in the clausal spine, which, in turn, allows for the co-indexation of T and V (cf. 33). As a result, we can recognize two auxiliary patterns in Istro-Romanian: one following a typical Daco-Romance nominative–accusative alignment, with lower placement of the auxiliary yielding generalized HAVE, and the other in accordance with an active–stative alignment, where higher placement of the auxiliary according to a reanalysed Croatian model licenses auxiliary *fi* 'be' with unaccusatives (43; cf. Geană 2017, p. 213).[21]

(43) Fil'a-**i**   cu   ie   verit (IRo.)
daughter.DEF=be.3SG with him come.PTCP
'My daughter has come with him' (Geană 2017, p. 213, *apud* Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 173)

5. Subject Positions

5.1. Daco-Romanian

The west–east split at the level of V-movement is also correlated with variation in the availability of different subject positions. On a par with southern Romance varieties which also display low V-movement, in western Daco-Romanian varieties, the T-domain is inactive, since the verb is not probed by T but by *v* (cf. Ledgeway 2020, pp. 41f., 54–64). As a consequence, T in western varieties not only lacks a V-feature, but also a D-feature, such that it fails to attract either the verb or the clausal subject, with the result that SpecTP is not available as a default subject-position in western Daco-Romanian. It follows that subjects occupy either a *v*-related position (viz., Spec*v*P), which is overwhelmingly preferred in pragmatically unmarked sentences yielding thetic VSO orders, or a marked left-peripheral topic or focus position whenever preverbal. A direct structural consequence of the absence of an EPP-type SpecTP position is that orders such as Focus + Subject + Verb are predicted to prove ungrammatical in western Daco-Romanian, inasmuch as a focus, the lowest available left-peripheral position in the C-domain (Rizzi 1997), preceding the subject would require the subject to lexicalize SpecTP. Indeed, this prediction is borne out by our inquiries, with western speakers from Banat, Crișana and Oltenia rejecting sentences such as (44a) in which the preverbal subject is preceded by a focused constituent, rephrasing it as in (44b), in which the subject surfaces in a *v*-related postverbal position.

(44) a. *[FocP [Spec ACU'] [IP [TP [Spec **ăia**] to' timpu' îți cere [vP [Spec **ăia**]
now those always you.DAT.SG= ask.3SG
buletinu',]]]] da' 'nainte vreme nu era așa. (Delureni,
ID.DEF but before time NEG be.PST.IPFV.3SG thus
Vâlcea, Olt.)

b. [FocP [Spec ACU'] [IP [TP… to' timpu' îți cere [vP [Spec **ăia**] buletinu',]]]]
now always you.DAT.SG= ask.3SG those ID.DEF
da' 'nainte vreme nu era așa. (Delureni, Vâlcea, Olt.)
but before time NEG be.PST.IPFV.3SG thus
'NOW they always ask for your ID, but before it used to be different.'

By contrast, eastern varieties which display high V-movement are characterized by an active T-domain. In these varieties, as we have seen (cf. Section 3.1), T therefore comes with a strong V-feature which attracts the verb, but it also carries a corresponding strong D-feature spelt out in the licensing of a preverbal SpecTP subject position.[22] Indeed, for eastern Daco-Romanian speakers, there seem to be as many as three subject positions: a T-related EPP-type preverbal position (45a), the most frequent when the subject is overt and licensing pragmatically unmarked SVO thetic orders; a C-related position for marked topicalized or focalized subjects (45b); and a *v*-related postverbal position (45c).[23]

(45) a. [FocP [Spec ACUM [IP [TP [Spec **copiii**] știu [v-VP **copiii**]]]] cine vine, dar
now kids.DEF know.3PL who come.3SG but
înainte nu știau. (Giurgiu, Giurgiu, Munt.)
before NEG know.3PL
'NOW the kids know who's going to come, but before they didn't.'

b. [FocP [Spec **ANA**] [TP [Spec **Ana**] merge [v-VP **Ana** la munte]]], nu
Ana go.3SG at mountain NEG
Maria. (Giurgiu, Giurgiu, Munt.)
Maria
'It's Ana that is going to the mountains, not Maria.'

c. [IP [TP… Mă sună [v-VP **EL**.]]] (Giurgiu, Giurgiu, Munt.)
me.ACC= call.3 he
'HE'll ring me.'

Now, a crucial difference between eastern and western Daco-Romanian varieties lies in the fact that the former, but not the latter, display a so-called 'double subject construction' (Cornilescu 2000b, pp. 98–113), which on the surface appears to license two postverbal subjects. Thus, in a sentence such as (46), which is considered grammatical by eastern speakers, the first pronominal subject, *ei* 'they', occupies the dedicated preverbal subject position SpecTP, while the second lexical subject, *copiii* 'the children', occurs in Spec*v*P. Note that in this case, the verb *vin* 'will come' occupies a higher position, presumably a MOOD-related projection given its future meaning,[24] and thus occurring above both subject-positions.

(46) Las' că vin **ei** mâine **copiii**, n-ai
leave.IMP.2SG that come.3PL they tomorrow children.DEF NEG=have.2SG
grijă! (Ro.2)
worry
'The children, they'll come tomorrow, don't worry!' (Cornilescu 2000b, p. 101)

On the other hand, we have seen that western speakers only have one postverbal (*v*-related) subject-position, such that they are unable to structurally accommodate strings such as (46), since they lack an EPP-style preverbal subject-position within the sentential core. Our western Daco-Romanian speakers consequently rejected strings such as (46) and reported that the only possibility for *ei* 'they' and *copiii* 'the children' to co-occur after the verb would be to interpret *copiii* as being in apposition to *ei*, hence the comma intonation following the adverb *mâine* 'tomorrow' in (47). Thus, the structural representations of (46) and (47) can be sketched as in (48a-b), respectively.

(47) Las'   că   vin   **ei**   mâine,   **copiii**,   n-ai
      leave.IMP.2SG that come.3PL they tomorrow children.DEF NEG=have.2SG
      grijă! (Ro.$_1$)
      worry
      'They, (I mean) the children, will come tomorrow, don't worry!'

(48) a. [$_{IP}$ vin [$_{TP}$ [$_{Spec}$ ei]   [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ [$_{Spec}$ copiii]   ~~vin~~...]]]... (Ro.$_2$)
      b. [$_{IP}$ vin [$_{TP}$...   [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ [$_{Spec}$ ei]   ~~vin~~...]]], copiii... (Ro.$_1$)

Interestingly, the two possible interpretations have actually been discussed in the literature. For instance, Philippide (1929) argues for the appositional reading of the second subject, while for Byck (1937), the structure does not contain (or no longer contains) any apposition. Nevertheless, analyses like these have never taken into account variation across speakers from different areas and, more importantly, the fact that the availability or otherwise of the double-subject construction should be regarded as epiphenomenal. Indeed, our analysis predicts that both interpretations are found across Daco-Romanian speakers in accordance with the availability or otherwise of an EPP-style preverbal subject-position: while speakers of western varieties clearly prefer the appositional reading, speakers of eastern varieties display true double-subject constructions, in which the first postverbal subject occupies a T-related position (viz. SpecTP) and the second, a *v*-related position (viz. Spec*v*P).[25]

5.2. Daco-Romance

Let us now turn to the situation encountered in other Daco-Romance varieties. Similarly to the situation with the past-tense auxiliaries, the split continues to be between Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian on one hand and Istro-Romanian on the other. As discussed in Section 3.2, both Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian display internal variation with respect to V-movement, with some speakers consistently displaying higher V-movement than others in accordance with diatopic (e.g., Aromanian) and diachronic/diagenerational (e.g., Megleno-Romanian) variation. Now, in the absence of other tests such as the double-subject construction, it is difficult to assess whether there are one or two available postverbal subject-positions. Nevertheless, our prediction is that, on a par with the case of eastern Daco-Romanian varieties, speakers who raise the verb to a T-related position (namely, Aromanian$_2$ and Megleno-Romanian$_2$) will also display an EPP-style preverbal SpecTP subject position, since T in these varieties comes with complementary strong V- and D-features. Consequently, examples such as (49a-b) with an unmarked preverbal subject imply higher raising of the verb outside the *v*-domain and A-movement of the subject to SpecTP to check an EPP feature on T, thus yielding unmarked SV(O) orders. By contrast, in the case of speakers who display low V-movement below the T-area to the lower *v*-domain (namely, Aromanian$_1$ and Megleno-Romanian$_1$), where T fails to attract both the verb and the subject, the unmarked (and most frequent) word order is VS(O) (50a-b). This contrast can be seen more clearly in the near-minimal pair in (51), where the pronominal subject situated in SpecTP precedes the temporal adverb *tora* 'now' in Aromanian$_2$ (51a), in contrast to the Aromanian$_1$ example in (51b), where the pronominal occurs in Spec*v*P, and hence surfaces below the verb and the temporal adverb *tora*.

(49) a. [$_{IP}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{Spec}$ **Mine**]   merg [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ [$_{Spec}$ ~~mine~~] la oaste]]] şi   nu-i   cunuscută
                              I   go.1SG   at   war   and NEG=be.3SG know.PTCP
          di-se   vin   curundu. (Aro.$_2$, Cruşova/Kruševo)
          whether   come.1SG soon
          'I'm going to war and we don't know whether I'll be back soon.' (Papahagi 1905, p. 289)
      b. Si   ştii   că   [$_{IP}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{Spec}$ **io**]   sam   mort [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ **~~io~~**]]] (MRo.$_2$, Oşani/Ossiani)
          FUT   know.SBJV.2SG that   I   be.1SG die.PTCP
          'You will know that I died.' (Capidan 1928, p. 80)

(50) a. [IP Am [*v*-VP [Spec **io**]] tră țe alag. (ARo.1, Avela/Avdella)
  have.1SG I for what run.1SG
  'I have a reason for running like this.' (Papahagi 1905, p. 187)

  b. [IP Am [*v*-VP [Spec **io**]]] tsi un prăstin, în^j armasi. (MRo.1, Țârnareca/
  have.1SG I say.3SG a ring me.DAT=remain.PRT.3SG
  Karpi)
  'I have one more ring left, she says.' (VLACH, *The beautiful girl*, 05.05)

(51) a. [IP [TP [Spec **Mine**] tora trag [*v*-VP [Spec ~~mine~~] tu polim.]]] (Aro.2, Corița/Koritë)
  I now pull.1SG to war
  'I'm now going to war.' (Papahagi 1905, p. 196)

  b. [IP Tora acăk'isescu [*v*-VP [Spec **mine**]] (ARo.1, Vlaho-Clisura/Kleisoura)
  now understand.1SG I
  'I now understand [it].' (Papahagi 1905, p. 164)

We now turn to Istro-Romanian. Given the Croatian-style option of high (C-/T-)placement of (Wackernagel) auxiliaries, examples such as (52a) in which there is no overt evidence of a topicalized/focalized reading of the subject, especially since it occurs in an embedded clause where such pragmatic readings are generally less felicitous and less frequent, can be taken to illustrate the default subject position, viz., SpecTP. This is further substantiated by examples such as (27b), where the pronominal subject *voi* 'you' was seen to occur between the fronted auxiliary *åț* 'you have' (variously interpreted to be in C or a very high I-related position) and the temporal adverb *acmo* 'now', lexicalizing the specifier of TP$_{Past/Future}$, squarely placing the subject therefore in SpecTP. Similar arguments are proposed by Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2021, p. 8) for strings such as (52b), where the most plausible analysis is to interpret the pronominal subject *io* 'I' as lexicalizing the SpecTP position, since it precedes the low manner adverb *bire* 'well', which, in turn, precedes the lexical participle *zis* 'said' situated on the edge of the *v*-VP domain. Now, it is not by chance that Istro-Romanian generalized this T-related subject position, since the default subject position in Croatian is also SpecTP (cf. Migdalski 2006, pp. 87–89), from where subjects can raise to a C-related position in order to prevent auxiliaries from appearing clause-initially (52c; cf. also Kovačec 1971, p. 147). Once again this syntactic reflex can be taken to illustrate a further case of PAT(tern) borrowing that comes as part and parcel of PAT(tern) replication of the syntax of Wackernagel auxiliaries.

