1. Introduction.*

A line of research that has received a strong impulse from recent empirical work is the so-called ‘cartographic program’, which aims at reconstructing a map of functional projections in the structure of the clause. In the framework of this project, a highly articulated functional structure has been drawn so far, where specialised positions appear to have the same respective order across languages. Three areas have been identified: a higher CP area, which functionally connects the sentence with the syntactic and pragmatic context; an intermediate area IP, where Tense, Aspect, Modality and Voice are encoded; a lower VP area, where the semantic characteristics of the lexical verb define an event by marking the relevant positions of its functional structure, thus legitimising the insertion of arguments and participants.

Some of the results of this research can be found in Cinque (2002), Rizzi (2004), Belletti (forthcoming).

* This essay corresponds in its essentials to a lecture given at the GURT 2004, Georgetown; a slightly reduced version is going to appear in the Proceedings. Various parts of this work have been presented and discussed in class lectures and seminars at the University of Padua (2001-2, 2004), the Sodalizio Glottologico Milanese, University of Milan (2001), the Department of Linguistics, University of Konstanz (2002), the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (2004); some aspects have been the subject of talks presented at the meeting “Italiano. Strana lingua” (Sappada, July 2002