(52) a. șa fost-a [CP cum [WackernagelP a [TP [Spec **ia**]
  thus be.PTCP=have.3SG how have.3SG she
  [*v*-VP zis.]]]] (IRo.2, Noselo/Nova Vas)
  say.PTCP
  'and it was as she had said.' (Cantemir 1959, p. 41)

  b. [CP cum [WackernagelP ŭam [TP [Spec **io**] [VoiceP [Spec bire] zis [*v*-VP …]]]]]. (IRo.2, Noselo/
  as have.1SG I well say.PTCP
  Nova Vas)
  'as I correctly said.' (Cantemir 1959, p. 45)

  c. [CP **Jovan** [WackernagelP je [TP [Spec ~~Jovan~~] [*v*-VP [Spec ~~Jovan~~] čitao
  Jovan be.3SG read.PTCP.MSG
  knjigu.]]]] (Serbo-Croatian)
  book
  'Jovan read the/a book.' (Migdalski 2006, p. 87)

However, we know from our discussion above (cf. Section 3.2) that, alongside the Croatian-style grammar (viz., Istro-Romanian2), speakers also have access to a Daco-Romance grammar (viz. Istro-Romanian1) in which the auxiliary targets a lower position within the I-domain immediately below (Spec)TP$_{Anterior}$ (cf. 27a). While under the Croatian-style grammar, the unmarked word order is Aux + S$_{SpecTP}$ + Ptcp, *a priori* we would expect speakers adopting the traditional Daco-Romance grammar to adopt the word order Aux + Ptcp + S$_{Spec vP}$, as illustrated in (53).

(53) [IP [LAS Åm mes [*v*-VP [Spec **io**] din plåče.]]] (IRo.1, Žejane)
  have.1SG go.PTCP I after salary
  'I went for the salary.' (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 96)

While, in Croatian, the Aux + Ptcp + S word order in (53) would require a marked reading in which the post-participial subject is interpreted as a case of informational focus (cf. Migdalski 2006, p. 88), presumably occurring in a focus position of the lower left periphery, in the Istro-Romanian$_1$ grammar no such focus-interpretation of the post-participial subject is required, since the subject can occur *in situ* in Spec*v*P. However, contrary to expectations, quantitatively, orders such as (53) prove extremely rare in all available corpora. Rather, all speakers, even when they employ the low V-movement grammar, typically display the Croatian-style option and generalize SpecTP as the default subject position,[26] a behaviour widely highlighted in the literature (cf. Kovačec 1971, p. 147; Dragomirescu and Nicolae 2020, 2021). Consequently, rare orders such as (53) are typically rivalled and replaced by orders like the following, in which the subject, whether pronominal (54a) or lexical (54b), lexicalizes SpecTP (recall that in the Daco-Romance-style grammar, the auxiliary does not raise beyond the head of TP$_{Anterior}$, and hence is situated below the EPP SpecTP preverbal subject position).

(54) a. ke **io** nu v-åm știút ânțeleje. (IRo.$_1$, Žejane)
        that I NEG you.PL=have.1SG know.PTCP understand.INF
        'because I could not understand you' (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 51)
    b. A trei vota **ceaia** au zis lu fil'u [...] (IRo.$_1$, Žejane)
        the third time father have.3SG say.PTCP to son
        'The third time the father said to his son [...]' (Morariu 1928, p. 133)

The situation with lexical verbs is not any different, in that the low position of the verb, below VoiceP in Istro-Romanian$_2$ (55a) but above VoiceP in Istro-Romanian$_1$ but still within the lower adverb space (55b), would lead us to expect once again that SpecTP is not available, since T is inactive in both varieties. However, this prediction is not borne out, inasmuch as the subject, whether pronominal or lexical, invariably lexicalizes SpecTP. This is clear from both examples in (55), where the subject occurs to the left of the very low manner adverb *bire* 'well', which sits just above the first-merge position of the external argument, namely [$_{LAS}$...*bire* [$_{v}$-VP [$_{Spec}$ EA]]], thereby firmly situating the subject in SpecTP (or, alternatively, in a left-peripheral topic or focus position in cases of marked word order).

(55) a. **Nona** bire cuvinta po jeiånski. (IRo.$_2$, Žejane)
        grandmother well speak.3SG in Istro-Romanian
        'Grandma speaks Istro-Romanian well.' (Neiescu 2011, p. 342)
    b. **Ie** lucra bire cași nićur. (IRo.$_1$)
        he work.PST.IPFV.3SG well like nobody
        'He worked better than anyone else.' (Neiescu 2016, p. 51)

We therefore witness in Istro-Romanian$_1$, as well as in Istro-Romanian$_2$ in conjunction with lexical verbs, an inconsistent pairing of head and edge features across T and *v*, yielding a marked hybrid parametric option which variously blends facets of traditional Daco-Romance syntax with Croatian syntax: while *v* arguably carries both strong V and D features, respectively, correlating with low V-movement and (a certain degree of) DOM, T, inconsistently, also comes with a strong D edge feature exceptionally licensing a dedicated EPP-style preverbal subject position in SpecTP, despite the failure of T to probe the verb. While this state of affairs is unexpected, given our canonical assumptions about the consistent pairing of head and edge features across the functional heads T and *v*, this particular outcome is not atypical of cases of language contact in which exogenous forces, in this case the replication of a Croatian-style generalized SpecTP subject position, can produce non-linear, and otherwise apparently incongruous, results.[27]

6. Differential Object Marking

6.1. Daco-Romanian

[Ledgeway](2020, sct. 4.4) observes that northern Romance varieties form a compact group, since they typically do not formally distinguish between different classes of direct object and, in particular, between animate and inanimate specific objects (56a). By contrast, southern Romance varieties formally distinguish between animate and inanimate specific direct objects (56b), realizing the former, but not the latter, with a differential marker, a case of differential object marking (DOM).

(56) a. J'   ai   vu   **la** **table** /   **la** **femme**. (Fr.)
         I   have.1SG see.PTCP the   girl   the   woman
      b. He   visto   (*****a**)   **la** **mesa**   /   *****(a)** **la** **mujer**. (Sp.)
         have.1SG see.PTCP DOM   the   table   DOM   the   woman
      'I've seen the table / the woman.'

Assuming DOM to be a reflex of an object shift-like operation which raises the object to Spec*v*P ([Torrego 1998](); [Ledgeway 2000](), [2020](), sct. 4.4; [2022a](); [Peverini-Benson 2004](); [Andriani 2011](), [2015](); [López 2012](); [Cornilescu 2020](); [Tigău 2021]()), the relevant difference between northern and southern Romance can be simply captured in terms of the respective absence and presence of a D-feature on *v* to probe the object. In turn, the relevant content of this D-feature in southern Romance shows considerable cross-dialectal microvariation in relation to such properties as person, number, animacy and specificity, which variously restrict the ability of *v* to probe different subclasses of nominal (cf. [Ledgeway 2023a](), [2023b](), [2023c]()). Arguably, then, the settings for the V-movement parameter which, respectively, licenses V-to-T movement in northern Romance varieties and V-to-*v* movement in southern Romance varieties is also implicationally correlated with the distribution of a subject clitics and the availability of a preverbal EPP subject position (SpecTP) on the one hand and DOM on the other. In particular, the activation of T and *v* through a strong V-feature equally licenses a corresponding strong D-feature in their edge, in the same way that the activation of generalized V-movement to C in V2 varieties licenses a generalized edge feature satisfied through XP movement.

Now, if V-to-T movement is bundled with a strong D-feature in the TP-edge, hence licensing the so-called double-subject construction in eastern Daco-Romanian varieties, then lower V-movement in western Daco-Romanian varieties is predicted to license a strong D-feature in the *v*P-edge and, hence, DOM. Deliberately oversimplifying,[28] Daco-Romanian varieties typically display DOM with animate referents (cf. also *ALR* [(VI) 1969](), 1642, 1704), marking, for example, (personal) pronouns (57a), proper names (57b) and definite DPs (57c) with the preposition *p(r)ă/pe* 'on'.

(57) a. Am   sărit   ș-am   luat-o   **pe**   **ia**. (Verbița, Dolj, Olt.)
         have.1PL   jump.PTCP and=have.1PL   take.PTCP=her   DOM   her
      'We jumped and took her.' ([Cazacu 1967](), p. 298)
      b. O   sun   acum   **pă**   **Maria**. (Cazasu, Brăila, Munt.)
         her=   call.1SG now   DOM   Maria
      'I'm calling Maria now.'
      c. Nora   o   adus   **pă**   **sora**   **iei**. (Vârșeț/Vršac,
         daughter-in-law.DEF   have.3   bring.PTCP   DOM   sister.DEF her
         Serbian Banat)
      'My daughter-in-law brought her sister.' ([Marin 2023](), p. 310)

Nevertheless, a series of tendencies and preferences in the distribution of DOM may potentially be explained through differences in V-movement (cf. [Ledgeway 2020](), pp. 59f.). For example, standard Romanian grammars usually discuss the case of 'optional contexts' (cf. [Pană Dindelegan 2013](), pp. 133f.), in which the absence of DOM does not lead to ungrammaticality, including when the direct object is realized by an indefinite, interrogative or floating quantifier. When examined in greater detail, however, such cases of apparent

optionality turn out to be epiphenomenal, inasmuch as speakers who display lower V-movement and, crucially, interpret the double-subject construction as an appositional structure employ DOM with a much higher frequency than speakers who have higher V-movement. In short, speakers of western varieties clearly prefer—indeed require—DOM when the direct object is introduced by an indefinite (58a), interrogative (58b) or floating (58c) quantifier.

(58) a. Le-o mânat la concurs *(**pă**) **câtiva** **eleve**. (Valea de Jos, Bihor, Criș.)
them=have.3 send.PTCP to competition DOM some students
'He sent a few students to the competition.'
b. *(**Pră**) **câț** **priecini** puoț să-i suni macăr când? (Sacoșu Mare, Timiș, Ban.)
DOM how.many friends can.2SG that.IRR=them call.2SG even when
'How many friends can you call at any time?'
c. I-am chimat **pă** **tos** **trei** **jinerii**. (Vârșeț/Vršac, Serbian Banat)
them=have.1SG call.PTCP DOM all three sons-in-law.DEF
'I called all three sons-in-law.' (Marin 2023, p. 449)

By contrast, eastern varieties, which display higher V-movement, do not generally employ the marker *pă/pe* in these same so-called optional contexts, witness the absence of DOM in (59a-c).

(59) a. Am trimis **v'o** **două** **eleve** la concurs. (Grințieș, Neamț, Mold.)
have.1SG send.PTCP some= two students to competition
'I sent a few students to the competition.'
b. **Câți** **prieteni** poți suna acu'? (Găești, Dâmbovița, Munt.)
how.many friends can.2SG call.INF now
'How many friends can you call now?'
c. Am invitat **toți** **colegii** la ziua mea. (Giurgiu, Giurgiu, Munt.)
have.1SG invite.PTCP all colleagues at day.DEF my
'I invited all my colleagues to my birthday.'

In conclusion, the parallel assumption that the activation of T and *v* automatically comes with a strong D edge feature not only predicts the differential marking of subjects and objects in northern and southern Romance varieties, respectively, but also provides a natural explanation for significant differences between eastern and western Daco-Romanian varieties. In particular, we now have a principled explanation for the more consistent distribution of DOM in western Daco-Romanian than in eastern Daco-Romanian, its distribution falling out as a concomitant of the setting of the T/*v* parameter. However, while we witness in western varieties a complementary and consistent distribution of head and edge features on T and *v*, in that head and edge features on T are weak but strong on *v*, in turn, correlating with unmarked VSO order and a robust distribution of DOM, in eastern varieties T arguably carries both strong V and D features (manifested in high V-movement and unmarked SVO order), but, inconsistently, *v* also comes with a strong D feature that exceptionally licenses a less consistent distribution of DOM. Indeed, this marked setting of the DOM subparameter in eastern Romanian, in contrast to its unmarked setting in western Romanian which combines a positive edge feature on *v* with a corresponding positive head feature on the same, finds independent support in recent proposals by Cornilescu (2020, pp. 127–29) and Tigău (2021). They argue that DOM-ed and unmarked objects exhibit the same distribution in Romanian, such that DOM-ed objects (= KPs) necessarily scramble to the *v*P periphery, while this is merely an option for unmarked objects (= DPs), which may either scramble or remain *in situ*. Presumably, such optionality underlies the more marked nature of the distribution of the D edge feature seen in eastern Daco-Romanian varieties (viz., Romanian$_2$), where the relevant nominals may be licensed *in situ* on a par with non-DOM grammars, in which *v* is specified [–D]. In western Daco-Romanian varieties

(viz. Romanian₁), by contrast, the unmarked [+D] specification on *v* aligns with a more consistent licensing of the relevant nominals which invariably undergo scrambling and surface with DOM.

Indeed, this view finds direct empirical support in the following word order contrasts. In answer to the question in (60), a thetic response involving an animate subject and inanimate object, in which none of the arguments is presupposed or topicalized, invariably gives rise to unmarked VSO word order (60a), both among western speakers and, optionally, among eastern speakers who also allow SVO word order in such contexts. Interestingly, however, if the object is also animate and hence a potential candidate for DOM, the unmarked order found among eastern speakers remains VSO (60b), but is replaced by unmarked VOS among western speakers (60c).

(60) Ce se întâmplă? (Ro.)
 what self= happen.3SG
 'What is happening?'
 a. (O) pupă Ion **icoana**. (Ro.₁/₂, VSO)
  it.FSG= kiss.3SG Ion icon
  'Ion is kissing the religious icon.'
 b. (O) pupă Ion **pe** **Maria**. (Ro.₂, VSO)
  her= kiss.3SG Ion DOM Maria
 c. O pupă **pe** **Maria** Ion. (Ro.₁, VOS)
  her= kiss.3SG DOM Maria Ion
  'Ion is kissing Maria.'

The contrast between the respective unmarked eastern and western orders in (60b-c) transparently betrays the availability or otherwise of object shift with DOM-ed objects in each variety. In eastern varieties, the object *pe Maria* remains *in situ*, as in the case of inanimate unmarked objects such as *icoana* in (60a), yielding VSO order in which the subject *Ion* occurs in its base Spec*v*P position, and hence to the left of the object. In western varieties, by contrast, the object *pe Maria* is probed by a D-feature on *v* causing it to raise to an outer specifier position immediately above the subject in Spec*v*P, thereby placing it to the left of *Ion* and yielding the derived VOS order.

6.2. Daco-Romance

Although initially believed to be absent from the remaining Daco-Romance varieties (cf. Pană Dindelegan 2013, p. 135), recent studies have shown that DOM is indeed present, albeit to different degrees, in Aromanian (Manzini and Savoia 2018, pp. 167–69; Hill and Mardale 2021, pp. 29–32) and Istro-Romanian (Geană 2020). Moreover, as we shall see, traces of DOM can also be found in Capidan's (1925) Megleno-Romanian corpus, although it is admittedly extremely rare there.

Discussing Aromanian, Capidan (1925, p. 203) remarks that 'true Aromanian does not employ *pre*', concluding that the presence of DOM attested in available Aromanian corpora (e.g., Papahagi 1905 collection of Aromanian fairy tales) is nothing more than an artificial phenomenon possibly influenced by standard Daco-Romanian norms (Capidan 1932, p. 530). Nonetheless, a few lines later, Capidan himself admits that other interpretations cannot be completely dismissed, given that instances of DOM are found in eighteenth-century Aromanian (61), leading him to conclude that DOM is a genuine feature of some, but crucially not all, Aromanian varieties. According to him, DOM is found in southern Aromanian dialects, but is completely absent in northern Aromanian and the varieties spoken in Albania.

(61) se lumbrisească **pre noi** luńina a prosopăl'i atăei. (Aro.)
 that.IRR light.SBJV.3 DOM us aura.DEF A face.GEN yours.GEN
 'the aura of your face would light us.' (Capidan 1932, p. 530)

Indeed, as already discussed above, Papahagi's (1905) Aromanian corpus is predominantly southern, and it appears that virtually all examples of DOM were produced by speakers of southern (viz. Pindian and Gramostian) Aromanian varieties (62), variously coming from Avela/Avdella (e.g., pp. 202, 502), Samarina (e.g., p. 496), Malăcași/Malakasi (e.g., p. 190), Xirolivade/Xirolivodi (e.g., pp. 47, 453), Călivele/Badralexi (e.g., pp. 67, 231, 365), and Veria/Verroia (e.g., p. 62). In fact, the availability of DOM in southern Aromanian varieties is still attested in modern southern varieties spoken in Kranea/Turya in Thessaly (Sobolev 2008) and in several villages in Epirus (Asenova and Aleksova 2008), witness the representative example in (63).

(62) Io va   o   nțap   la ureacl'a ndreapta **pri**
      I   AUX.FUT.1SG her= sting.1SG at ear.DEF right(DEF) DOM
      Mușata-Loclui. (ARo.$_1$, Samarina)
      Mușata-Loclui
      'I will sting Mușata-Loclui on her right ear.' (Papahagi 1905, p. 196)

(63) U   m'esku   **pri nve'astă** tu-ać'a   o'ară. (Aro$_1$., Kranea/Turya)
      her= cherish.1SG DOM wife   in=that   instant
      'Then I cherish my wife.' (Sobolev 2008, p. 117)

Although the presence of DOM may seem fortuitous, given that there were Romanian schools between 1884 and 1944 in Aromanian villages in (Greek) Macedonia (cf. Rosetti 1968, p. 535), the retention of DOM in this area must be explained on structural grounds directly related to the T/v parameter. In particular, we have seen that these southern varieties display a lower level of V-movement licensed through a strong V-feature on v, a parameter setting which, in turn, correlates with the generalization of a single perfective auxiliary HAVE (unlike northern Aromanian varieties which display an emerging HAVE/BE active–stative auxiliary split in compound tenses thanks to a higher movement of the verb to the T-domain) and the licensing of DOM on account of a strong D feature on v.[29] In a similar fashion, modern low V-movement varieties of Aromanian spoken in Northern Macedonia, mainly in the Ohrid–Struga region (predominantly inhabited by speakers of the southern Gramostian variety), though not in the Krushevo–Bitola area, also display productive DOM with pronouns (64a) and definite common nouns (64b),[30] a syntactic feature also found in Macedonian dialects spoken in the same area (Tomić 2006, p. 184; Bužarovska 2017, p. 67; Makarova and Winistörfer 2020; Hill and Mardale 2021, p. 31).[31]

(64) a. L-am   vidzută **pi aistu**. (ARo$_1$., Ohrid—Struga)
          him=have.1SG see.PTCP DOM this
          'I've seen this one.' (Tomić 2006, p. 184)
      b. U   mutresc **pi feta**. (ARo$_1$., Dolna Belica)
          her=   see.1SG   DOM girl.DEF
          'I can see the girl.' (Makarova and Winistörfer 2020)

There is significantly less variation in Megleno-Romanian varieties, in that DOM now appears to be extinct (cf. also Hill and Mardale 2021, p. 32). Nevertheless, although Capidan (1925, pp. 203f.) maintains that Megleno-Romanian lacks DOM, his own corpus does display some, albeit infrequent, examples of DOM. Although the reduced number of attestations in his corpus makes it difficult to arrive at any firm generalizations, it appears that speakers with lower V-movement (for example, those from Huma/Uma) are more likely to use DOM (65) than speakers from other areas who display higher V-movement.

(65) Și au muri   și **pri tsea mul'ari**. (MRo., Huma/Uma)
     and her= kill.PRT.3SG too DOM that woman
     'And he killed that woman too.' (Capidan 1925, p. 116)

Alongside DOM proper, it must be noted that, on a par with their respective contact languages, both Aromanian (66a) and Megleno-Romanian (66b) also make use of clitic doubling to mark topical direct objects (Hill and Mardale 2021, pp. 29–33; for Aromanian, see also the article by Savoia and Baldi in this special issue). In this respect, language contact can be seen as one of the main causes for the loss of *pe/pi*-marking, given that both Greek (67a) and Macedonian (67b) mark (animate and inanimate) topical direct objects through clitic doubling. Thus, in the history of Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, what seems to have changed are the features involved in differential object marking, whether realized through the preposition *pe/pi* or clitic doubling: while older stages arguably favoured Romance-style DOM highlighting the centrality of specificity and animacy, more recent stages have seen a gradual increase in the frequency of Balkan-style clitic doubling that singles out direct objects in accordance with their topicality.

(66) a. Furl'i   nu **u**   vidzură **feata**. (ARo.)
        thieves.DEF NEG her=   see.PRT.3PL girl.DEF
        'The thieves did not see the girl.' (Asenova and Aleksova 2008, p. 13)
     b. Băltiio,   ai   s-**lă**   taljom **pomu**. (MRo., Oșani/Ossiani)
        ax.VOC   let's that.IRR=it cut.1PL tree.DEF
        'Ax, let's cut the tree.' (VLACH, *Vani and the unreachable bag*, 00.59)

(67) a. Soû   (**tó**) plékō   **éna poulóber**. (Greek)
        you.DAT it.ACC knit.1SG a   sweater
        'I'm knitting you a sweater.' (Kazazis and Pentheroudakis 1976, p. 400)
     b. Jana   **go**   vide   **volkot**. (Macedonian)
        Jana   it.ACC   see.3SG wolf.DEF
        'Jana saw the wolf.' (Tomić 2006, p. 252)

Turning finally to Istro-Romanian, DOM has been claimed to be either entirely absent (Hill and Mardale 2021, p. 34) or only marginally present (Geană 2020) in this sub-branch of Daco-Romance. From a diachronic perspective, DOM seems to be optionally employed in recordings from 1928–1933 (68a; cf. Traian Cantemir's *Texte istroromâne* and Leca Morariu's *Lu Frați Noștri*),[32] but becomes extremely rare, if present at all, in recordings from 1982–1996 (68b; cf. Richard Sârbu and Vasile Frățilă's *Dialectul istroromân*), before disappearing entirely in recordings from 2009 (68c; cf. *Preservation of the Vlaški and Žejanski language project* (VlaŽej)). However, unlike Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian, in which Romance-style DOM is being gradually replaced by clitic doubling where topicality is now regarded as the main trigger for differential object marking, Istro-Romanian shows no such tendencies.

(68) a. Potle   legat-a   și **pre**   **maia**. (IRo., Šušnjevica)
        Potle   chain.PTCP=have.3SG too DOM   mother
        'Potle also chained up the mother.' (Cantemir 1959, p. 105)
     b. Åre   **pre**   **me**   uta. (IRo., Žejane)
        have.3SG DOM   me   forget.INF
        'She will forget me.' (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 98)
     c. Și   **mire**   av   nuștire   kljemåt. (IRo., Žejane)
        and   me   have.3SG someone   call.PTCP
        'And someone called my name.' (VlaŽej, *The return from war imprisonment*)

From a structural point of view, Istro-Romanian is expected to display Romance-style DOM, inasmuch as lexical verbs do not target high positions within the IP such that *v* is predicted to license a strong D-feature in its *v*P-edge. However, while lower V-movement strongly favours the use of DOM, Istro-Romanian DPs have progressively been losing their ability to overtly encode definiteness/specificity, which is similar, though not identical, to the situation found in Croatian.[33] For example, under the pressure of Croatian feminine nouns, which end in *-a* (69a), Istro-Romanian feminine nouns, e.g., *cåsa* 'house.DEF' (69b), also began to license an indefinite reading, namely 'house'. From a structural perspective, the Istro-Romanian D-head containing both the noun and definite suffix was reanalysed as an N-head (68c) underspecified for definiteness.

(69) a. [DP [D′]   [NP [N′   hĭža]]] (Chakavian Croatian)
                                               house
        '(a/the) house'
      b. [DP [D′ *cåsa*]   [NP [N′ *cåså*]]] (IRo., before reanalysis)
                 house=the
        'the house'
      c. [DP [D′]   [NP [N′   *cåsa*]]] (IRo., after reanalysis)
                                               house
        '(a/the) house'

Given that DOM is intrinsically linked to definiteness/specificity as formalized in various referential hierarchies (cf. Aissen 2003; Witzlack-Makaraevich and Seržant 2018, pp. 5–7), a direct consequence of the loss of transparent encoding of definiteness/specificity on Istro-Romanian nominals is manifested in the gradual loss of DOM. This development presumably first affected the licensing of DOM with DPs containing non-specific, indefinite specific, and definite nominals (cf. Bossong 1991) which were not intrinsically definite or specific. This stage is already well attested in Cantemir's and Morariu's corpora, where such referents overwhelmingly occur without the *pre* marker. Subsequently, DOM would have no longer served to distinguish between specific and non-specific referents, eventually leading to its progressive loss, even with proper names and personal pronouns which are intrinsically specific. Thus, it is not by chance that in Sârbu and Frăţilă's (1998) *Dialectul istroromân* there are only a handful of (perhaps dubious) attestations of DOM, all of which involve personal pronouns, the last class of nominals to lose DOM. Indeed, by the time of the first recordings of the *Preservation of the Vlaški and Žejanski Language* project initiated in 2007, DOM had completely disappeared, a development which is matched by a concomitant reanalysis of erstwhile definite nouns/adjectives which are now generally, though not exclusively, interpreted as being underspecified for definiteness.

7. Postverbal Negators

A final significant consequence of the difference in the ability of T to probe the verb that we now explore is the prediction that it makes about the distribution of different negation strategies. As is well known,[34] in the dialects of central, southern and north-eastern Italy, Ligurian, eastern Romansh, Catalan, European Portuguese, Spanish and Romanian, sentential negation is marked by a simple reflex of Latin preverbal NON 'not', so-called Stage I of Jespersen's Cycle (70a). Elsewhere, negation is either at Stage II, as in many northern Italian dialects, standard (written/formal) French, and Gascon, where negation is expressed discontinuously by both a preverbal and postverbal negator (70b), or at Stage III, as in many north-western Italian dialects, western/central Romansh, spoken French, Occitan, Aragonese, and northern Catalan dialects, where negation is expressed by a single postverbal negator (70c).

(70) a. **Un**   duarmu. (Cosenza, Calabria)
          NEG   sleep.1SG
      b. A   **n**   dorum   **briza**. (Modena, Emilia-Romagna)
          SCL   NEG sleep.FUT.1SG NEG
      c. Dürmirai   **nen**. (Piedmont)
          sleep.FUT.1SG NEG
          'I don't/won't sleep.'

In light of these distributions, Ledgeway and Schifano (2023) propose an original connection between each of these three stages and the extent of V-movement. In particular, varieties with simple preverbal negation (Stage I) may display either low V-movement (e.g., Cosentino) or high V-movement (e.g., some northern Italian dialects such as most Ligurian and Venetan varieties), whereas in varieties with non-emphatic postverbal negators (Stages II-III), the verb must raise to a high position (e.g., French and most northern Italian dialects). The relevant empirical generalization then is as in (71), inasmuch as we see that the presence of a non-emphatic postverbal negator is not compatible with low V-movement. Rather, a postverbal negator can only be licensed if the verb raises through the projection hosting the negator (for a more detailed technical implication of this basic idea, see Ledgeway and Schifano 2023, sct. 6). It follows that high(er) V-movement is essential for the licensing of Stages II-III of Jespersen's Cycle, and that only in the modern dialects of northern Romance, where we have independently established that T probes V, does postverbal negation obtain. By contrast, in southern Romance where V-movement is low, all varieties are necessarily at Stage I.

(71) If a variety is at Stages II-III, it necessarily exhibits clause-medial or high verb-movement

The inescapable conclusion therefore is that Jespersen's Cycle is inextricably tied to the relative height of V-movement. Significant in this respect is Daco-Romanian, which, as repeatedly noted above, offers us evidence of both low (western) and high (eastern) V-movement grammars, but which in both cases uniformly displays Stage I negation (72a-b), highlighting how high V-movement is a necessary but not an automatic trigger for Stage II or III negation.

(72) a.   Bașcă   zâșe   că **nu**-i   pasă. (Ro$_1$., Checea, Timiș, Ban.)
      b. Spune intenționat   că **nu**-i   pasă. (Ro.$_2$, Cumpăna, CȚ, Dobr.)
          say.3SG deliberately say.3SG that NEG=DAT.3= matter.3SG
          'He deliberately says that he doesn't care.'

However, an important synchronic prediction of our approach to the distribution of Jespersen's Cycle is that, if the empirical generalization in (71) is correct, signs of grammaticalization of new postverbal sentential negators should only be detected in varieties which exhibit high V-movement. A very revealing test case is represented by colloquial varieties of eastern Daco-Romanian, where our investigations have revealed a productive use of n-words employed as sole (increasingly non-emphatic) negators, suggesting an ongoing shift towards Stage III negation (cf. discussion of northern Italo-Romance in Ledgeway and Schifano 2023, sct. 5.2.2). Representative in this respect are the following eastern examples produced by speakers from Muntenia and Dobrogea.

(73) a.   A   înțeles   **fix**   **pula**   din   ce   i-am
        have.3SG   understand.PTCP exactly   cock   of   what   3.DAT=have.1SG
        zis. (Ro.2, Muntenia / Dobrogea)
        say.PTCP
        'He hasn't understood (at all) what I told him.'

      b.   A   făcut   **fix**   **pix**. (Ro.2, Munt. / Dobr.)
        have.3SG   do.PTCP   exactly   cock
        'He hasn't done it (at all).'

      c.   A   auzit   **o**   **pulă**   /   **o**   **laie**. (Ro.2, Munt. / Dobr.)
        have.3SG   hear.PTCP   a   cock   a   rabble
        'He hasn't heard (at all).'

      d.   Lasă   că   rezolv   eu! –   Ei,   rezolvi   **o** **pulă** /   **o**
        let.IMP.2SG   that   solve.1SG I   hey   solve.2SG a   cock   a
        laie! (Ro.2, Munt. / Dobr.)
        rabble
        'Let me sort it out!—What, there's no way you can sort it out!'

      e.   Mă   ascultă?   –   Ascultă **o**   **pulă**   /   **o**   **laie**! (Ro.2, Munt. / Dobr.)
        me.ACC=   listen.3SG   listen.3SG a   cock   a   rabble
        'Is he listening to me?—He's not listening (at all).'

      f.   Am   reușit   (**fix**)   **un**   **căcat**. (Ro.2, Munt.)
        have.1SG   succeed.PTCP   exactly   a   shit
        'I didn't succeed (at all).'

As predicted, examples like those in (73a–f) are only found in high V-movement varieties where the placement of the verb above the LAS may license new postverbal negators. Western Daco-Romanian speakers, by contrast, categorically reject all such examples, which simply do not form part of their grammars, which fail to show any signs of grammaticalizing n-words, a conclusion entirely in line with our observation that all western varieties display low V-movement. In short, our original independent observations about differences in V-movement in western and eastern Daco-Romanian turn out once again to have more general explanatory power, in this case providing a principled account for the restriction of incipient cases of grammaticalization of postverbal negators to Daco-Romanian varieties with high V-movement.[35]

In the absence of relevant data, we leave it to future research to determine whether similar differences in negation strategies can be identified in the other sub-branches of Daco-Romance in accordance with their particular setting of the V-parameter.

8. Conclusions

We have reviewed robust parametric evidence both from within Daco-Romanian and across Daco-Romance to support some major differences in the height of V-movement in accordance with diatopic (e.g., Daco-Romanian, Aromanian), inter-speaker and dia-generational (e.g., Megleno-Romance) and language-endogenous/-exogenous (e.g., Istro-Romanian) factors. At the same time, we have observed how parameters do not operate in isolation, inasmuch as the setting of one parameter entails significant knock-on effects elsewhere in the grammar. Such is the case with T, which probes the verb in eastern Daco-Romanian, northern Aromanian, optionally in 'traditional' Megleno-Romanian1, and auxiliaries in Croatian-style Istro-Romanian2, a parametric setting which, in turn, accounts for V-Adv orders; (incipient) active–stative perfective auxiliary selection and the tendential loss or weakening of the preterite (though not in Aromanian and Megleno-Romanian); a dedicated preverbal subject position licensing unmarked SVO; the (near) absence or heavily reduced distribution of DOM; and incipient Stage III negation. By contrast, in western Daco-Romanian, southern Aromanian, 'modern' Megleno-Romanian2, and in conjunction with lexical verbs in traditional Daco-Romance-style Istro-Romanian1, all these same options are largely absent, since T fails to attract the verb, which is probed instead by *v*. This parametric setting explains the presence in these varieties of Adv-V orders; the generalization of a single perfective auxiliary in accordance with a nominative–accusative alignment, and, with the exception of Istro-Romanian, the retention of the preterite; the absence of a dedicated preverbal subject-position, yielding unmarked VSO, though not in

Istro-Romanian, which, under the exogenous influence of Croatian, has generalized the preverbal subject-position; a robust and productive distribution of DOM, except in Istro-Romanian, where contact-induced changes in the marking of definiteness and specificity have arguably led to its attrition; and robust Stage I negation. These facts are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. V-parameter and its consequences across Daco-Romance.

	Romanian		Aromanian		Megleno-Romanian		Istro-Romanian	
	West (Ro.$_1$)	East (Ro.$_2$)	South (Aro.$_1$)	North (Aro.$_2$)	(MRo.$_1$)	(MRo.$_2$)	IRo.$_1$	IRo.$_2$
V$_{Lex}$	LAS	HAS	LAS	HAS	LAS/HAS	LAS	higher LAS	lower LAS
V$_{Aux}$	LAS	HAS					LAS	HAS
Adv$_{LAS}$ + V	+	−	+	−	±	+	+	+
Adv$_{HAS}$ + Aux	+	−					+	−
Aux$_{HAVE/BE}$	−	+	−	(+)	(+)	−	−	+
Preterite	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	−
SpecTP	−	+	−	+	±	−	+ (−)	+
DOM	+	±	+	−	(+)	−	− (+)	−
Stage III Neg	−	+						

Notes

[1] As argued in Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005), the HAS comprises the functional projections lexicalized by pragmatic speech-act adverbs to the left and celerative events adverbs to the right, while the LAS includes all lower functional projections situated between presuppositional negators to the left and singular completive adverbs to the right.

[2] Indeed, even in Romanian$_2$ (and hence also in the standard written language) there are a number of adverbs such as *(de-)abia* 'hardly' and *tocmai* 'just' which must always precede the verb (i.a,b; cf. also Cornilescu 2000b, p. 91) and which presumably can be treated as nanoparametric (viz., idiosyncratic lexical) triggers of the older low V-movement grammar preserved in Romanian$_1$.

(i) a. Unii abia știu (*abia) să citească și să scrie. (Ro.$_{1/2}$)
    some hardly know.3PL hardly that.IRR read.SBJV.3 and that.IRR write.SBJV.3
    'Some can barely read or write.'

   b. Tocmai am primit (*tocmai) o notificare. (Ro.$_{1/2}$)
    just have.1SG receive.PTCP just a notification
    'I've just received a notification.'

[3] The Daco-Romanian data were collected via questionnaires and semi-structured interviews with native speakers. In order to provide an objective description, we worked with 10 speakers from each of the following regions (individual localities provided in brackets): Oltenia (Valea Mare, Delureni, Râmnicu Vâlcea, Slatina), Banat (Timișoara, Jimbolia, Checea, Sacoșu Mare), Crișana (Valea de Jos, Beiuș, Șuștiu, Oradea), Muntenia (București, Giurgiu, Găești), Dobrogea (Constanța, Cumpăna, Cazasu, Brăila), Moldova (Târgu Neamț, Grințieș), and Bucovina (Vatra Dornei, Șaru Dornei). In addition to the data obtained through our first-hand investigations with native speakers, we have also expanded, enriched and verified the results of our data collections through detailed examinations and comparisons of the available published sources on dialectal and non-standard varieties of

Daco-Romanian and the other Daco-Romance varieties, including written texts (e.g., plays, fairy tales), annotated collections of oral dialogues, linguistic atlases, grammars and individual linguistic studies.

[4] We have not taken into consideration the clitic adverbs *mai* '(any)more, still; also', *și* 'immediately, also; already', *prea* 'too much', *cam* 'rather', and *tot* 'still, also' (cf. Dobrovie-Sorin 1999, p. 522; Reinheimer Rîpeanu 2004, p. 225; Giurgea 2011; Mîrzea Vasile and Dinică 2013, pp. 447f.; Cornilescu and Cosma 2014; Mîrzea Vasile 2015; Nicolae 2019, p. 33) since they are heads rather than specifiers and therefore cannot be used as a diagnostic for V-movement in the varieties under investigation.

[5] Cf. Seche (1963), Mărgărit (2009, pp. 186–91).

[6] Indeed, one anonymous reviewer also notes that in their dataset from the Fier area in Albania, a northern Aromanian variety, verbs invariably precede adverbs, as shown by the following examples.

(i) a. ɛsti   eu   tsi   **vədi**   t̯ətuna (Aro.$_2$, Fier)
    be.3SG   him   that   see.1SG   always
    'It's him I always see.'
  b. mi   **grɛʃti**   t̯ətuna (Aro.$_2$, Fier)
    me=   call.3SG   always
    '(S)he always calls me.'

[7] Evidence such as (i) below might suggest that lexical verbs actually target a position in the lower portion of the higher adverb space, witness the position of the finite verb *avemo* to the left of the lower temporal adverb "*vet*" 'already'(Spec TP$_{Anterior}$) and, in particular, to the left of *acmo* 'now' (SpecTP$_{Past/Future}$). However, the example involves the verb HAVE, which even in its copular possessive uses is probably more appropriately considered a functional predicate, which, as we shall see below, is a class which independently targets higher positions than lexical verbs.

(i) Ne oi   **n-avem**   acmo   vet**″**   de   dupa   oste. (IRo.$_1$, Žejane)
    no sheep   NEG=have.1PL   now   already   of   after   war
    'Now, after the war, we already don't have any sheep.' (Sârbu and Frățilă 1998, p. 144)

[8] For Croatian, see Radanović-Kocić (1988), Franks and Progovac (1994), Rivero (1994, 1997), Wilder and Ćavar (1994), Schütze (1994), Dimitrova-Vulchanova (1995), Halpern (1995), Progovac (1996), King (1996), Tomić (1996), Embick and Izvorski (1997), Franks (1998, 2000), Bošković (2001), and Roberts (2010).

[9] This account potentially explains contradictory data found in the literature. For example, Giusti and Zegrean (2015, p. 126) observe that the Istro-Romanian auxiliary cannot occur in clause-initial position, while Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2018, pp. 96f.) highlight an example where the auxiliary is found in clause-initial position. Significant in this respect is Dragomirescu and Nicolae's (2018, p. 97) observation that Istro-Romanian 'auxiliaries do not *strictly* obey a Wackernagel constraint' [our italics].

[10] Here we gloss over the precise details of the derivation of the inverted structure and, in particular, how the participle comes to precede the auxiliary. In the corresponding southern Slavonic construction, the inverted structure is typically explained by positing independent movement of the lexical verb over the auxiliary to SpecTP or the C-domain (Migdalski 2006, pp. 62–81). According to Rivero's (1992, 1994) classic analysis across a variety of Balkan varieties, such structures involve long head movement of the lexical verb to C over the auxiliary. It is not clear, however, that the Megleno-Romanian inverted construction can be readily equated with that found in southern Slavonic since, for example, clitics and negation occur immediately before the participle+Aux cluster in the former, but not in the latter, in which clitics occur between the participle and the auxiliary.

[11] For correlations between V-movement and active participle agreement, see Ledgeway (2020, pp. 47f.).

[12] When the auxiliary verb exceptionally raises to T in the south, as can happen in irrealis contexts, active–stative effects may persist, as demonstrated in Ledgeway (2022b) for Ibero-Romance.

[13] It is not by chance that western Daco-Romanian employs *fi* 'be' with transitive participles. When the fieldwork for *ALR* (VI) (1969), 1997 was carried out, parts of western Romania, predominantly from Banat, still spoke Serbian. As a result, some speakers used Serbian *ia sam pevo* (lit. 'I be.1SG sing.PTCP') to render Daco-Romanian *am cântat* (lit. 'have.1SG sing.PTCP') 'I sang/have sung'.

[14] Crucially, when testing the grammaticality of this type of construction the periphrasis was always used in conjunction with temporal adverbials such as *de trei zile* 'three days ago' and *de ieri* 'since yesterday', which force a resultative reading. Finally, it must be noted that structures containing *fi* 'be' and a past participle can also be found, albeit extremely rarely, in the west. However, unlike in the east, in such uses the participle assumes a purely adjectival nature (cf. also Iordan 1973, p. 405; Coteanu 1982, p. 169; Avram 1994, pp. 494, 506), as shown by the possibility in (i) of coordinating it with other adjectives.

(i) Fata   e   **căzută**   pe scări și   **plină**   de sânge. (Râmnicu Vâlcea, Vâlcea, Olt.)
    girl.DEF   be.3SG   fall.PTCP.FSG   on stairs and   full.FSG   of blood
    'The girl is fallen (i.e., lying) on the stairs and completely covered in blood.'

[15] There are other explanations in the literature that have been put forward to explain the loss of the preterite in the east and the standard. For example, Șiadbei (1930) and Frâncu (1967, 1984, 2009) see the gradual replacement of the preterite with the analytic past as a result of homonymies in the relevant verb paradigms, e.g., ORo. preterite *cântămu* 'we sang' vs present *cântămu* 'we

sing'. Now, even if true—but cf. Sp. preterite *cantamos* 'we sang' and present *cantamos* 'we sing', and, similarly, BrPt. preterite *cantamos* 'we sang' and present *cantamos* 'we sing', where the preterite has not been lost despite some formal homophony with the present—it must be noted that, while in the east the tendency was to lose these forms altogether, in the west (initially in Oltenia and then in Banat and Crișana) there arose innovative preterite forms containing the *-ră-* suffix, e.g., ORo. *cântămu* 'we sang' > ModRo. *cânta**ră**m* 'we sang/we have sung'.

16 The preterite is also used to refer to past events without present relevance in Maramureș (e.g., in Transcarpathia, Ukraine), as exemplified in (i).

(i) Victor **fu** numele [lui]. (Dibrova, Transcarpathia, Mara.)
Victor be.PRT.3SG name.DEF his
'His name was Victor.' (Marin et al. [1998] 2000, p. 81)

17 There also seems to be idiolectal and nanoparametric (viz., lexical-based) variation among speakers from Crișana. For example, our informants from Șuștiu (Bihor, Crișana) showed a clear preference for the use of the preterite with (more functional) verbs such as *fi* 'be', *veni* 'come', and *merge* 'go'. However, as shown in (i), other (more lexical) verbs can also be found in the preterite, albeit more rarely.

(i) **Vinii** să văd ce faci, **terminași** treaba? (Șuștiu, Bihor, Orad.)
come.PRT.1SG that.SBJV see.1SG what do.2SG finish.PRT.1SG job.DEF
'I came to see what are you doing, have you finished your job?'

18 This development, described by Squartini and Bertinetto (2000, p. 418) as 'a peculiar form of aoristic drift', has been shown to be a relatively recent development (cf. Pană-Boroianu 1982). More specifically, while the form *per se* undoubtedly has a Latin etymon, the semantic development and hodiernal specialization of the form mirror those found in some neighbouring Balkan (Slavonic) varieties such as Serbian and (Štokavian) Croatian (Babić 1992, p. 265; Lindstedt 1994, pp. 36f.). By way of illustration, both the Oltenian example in (i.a) and the (Štokavian) Croatian in (i.b) can only be interpreted as referring to events that took place in the immediate past, but not for more distant events, witness the ungrammaticality of the use of the preterite form in the Oltenian example (ii) for non-hodiernal events.

(i) a. **Veni** văr-tu să-mi dea banii. (Ro.₁, Olt.)
come.PRT.3SG cousin=your.SG that.SBJV=me.DAT= give.SBJV.3 money.DEF
'Your cousin has just come to give me the money.'
b. Majko, evo **dođe** otac! (Serbo-Croatian)
mother.VOC there come.PRT.3SG father
'Look mother, father has just arrived!' (Lindstedt 1994, p. 37)

(ii) *****Veni** săpămâna trecută. (Ro.1, Olt.)
come.PRT.3SG week.DEF last
'He came last week.'

In this respect, it is important to note that at the beginning of the nineteenth century south Oltenian regions were populated by a significant number of 'Serbians' (e.g., 1242 families in 1831), an umbrella term for Slavswho had fled from the Ottoman Empire. Indeed, the same territories continue to be populated by Slavonic peoples even today: Macedonians represent the overwhelming majority in Brebeni Sârbi (Olt county), while Serbian is still spoken in Băilești (Dolj county).

19 The fact that *veari* 'have' was employed as a (generalized) auxiliary at an earlier date than *iri* 'be' in Megleno-Romanian is supported by the lack of attested traces of auxiliary *iri* 'be' in the case of 'renarrated mood' (consisting of an invariable form of the participle and auxiliary *veari* 'have'). In short, around the fifteenth century, both Bulgarian and Macedonian changed the semantics of auxiliary BE (cf. OCS *byti*) and the *l*-participle such that, besides referring to past actions with present relevance, it also began to encode an evidential meaning, implying that the situation described was not personally witnessed by the speaker (cf. Izvorski 1997). For example, Bulgarian *xodil săm* (lit. 'go.PTCP.MSG be.1SG') can mean both 'I have gone' and 'I went, so they say' (Lindstedt 1994, p. 44; Migdalski 2006, pp. 30, 54f.). The 'renarrated mood' also entered Megleno-Romanian under the form of the inverted analytic past (Capidan 1925, p. 205; Tomić 2006, pp. 380f.; but cf. Atanasov 2011, pp. 486–90), such that MRo. *știut-au* (lit. 'know.PTCP=have.3PL') does not mean 'they have found out', but, rather, 'they have apparently found out'.

20 Nevertheless, it must be noted that alongside these incipient active–stative tendencies in auxiliary selection, some Megleno-Romanian speakers tend towards the generalization of *iri* 'be' with all predicates, including transitives, e.g., *sam mâncat* lit. 'be.1SG eat.PTCP.MSG' (= 'I ate/have eaten'), unergatives *ies avdzăt*, e.g., lit. 'be.1SG hear.PTCP.MSG' (= 'I (have) heard'), as well as unaccusatives (cf. 42). While this syntactic reflex is not discussed by Tomić (2006, pp. 381–83), it is briefly touched upon by Capidan (1925, p. 205), Dahmen (1989, p. 441) and Atanasov (2011, p. 484), who explain it as a result of influence from Macedonian.

21 The interpretation of auxiliary *fi* 'be' in conjunction with unaccusatives as an emerging syntactic tendency rather than an old Daco-Romance relic is supported by both empirical and theoretical arguments. As Geană (2017, p. 213) notes, 'there is no consistent use of the compound past with the auxiliary *fi* 'be' (if any)'. Indeed, if *fi* 'be' had been preserved in Istro-Romanian from earlier stages of the language displaying an active–stative split, then there is no straightforward explanation for the inconsistent

use of the auxiliary in modern Istro-Romanian. If anything, the influence of Croatian, which exclusively displays BE in the analytic past periphrasis, should have enhanced the use of *fi* 'be' with unaccusative verbs. Rather, the use of auxiliary BE in conjunction with unaccusatives must represent an innovation arising from an imperfect replication of Croatian-style higher placement of the auxiliary which feeds unaccusative reflexes in the auxiliary system in accordance with (33).

22 As argued in detail in Ledgeway (2020, sct. 3.3; 2022a, sct. 2.3), in northern Romance varieties more generally, which also show high V-movement, the strong D-feature on T is manifested in the grammaticalization of a dedicated preverbal SpecTP subject position, leading to a reversal in the pro-drop parameter in French and some (northern) Occitan varieties, which is supplemented in northern Italian dialects, Raeto-Romance (including Ladin) and some northern Occitan varieties by the overt spell-out of the strong D-feature of the subject through a (partial/complete) system of subject clitics. This explains the contrast between the availability of unmarked SVO word order in the north and VSO order in the south, where T is inactive and lacks an EPP-style D-feature that probes the subject.

23 This lower *v*-related subject position is compatible with both a (narrow) focus reading, as in (45c), as well as a topicalized reading, as in (i). We leave open here the question of whether such interpretations are licensed *in situ* in Spec*v*P or whether they involve raising of the subject to a focus or topic position in the lower left periphery (cf. Belletti 2004).

    (i) Nu am   vorbit   azi   cu Mihai, dar mă   sună   **el** când ajunge   acasă. (Ro.$_2$)
        NEG have.1SG   speak.PTCP today with Mihai but me.ACC= ring.3SG he when arrive.3SG   home
        'I haven't spoken today with Mihai, but he'll call me when he gets home.'

24 Indeed it is not by chance that the verb in the double-subject construction typically carries an irrealis interpretation (e.g., future, subjunctive) since there is independent evidence across Romance that irrealis verb forms raise to an even higher position than in realis uses (cf. Ledgeway 2009a, 2013, 2015, 2020, pp. 38–40, 2022, 2023d; D'Alessandro and Ledgeway 2010; Ledgeway and Lombardi 2014; Schifano 2018, pp. 42–51, 96–113, 237f.; Groothuis 2020, pp. 199f.). For example, of the thirty examples of the double-subject construction reported in Cornilescu (2000b), there are twenty-four examples of the 'present' with future interpretation, one example of the subjunctive involving V-to-C movement, and one example of a gerund with an irrealis reading; the remaining four examples involve what is arguably a distinct construction labelled by Cornilescu as an example of 'standard familiar Romanian' (cf. i), in which there is a gender mismatch between the postverbal pronominal subject (always in the default masculine singular) and the following lexical subject, and the verb has a realis interpretation (e.g., present, past). From this, it is clear that licensing of the double-subject construction requires an exceptional movement of the verb to an irrealis modal position situated within the highest portion of the sentential core, or even the C-domain.

    (i) Vine   el fata. (familiar Ro.$_2$)
        come.3SG he girl.DEF
        'The girl is coming.'

25 Orthogonal to our argument about the availability of one or more subject positions within the sentential core is the manner in which genuine double-subject constructions are actually derived. Nevertheless, one possible analysis, given the order of pronoun + lexical DP, is to argue for a 'big DP' analysis (cf. object clitic-doubling structures) in which the pronominal part of the underlying big DP floats off to the SpecTP position, stranding the lexical DP *in situ*. For further details, see Cornilescu (2000b).

26 Note that this tendency to generalize SpecTP is not sensitive to a preverbal AGENT vs postverbal UNDERGOER active–stative distinction, witness the example in (i), where the UNDERGOER subject typically occurs in SpecTP.

    (i) **Oile**   bire   crescu. (IRo.)
        sheep.PL.DEF   well   grow.3PL
        'The sheep are growing well.' (Neiescu 2011, p. 307)

27 For similar cases of contact-induced change producing a non-uniform distribution of head and edge features across T and *v*, see the discussion in Ledgeway (2022a, sct. 3).

28 But see Pușcariu (1922), Racoviță (1940), Graur (1945), Niculescu (1959, 1965), Onu (1959), Guțu Romalo (1973), Pană Dindelegan (1976, 1997, 1999), Dobrovie-Sorin (1990, 1994), Sala (1999), Cornilescu (2000a), Ionescu (2000), Guruianu (2005), Cornilescu and Dobrovie-Sorin (2008), Tigău (2010, 2011), Mardale (2015), Irimia (2017, 2020), Hill and Mardale (2021), and Ledgeway (2022a).

29 Apart from the north–south divide regarding the presence or otherwise of DOM, Aromanian represents an interesting case from a diachronic perspective. Simplifying somewhat, the Aromanian spoken in Albania, argued Capidan (1932, p. 530), completely lacked DOM, whereas Manzini and Savoia (2018, pp. 167–69) remark that, in the variety spoken in Diviakë (Albania), 'DOM with highly ranked objects is possible, but not enforced'. Although an in-depth analysis of V-movement in the Aromanian varieties spoken in Albania is required in order to identify the exact triggers of this development, it would seem that in the last 100 years there has been a (re)emergence of DOM. As expected, the first constituents to be marked with *pe/pi* are highly definite (personal) pronouns (i).

    (i) Mini gresku   **pe**   **tseu**. (ARo., Diviakë)
        I   call.1SG   DOM   him
        'I call him.' (Manzini and Savoia 2018, p. 168)

30 An ongoing tendency in these territories is the optional use of *pi* with definite inanimate nouns to signal topicality, which is similar to what is found in Macedonian (Bužarovska 2017, pp. 78f.).

31 DOM, viz., *na*-marking, seems to be a recent phenomenon in Macedonian, given its absence in Daniel's late eighteenth-century *Tetraglosson* (cf. Nichev 1997). Interestingly, nineteenth-century Aromanian texts from the Struga region also lack DOM (Bužarovska 2017, p. 71), a conclusion that overlaps with Capidan's (1932, p. 530) observations regarding northern Aromanian varieties. On this note, Tošev (1970) argues that Aromanian refugees from Moschopolis/Moscopole (Albania) brought this syntactic feature to the Struga area (though cf. Friedman 2000 for a different explanation that relies on the effects of standard Daco-Romanian being taught in schools).

32 Such optionality is probably only apparent, inasmuch as the distribution of DOM appears to be determined by diatopic factors, with virtually all the examples of DOM attested in Cantemir's and Morariu's corpora coming from the southern Šušnjevica, Noselo/Nova Vas and Sucodru/Jesenovik varieties; cf. Cantemir (1959, pp. 39, 60, 93, 105) and Morariu (1928, pp. 5, 7, 38, 68, 69).

33 While in older stages of Croatian, the definite/indefinite distinction was marked through adjectival forms, with long forms marking definite DPs and short forms indefinite DPs (cf. Aljović 2000, pp. 28f.; Sussex and Cubberley 2006, p. 266), in modern Croatian the system is slowly falling into disuse, with speakers lacking sharp grammaticality judgements in relation to long and short adjectival forms (Velnić 2015, pp. 29f.). In a similar development, some prenominal Istro-Romanian adjectives bearing the definite article can convey the same meaning as prenominal adjectives without the definite article (cf. also Kovačec 1984, p. 567; Geanǎ 2019, p. 65). For example, the DP in (i.a) *mǎrle sǎd* was translated by Sârbu and Frǎțilǎ (1998, p. 270) as an indefinite (cf. *mǎre* 'big'), despite the formal presence of the definite article *-le*. By the same token, in the recordings from the *Preservation of the Vlaški and Žejanski Language* project, begun in 2007, the DPs in (i.b) were translated as indefinite despite being formally marked as definite.

(i) a. De   [DP mår**le** såd],   s-au   rasțipęit. (IRo., Žejane)
       from   big.DEF log   self=have.3PL chop.PTCP
       'They chopped a big log.' (Sârbu and Frǎțilǎ 1998, p. 104)
    b. k-av   [DP o   mår**le** kâre]   k-av   verit   ân kåle (IRo., Žejane)
       that=have.3SG a   big.DEF dog   that=have.3SG come.PTCP in way
       'that a huge dog came in front of him' (VlaŽej, *Grandfathers' interesting stories*)

34 See Zanuttini (1997), Parry (1997), Manzini and Savoia (2005, III, pp. 127–55), Poletto (2008, 2016a, 2016b), Garzonio and Poletto (2009, 2018), and the various Romance-specific chapters in Willis et al. (2013).

35 Although this requires further research, it is entirely plausible that this difference between western and eastern varieties of Daco-Romanian may also explain the fact that the preverbal negator *nu* from Lat. NON, which typically produces clitic reflexes in preverbal position across Romance (cf. Fr. *ne* + V vs constituent negator *non* (*pas*)), is frequently stressed in western varieties (i.a) but not in eastern varieties, where it typically surfaces as an unstressed clitic (i.b). This can be clearly seen from the atlases; witness the realizations of ***nu** mi-a pǎsat* 'I didn't care' in (*ALR* (VII) 1972, 2003) where the negator predominantly occurs in stressed form in the west but as an atonic clitic in the east.

(i) a. **Nú**   mi-o   pǎsát. (36, Ghilad, Timiș, Ban.)
    b. **Nu**   mi-a   pǎsát. (182, Sǎcele, Covasna, Braș.)
       NEG(=)   me.DAT=have.3(SG)   matter.PTCP
       'I didn't care.' (*ALR* (VII) 1972, 2003)

  In particular, it is well-known that high V-movement varieties of northern Romance that have developed Stage II-III negation display considerable weakening of the original preverbal negator, ultimately leading to its complete loss in Stage III varieties. Given the incipient tendencies towards the grammaticalization of postverbal negators in eastern Romanian varieties observed in (73a–f), it is not therefore surprising to find some prosodic weakening of the preverbal negator in the east, but, significantly, not in western varieties where, given their Stage I status licensed by a low V-movement grammar, the negator can in fact occur in stressed form, and frequently does.

References

Aissen, Judith. 2003. Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21: 435–83.

Alboiu, Gabriela. 2002. *The Features of Movement in Romanian*. Bucharest: Editura Univerisitǎții din București.

Alboiu, Gabriela, and Virginia Motapanyane. 2000. The generative approach to Romanian grammar. An overview. In *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*. Edited by Virginia Motapanyane. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 1–48.

Aljović, Nadira. 2000. Recherches sur la Morpho-Syntaxe du Groupe Nominal en Serbo-Croate. Doctoral thesis, Université de Paris VIII, Saint-Denis, France.

ALR (V) = *Atlasul Lingvistic Român (Serie Nouǎ), Volumul V*. 1966. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

ALR (VI) = *Atlasul Lingvistic Român (Serie Nouǎ), Volumul VI*. 1969. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

ALR (VII) = *Atlasul Lingvistic Român (Serie Nouǎ), Volumul VII*. 1972. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

ALRR (Banat) = *Atlasul Lingvistic Român pe Regiuni (Banat), Volumul IV*. 2005. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Andriani, Luigi. 2011. Differential Object Marking, Clitic Doubling and Argumental Structure in Barese. Master's thesis, University of Leiden, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Andriani, Luigi. 2015. Semantic and syntactic properties of the prepositional accusative in Barese. *Linguistica Atlantica* 34: 61–78.

Araújo-Adriano, Paulo Ângelo. 2020. Sobre a perda parcial do movimento do verbo no português brasileiro: A analiticização do tempo futuro. *Investigações* 33: 1–32. [CrossRef]

Araújo-Adriano, Paulo Ângelo. 2022. The position of the verb in relation to the adverb *sempre* along four centuries: Diagnosis for the (loss of) verb movement in Brazilian Portuguese. *Journal of Historical Syntax* 6: 1–50.

Araújo-Adriano, Paulo Ângelo. 2023. The Present Tense Analyticisation Process in Brazilian Portuguese: A Diachronic Approach. Doctoral thesis, University of Campinas, Campinas, Brazil.

Asenova, Petya, and Vassilka Aleksova. 2008. L'aspect balkanique de la nota accusative personalis. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 44: 1–22.

Atanasov, Radu-Mihail. 2011. Valorile perfectului compus în meglenoromână. *Limba Română* 60: 484–90.

Avram, Larisa. 1994. Auxiliary configurations in English and Romanian. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 49: 493–510.

Babić, Stjepan. 1992. *Gramatika Hrvatskoga Jezika, Priručnik za Osnovno Jezično Obrazovanje*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Baker, Mark. 2008. The macroparameter in a microparametric world. In *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*. Edited by Theresa Biberauer. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 351–74.

Belletti, Adriana. 1990. *Generalized Verb Movement*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In *The Structure of CP and IP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 16–51.

Boioc Apintei, Adnana. 2021. Limba română vorbită de rușii lipoveni. O perspectivă sociolingvistică și gramaticală. Doctoral thesis, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania.

Borer, Hagit. 1984. *Parametric Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax–Phonology Interface. Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Bossong, Georg. 1991. Differential object marking in Romance and beyond. In *New Analyses in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the XVIII Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Urbana- Champaign, 7–9 April 1988*. Edited by Dieter Wanner and Douglas Kibbee. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 143–70.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.

Bužarovska, Eleni. 2017. The contemporary use of DOM in south-western Macedonian dialects. *Rhema* 3: 65–87.

Byck, Jacques. 1937. L'emploi affectif du pronom personnel en roumain. *Buletin de Linguistique* 5: 15–33.

Cantemir, Traian. 1959. *Texte Istroromâne*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei.

Capidan, Theodor. 1925. *Meglenoromânii. Istoria și Graiul lor (I)*. Bucharest: Cultura Națională.

Capidan, Theodor. 1928. *Literatura populară la meglenoromâni (II)*. Bucharest: Cultura Națională.

Capidan, Theodor. 1932. *Aromânii. Dialectul Aromân. Studiu Lingvistic*. Bucharest: Imprimeria Națională.

Cazacu, Boris, ed. 1967. *Texte Dialectale Oltenia*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Cazacu, Boris, ed. 1975. *Texte Dialectale Muntenia (II)*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Chircu, Adrian. 2006. Adverbul românesc în diatopie (dialectul dacoromân). In *Lucrările celui de-al XII-lea Simpozion Național de Dialectologie 5–7 mai 2006*. Edited by Nicolae Saramandu. Cluj-Napoca: Mega, pp. 421–31.

Chitez, Mădălina. 2010. Perfect simple in Wallachia and Transylvania: A typological approach. *LinguaCulture* 1: 57–82. [CrossRef]

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clark, Robin, and Ian Roberts. 1993. A computational approach to language learnability and language change. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 299–345.

Cohuț, Cornelia, and Magdalena Vulpe. 1973. *Graiul din zona Porțile de Fier*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2000a. Notes on the interpretation of the prepositional accusative in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 2: 91–106.

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2000b. The double-subject construction in Romanian. In *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*. Edited by Virginia Motapanyane. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 83–133.

Cornilescu, Alexandra. 2020. Ditransitive constructions with differentially marked direct objects in Romanian. In *Dative Constructions in Romance and Beyond*. Edited by Anna Pineda and Jaume Mateu. Berlin: Language Science Press, pp. 117–42.

Cornilescu, Alexandra, and Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin. 2008. Clitic doubling, complex heads, and interarboreal operations. In *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages. Vol. 30, Linguistik Aktuell*. Edited by Dalina Kallulli and Liliane Tasmowski. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 289–319.

Cornilescu, Alexandra, and Ruxandra Cosma. 2014. On the functional structure of the Romanian *de*-supine. In *Komplexe Argumentstrukturen. Kontrastive Untersuchungen zum Deutschen, Rumänischen und Englischen*. Edited by Ruxandra Cosma. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 283–336.

Costea, Ștefania. 2019. When Romanian Meets Russian. The Effects of Contact on Moldovan Daco-Romanian Syntax. Master's thesis, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

Coteanu, Ion. 1982. *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*. Bucharest: Editura Albatros.

D'Alessandro, Roberta, and Adam Ledgeway. 2010. At the C-T boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation. *Lingua* 120: 2040–60. [CrossRef]

Dahmen, Wolfgang. 1989. Rumänisch: Arealinguistik III. Meglenorumänisch. In *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik. Band III. Die einzelnen romanischen Sprachen und Sprachgebiete von der Renaissance bis zur Gegenwart. Rumänisch, Dalmatisch/Istroromanisch, Friaulisch, Ladinisch, Bündnerromanisch*. Edited by Günter Holtus, Michael Metzeltin and Christian Schmitt. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 437–47.

Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 1995. Clitics in Slavic. *Studia Linguistica* 49: 54–92. [CrossRef]

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1990. Clitic doubling, wh-movement, and quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 351–97.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1999. Clitics across categories: The case of Romanian. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Edited by Henk van Riemsdijk. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 515–42.

Dragomirescu, Adina, and Alexandru Nicolae. 2013. Urme ale selecției auxiliarului de perfect compus în română. In *Hommages Offers à Florica Dimitrescu et Alexandru Niculescu*. Edited by Coman Lupu, Dan Octavian Cepraga, Lorenzo Renzi, Mihai Enăchescu, Mioara Angheluță, Oana Balaș and Simona Georgescu. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, pp. 338–52.

Dragomirescu, Adina, and Alexandru Nicolae. 2018. Syntactic archaisms preserved in a contemporary Romance variety: Interpolation and scrambling in old Romanian and Istro-Romanian. In *Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives on Romance Syntax*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula and Alexandru Nicolae. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 85–115.

Dragomirescu, Adina, and Alexandru Nicolae. 2020. At the Crossroad of Croatian and Italian Dialects: Subject Clitics in Istro-Romanian. Paper presented at the Workshop Contact and the Architecture of Language Faculty, Societas Linguistica Europaea, online, August 25.

Dragomirescu, Adina, and Alexandru Nicolae. 2021. Romance and Croatian in contact: Non-Clitic auxiliaries in Istro-Romanian. *Languages* 6: 187. [CrossRef]

Embick, David, and Roumyana Izvorski. 1997. Participle–auxiliary orders in Slavic. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting*. Edited by Wayles Browne, Ewa Dornish, Natasha Kondrashova and Draga Zec. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 210–39.

Emonds, Joseph. 1978. The verbal complex V'-V in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 151–75.

Frâncu, Constantin. 1967. Din istoria perfectului simplu românesc: Formele de persoana I și a II-a plural cu sufixul -ră-'. *Anuar de Lingvistică și istorie Literară* 18: 175–92.

Frâncu, Constantin. 1984. Din istoria verbelor neregulate: Formele de tipul *zisei*. *Limba Română* 23: 426–26.

Frâncu, Constantin. 2009. *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*. Iași: Casa Editorială Demiurg.

Franks, Steven. 1998. Clitics in Slavic. Paper presented at the Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop, Bloomington, IN, USA, June 5–7.

Franks, Steven. 2000. Clitics at the interface: An introduction to clitic phenomena in European languages. In *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Edited by Frits Beukema and Marcel Den Dikken. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 1–46.

Franks, Steven, and Ljiljana Progovac. 1994. On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics. In *Indiana Slavic Studies: Proceedings of the 9th Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore, Bloomington, IN, USA, 7–9 April 1994*. Bloomington: Indiana University, vol. 7, pp. 69–78.

Friedman, Victor. 2000. Pragmatics and contact in Macedonia. Convergence and differentiation in the Balkan Sprachbund. *Južnoslovenski Filolog* 56: 1343–51.

Garzonio, Jacobo, and Cecilia Poletto. 2009. Quantifiers as negative markers in Italian dialects. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 9: 127–52. [CrossRef]

Garzonio, Jacobo, and Cecilia Poletto. 2018. Sintassi formale e micro-tipologia della negazione dei dialetti italiani. In *Tipologia e 'dintorni': Il metodo tipologico alla intersezione di piani*. Edited by Joseph Brincat and Sandro Caruana. Rome: Bulzoni, pp. 83–102.

Geană, Ionuț. 2017. On the use of the compound past in Istro-Romanian. In *Sintaxa ca mod de a fi. Omagiu Gabrielei Pană Dindelegan, la aniversare*. Edited by Adina Dragomirescu, Alexandru Nicolae, Camelia Stan and Rodica Zafiu. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, pp. 209–14.

Geană, Ionuț. 2019. Structuri de bază în istroromână. In *Conferințele Catedrei de Lingvistică romanică (2017–2018)*. Edited by Camelia Ușurelu, Simona Georgescu and Coman Lupu. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, pp. 63–73.

Geană, Ionuț. 2020. The Morphosyntax of Istro-Romanian DPs. Paper presented at the Anglia Ruskin-Cambridge Romance Linguistics Seminars, Cambridge, UK, October 9.

Giurgea, Ion. 2011. The Romanian verbal cluster and the theory of head movement. In *Romance Linguistics 2010: Selected Papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Seattle, WA, USA, March 2010*. Edited by Julia Herschensohn. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 271–86.

Giusti, Giuliana, and Iulia Zegrean. 2015. Syntactic protocols to enhance inclusive cultural identity. A case study on Istro-Romanian clausal structure. *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali* 1: 117–38.

Graur, Alexandru. 1945. Contributions à l'étude du genre personnel en roumain. *Bulletin Linguistique* 13: 97–104.

Groothuis, Kim. 2020. Reflexes of Finiteness in Romance. Doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

Groothuis, Kim. 2022. Non-finite verb movement in Romance. *Probus* 34: 273–315. [CrossRef]

Guruianu, Viorel. 2005. *Sintaxa textelor românești originale din secolul al XVI-lea. Vol. 1. Sintaxa propoziției*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.

Guţu Romalo, Valeria. 1973. *Sintaxa Limbii Române*. Probleme şi Interpretări. Bucharest: Editura Didacticăşi Pedagogică.

Halpern, Aaron. 1995. *On the Morphology and Placement of Clitics*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Havu, Jukka, and Elenn Ştirbu. 2015. Perfectul simplu și perfectul compus în texte narative românești. *Analele Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza" din Iași. Secțiunea IIIe. Lingvistică* 61: 139–65.

Hill, Virginia, and Alexandru Mardale. 2021. *The Diachrony of Differential Object Marking in Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hill, Virginia, and Gabriela Alboiu. 2016. *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*. Oxford: Oxfrod University Press.

Ionescu, Emil. 2000. The role of PE in the direct object construction in Romanian (some critical remarks). *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 2: 81–91.

Iordan, Iorgu. 1973. Note sur la double valeur du participe passé roman. *Travaux de linguistique et de littérature* 9: 401–5.

Irimia, Monica Alexandrina. 2017. Decomposing Differential Object Marking. Adpositions and Licensing. Paper presented at the International Workshop Morphosyntactic Variations in Adpositions, Cambridge, UK, May 8–9.

Irimia, Monica Alexandrina. 2020. Types of structural objects. In *Case, Agreement, and Their Interactions: New Perspectives on Differential Argument Marking*. Edited by András Bárány and Laura Kalin. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 77–126.

Izvorski, Roumyana. 1997. The present perfect as an epistemic modal. Paper presented at the 7th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference, Stanford, CA, USA, March 21–23; Edited by Aaron Lawson. Ithaka: Cornell University, pp. 222–39.

Kahl, Thede, and Ioana Nechiti. 2019. *The Boyash in Hungary*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Kayne, Richard. 1991. Romance clitics, verb movement and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647–86.

Kazazis, Kostas, and Joseph Pentheroudakis. 1976. Reduplication of indefinite direct objects in Albanian and Modern Greek. *Language* 52: 398–403. [CrossRef]

King, Tracy Holloway. 1996. Slavic clitics, long head movement, and prosodic inversion. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 4: 274–311.

Kovačec, August. 1971. *Descrierea istroromânei actuale*. Bucharest: Academia Republicii Socialiste România.

Kovačec, August. 1984. Istroromâna. In *Tratat de dialectologie românească*. Edited by Valeriu Rusu. Craiova: Scrisul Românesc, pp. 550–91.

La Fauci, Nunzio. 1991. La continuità nella diversità formale: Aspetti di morfosintassi diacronica romanza. In *Innovazione e Conservazione Nelle Lingue*. Edited by Vincenzo Orioles. Pisa: Giardini, pp. 135–58.

La Fauci, Nunzio. 1994. *Oggetti e Soggetti Nella Formazione Della Morfosintassi Romanza. (Objects and Subjects in the Formation of Romance Morphosyntax)*. Translated by Nunzio La Fauci. Bloomington: IULC. First published 1988.

La Fauci, Nunzio. 1997. *Per una teoria grammaticale del mutamento morfosintattico. Dal latino verso il romanzo*. Pisa: ETS.

La Fauci, Nunzio. 1998. Riflettendo sul mutamento morfosintattico: Nel latino, verso il romanzo. In *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX Congresso Internazionale Della Società di Linguistica Italiana*. Edited by Paolo Ramat and Elisa Roma. Rome: Bulzoni, pp. 519–52.

Lambova, Mariana. 2003. On Information Structure and Clausal Architecture: Evidence from Bulgarian. Doctoral thesis, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2000. *A Comparative Syntax of the Dialects of Southern Italy: A Minimalist Approach*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2009a. Aspetti della sintassi della periferia sinistra del cosentino. In *Studi sui dialetti della Calabria*. Edited by Diego Pescarini. Padua: Unipress, pp. 3–24.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2009b. *Grammatica Diacronica del Napoletano* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie Band 350). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2013. Contatto e mutamento: Complementazione e complementatori nei dialetti del Salento. In *Lingue e Grammatiche. Contatti, Divergenze, Confronti*. Edited by Marina Benedetti. Special issue of *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata*. Oxford: Oxford Academic, vol. 41, pp. 459–80.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2015. Reconstructing complementiser-drop in the dialects of the Salento: A syntactic or phonological phenomenon? In *Syntax Over Time: Lexical, Morphological, and Information-structural Interactions*. Edited by Theresa Biberauer and George Walkden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 146–62.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2020. The north-south divide: Parameters of variation in the clausal domain. *L'Italia Dialettale* 81: 29–77.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2022a. Disentangling parameters: Romance differential object marking and the distribution of head and edge features. In *A Life in Linguistics. A Festschrift for Alexandra Cornilescu on her 75th Birthday*. Edited by Gabriela Alboiu, Daniela Isac, Alexandru Nicolae, Mihaela Tănase-Dogaru and Alina Tigău. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București, pp. 439–58.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2022b. Residues and extensions of perfective auxiliary BE: Modal conditioning. *Languages* 7: 160. [CrossRef]

Ledgeway, Adam. 2023a. Differential object marking in the dialects of southern Italy. *Caplletra: Revista Internacional de Filologia* 74: 1–36.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2023b. La distribuzione dell'accusativo preposizionale nei dialetti d'Italia. In *Atti del VI Convegno internazionale di dialettologia—Progetto A.L.Ba*. Edited by Patrizia Del Puente and Teresa Carbutti. Lagonegro: Zaccara Editore, pp. 81–130.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2023c. Parametric variation in differential object marking in the dialects of Italy. In *Differential Object Marking in Romance. Towards Microvariation*. Edited by Monica Irimia and Alexandru Mardale. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 267–314.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2023d. The Romance personal infinitive revisited: Verb movement and subject positions. In *From Formal Linguistic Theory to the Art of Historical Editions: The Multifaceted Dimensions of Romance Linguistics*. Edited by Natascha Pomino, Eva-Maria Remberger and Julia Zwink. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, pp. 35–48.

Ledgeway, Adam, and Alessandra Lombardi. 2005. Verb movement, adverbs and clitic positions in Romance. *Probus* 17: 79–113. [CrossRef]

Ledgeway, Adam, and Alessandra Lombardi. 2014. The development of the southern subjunctive: Morphological loss and syntactic gain. In *Diachrony and Dialects. Grammatical Change in the Dialects of Italy*. Edited by Paola Benincà, Adam Ledgeway and Nigel Vincent. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 25–47.

Ledgeway, Adam, and Norma Schifano. 2022. Parametric variation. In *The Cambridge Handbook of Romance Linguistics*. Edited by Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 637–70.

Ledgeway, Adam, and Norma Schifano. 2023. Negation and verb-movement in Romance: New perspectives on Jespersen's Cycle. *Probus* 35: 151–211. [CrossRef]

Lindstedt, Jouko. 1994. On the development of the south Slavonic perfect. In *Three Papers on the Perfect*. EUROTYP Working Papers, Series VI; Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, vol. 5, pp. 32–53.

Lois, Ximena. 1989. Aspects de la Syntaxe de L'espagnol et Théorie de la Grammaire. Doctoral thesis, Université de Paris VIII, Saint-Denis, France.

López, Luís. 2012. *Indefinite Objects: Scrambling, Choice Functions and Differential Marking*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Makarova, Anastasia, and Olivier Winistörfer. 2020. DOM in the Making: The Emergence of Differential Object Marking in Aromanian Varieties. Paper presented at the Workshop Contact and the Architecture of Language Faculty, Societas Linguistica Europaea, Bucharest, Romania, August 26–September 1.

Manzini, Maria Rita, and Leonardo Savoia. 2005. *I Dialetti Italiani e Romanci. Morfosintassi generativa*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 3 vols.

Manzini, Rita Maria, and Leonardo Savoia. 2018. *The Morphosyntax of Albanian and Aromanian Varieties*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mardale, Alexandru. 2015. Differential object marking in the first original Romanian texts. In *Formal Approaches to Old Romanian DP*. Edited by Virginia Hill. Leiden: Brill, pp. 200–45.

Mărgărit, Iulia. 2009. Elemente de interferențe slavo-romanice la nivelul limbii române. *Folia Linguistics Bucarestiensia* 4: 186–96.

Marin, Maria. 1985. Formes verbales périphrastiques de l'indicatif dans les parlers dacoroumains. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 30: 459–67.

Marin, Maria, ed. 2023. *Graiuri românești din Banatul Sârbesc*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Marin, Maria, Iulia Mărgărit, and Victorela Neagoe. 2000. Graiuri românești din Ucraina și Republica Moldova. In *Cercetări asupra graiurilor românești de peste hotare*. Edited by Maria Marin, Iulia Mărgărit, Victorela Neagoe and Vasile Pavel. Bucharest: Biblioteca digitală, pp. 42–119. First published 1998.

Matras, Yaron, and Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31: 829–65. [CrossRef]

Mavrogiorgos, Marios. 2010. *Clitics in Greek. A MinimalistAaccount of Proclisis and Enclisis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2006. *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*. Utrecht: LOT.

Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2016. *Second Position Effects in the Syntax of Germanic and Slavic Languages*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Mîrzea Vasile, Carmen. 2015. The position of the light adverbials *si*, *cam*, *mai*, *prea*, and *tot* in the verbal cluster: Synchronic variation and diachronic observations. In *Diachronic Variation in Romanian*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Rodica Zafiu, Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula, Alexandru Nicolae and Louise Esher. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 385–416.

Mîrzea Vasile, Carmen, and Andreea Dinică. 2013. Adverbs and adverbial phrases. In *The Grammar of Romanian*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 432–39.

Moise, Ion. 1977. Aria de răspândire a perfectului simplu în Oltenia și Muntenia. *Limba Română* 26: 91–93.

Morariu, Leca. 1928. *Lu Frați Noștri. Libru lu Rumeri din Istrie*. Suceava: Editura Revistei Făt-Frumos.

Neagoe, Victorela. 1985. În legătură cu unele forme arhaice de perfect simplu și de mai mult ca perfect și cu unele valori ale perfectului în graiurile populare actuale. *Anuar de Lingvistică și Istorie Literară* 30: 171–77.

Neiescu, Petru. 2011. *Dicționarul Dialectului Istroromân. Volumul I (A–C)*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Neiescu, Petru. 2016. *Dicționarul Dialectului Istroromân. Volumul III (L-Pința)*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Nichev, Aleksandr. 1997. *Daniel's Lexicon Tetraglosson*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na blgarskaja akademjia naukite.

Nicolae, Alexandru. 2015. *Ordinea constituenților în limba română: O perspectivă diacronică. Structura propoziției și deplasarea verbului*. Bucharest: Editura Univerisității din București.

Nicolae, Alexandru. 2019. *Word Order and Parameter Change in Romanian. A Comparative Romance Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Niculescu, Alexandru. 1959. Sur l'objet direct prépositionnel dans les langues romanes. In *Recueil d'études romanes publiées à l'occasion du IXème Congrès International de linguistique romane à Lisbonne*. Edited by Ion Coteanu, Iorgu Iordan and Alexandru Rosetti. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, pp. 167–85.

Niculescu, Alexandru. 1965. *Obiectul direct prepozițional în limbile romanice. Individualitatea limbii române între limbile romanice*. Bucharest: Editura Științifică.

Onu, Liviu. 1959. L'origine de l'accusatif roumain avec p(r)e. In *Recueil d'études romanes*. Edited by Ion Coteanu, Iorgu Iordan and Alexandru Rosetti. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române, pp. 187–209.

Pană-Boroianu, Ruxandra. 1982. Remarques sur l'emploi du passé simple dans les texts non-litteraires d'Oltenie. *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique* 5: 423–45.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 1976. *Sintaxa transformaţională a grupului verbal în limba română*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 1997. Din nou despre statutul prepoziţiei. Cu referire specială la prepoziţia PE. *Limba Română* 1–3: 165–74.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 1999. *Sintaxă şi semantică. Clase de cuvinte şi forme gramaticale cu dublă natură*. Bucharest: Tipografia Universităţii.

Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. 2013. The direct object. In *The Grammar of Romanian*. Edited by Gabriela Pană Dindelegan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 125–44.

Papahagi, Pericle. 1905. *Basme aromâne și glosar*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Parry, Mair. 1997. Negation. In *The Dialects of Italy*. Edited by Martin Maiden and Mair Parry. London: Routledge, pp. 179–85.

Perlmutter, David. 1978. Impersonal passives and the unaccusative hypothesis. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4: 157–89. [CrossRef]

Peverini-Benson, Claudia. 2004. The Prepositional Accusative in Marchigiano. Master's thesis, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.

Philippide, Alexandru. 1929. *Originea românilor II. Ce spun limbile română și albaneză*. Iași: Tipografia Viața Românească.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2008. On negative doubling. In *La Negazione: Variazione Dialettale ed Evoluzione Diacronica* (Quaderni di lavoro dell'ASIt n.8). Edited by Federica Cognola and Diego Pescarini. Padua: Unipress, pp. 57–84.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2016a. Negation. In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*. Edited by Adam Ledgeway and Martin Maiden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 833–46.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2016b. Negative doubling: In favor of a 'Big NegP' analysis. In *Studies on Negation*. Edited by Silvio Cruschina, Katharina Hartmann and Eva-Maria Remberger. Vienna: V&R Unipress, pp. 81–104.

Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar, and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 365–424.

Progovac, Ljiljana. 1996. Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. In *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*. Edited by Aaron Halpern and Arnold Zwicky. Stanford: CSLI Publications, pp. 411–28.

Pușcariu, Sextil. 1922. Despre p(r)e la acuzativ. *Dacoromania* 2: 565–81.

Racoviță, Constantin. 1940. Sur le genre personnel en roumain. *Bulletin Linguistique* 9: 154–58.

Radanović-Kocić, Vesna. 1988. The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics: A Synchronic and Diachronic Perspective. Doctoral thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL, USA.

Reinheimer Rîpeanu, Sanda. 2004. Intensification et atténuation en roumain: Les adverbs *cam*, *mai*, *prea*, *și*, *tot*'. *Travaux et Documents* 24: 225–46.

Rivero, María-Luisa. 1992. Patterns of V0-raising in long head movement and negation: Serbo-Croatian vs. Slovak. In *Syntactic Theory and Basque Syntax*. Edited by Joseba A. Lakarra and Jon Ortiz de Urbina. Donostia: Gipuzkoako Foru Aldundia, pp. 365–86.

Rivero, María-Luisa. 1994. Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12: 63–120.

Rivero, María-Luisa. 1997. On two locations for complement clitic pronouns: Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian, and Old Spanish. In *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*. Edited by Nigel Vincent and Ans Van Kemenade. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 170–206.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *The New Comparative Syntax*. Edited by Liliane Haegeman. London: Longman, pp. 281–337.

Roberts, Ian. 2010. *Agreement and Head Movement: Clitics, Incorporation, and Defective Goals (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 59)*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rosetti, Alexandru. 1955. Despre valoarea perfectului simplu. *Limba Română* 4: 69–73.

Rosetti, Alexandru. 1968. *Istoria limbii române*. Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Sala, Marius. 1999. *Du Latin au Roumain*. Paris: L'Harmattan. Bucharest: Univers Enciclopedic.

Sârbu, Richard, and Vasile Frățilă. 1998. *Dialectul istroromân. Texte și glosar*. Timișoara: Amarcord.

Schifano, Norma. 2015. Il posizionamento del verbo nei dialetti romanzi d'Italia. *The Italianist* 35: 121–38. [CrossRef]

Schifano, Norma. 2018. *Verb Placement in Romance: A Comparative Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schütze, Carson. 1994. Serbo-Croatian second position clitic placement and the phonology-syntax interface. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21: 373–473.

Seche, Luiza. 1963. Despre etimologia adverbului *neam*. *Limba Română* 12: 147–50.

Șiadbei, Gheorghe. 1930. Le sort du preterit roumain. *Romania* 61: 331–60. [CrossRef]

Sobolev, Andrej. 2008. On some Aromanian grammatical patterns in the Balkan Slavonic dialects. In *The Romance Balkans*. Edited by Biljana Sikimić and Tijana Ašić. Belgrade: Balkanološki institut SANU, pp. 113–21.

Squartini, Mario, and Pier Marco Bertinetto. 2000. The simple and compound past in Romance languages. In *Empirical Approaches to Language Typology: Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Edited by Östen Dahl. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 403–39.

Sussex, Roland, and Paul Cubberley. 2006. *The Slavic Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tescari Neto, Aquiles. 2013. On Verb Movement in Brazilian Portuguese: A Cartographic Study. Doctoral thesis, University Ca' Foscari Venice, Venice, Italy.

Tescari Neto, Aquiles. 2019. Da posição do verbo temático em cinco variedades ibéricas. *Revista de Estudos da Linguagem* 27: 737–70. [CrossRef]

Tescari Neto, Aquiles. 2020a. Diagnosing verb raising. In *Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today*. Edited by Roberta Pires de Oliveira, Ina Emmel and Sandra Quarezemin. Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 168–90.

Tescari Neto, Aquiles. 2020b. Movimento do verbo finito e advérbios (bem) baixos em português brasileiro. Uma aproximação à ordem 'ideal' de línguas de núcleo inicial? *SAIL* 16: 29–52.

Tescari Neto, Aquiles. 2022a. Adverbs and functional heads- twenty years later: Cartographic methodology, verb raising and macro/micro-variation. *Linguistic Review* 39: 1–39. [CrossRef]

Tescari Neto, Aquiles. 2022b. On the raising of the finite main verb in Angolan Portuguese and in Mozambican Portuguese: Cartographic hierarchies, microvariation and the use of adverbs as diagnostics for movement. *Probus* 34: 171–234. [CrossRef]

Tescari Neto, Aquiles, and Francisco Pataquiva. 2020. Do movimento do verbo finito e infinitivo em português brasileiro e espanhol colombiano: Microvariação e cartografias. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 12: 491–511.

Tigău, Alina-Mihaela. 2010. Towards an account of DOM in Romanian. *Bucharest Working Papers in Linguistics* 12: 137–58.

Tigău, Alina-Mihaela. 2011. *Syntax and Semantics of the Direct Object in Romance and Germanic Languages*. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Tigău, Alina-Mihaela. 2021. Differential object marking in Romanian and Spanish. A contrastive analysis between differentially marked and unmarked direct objects. In *Differential Object Marking in Romance. The Third Wave*. Edited by Johannes Kabatek, Philipp Obrist and Albert Wall. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 173–212.

Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 1996. The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 14: 811–72.

Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-Syntactic Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Torrego, Esther. 1998. *The Dependencies of Objects*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Tortora, Christina. 2002. Romance enclisis, prepositions, and aspect. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 20: 725–58.

Tortora, Christina. 2010. Domains of clitic placement in finite and non-finite clauses: Evidence from a Piedmontese dialect. In *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*. Edited by Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway and Ian Roberts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 135–49.

Tortora, Christina. 2015. *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanarese*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Tošev, Krum. 1970. Some innovations in the urban speech of Struga. *Contributions* 1: 105–13.

Velnić, Marta. 2015. On good thieves and old friends: An analysis of Croatian adjectival forms. *Norvegian Journal of Slavic Studies* 18: 18–54. [CrossRef]

Wartburg, Walther von. 1950. *Die Ausgliederung der Romanischen Sprachräume*. Bern: Francke.

Wilder, Chris, and Damir Ćavar. 1994. 'Long head movement? Verb movement and cliticization in Croatian. *Lingua* 93: 1–58. [CrossRef]

Willis, David, Chris Lucas, and Anne Breitbarth, eds. 2013. *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean. Volume 1: Case Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Witzlack-Makaraevich, Alena, and Ilja Seržant. 2018. Differential argument marking: Patterns of variation. In *The Diachronic Typology of Differential Argument Marking*. Edited by Alean Witzlack-Makaraevich and Ilja Seržant. Berlin: Language Science Press, pp. 1–39.

Zagona, Karen. 2002. *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zamboni, Alberto. 1998. Dal latino tardo al romanzo arcaico: Aspetti diacronico-tipologici della flessione nominale. In *Sintassi Storica. Atti del XXX Congresso Internazionale della Società di Linguistica Italiana*. Edited by Paolo Ramat and Elisa Roma. Rome: Bulzoni, pp. 127–46.

Zamboni, Alberto. 2000. *Alle origini dell'italiano. Dinamiche e tipologie della transizione dal latino*. Rome: Carocci.

Zanuttini, Raffaella. 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.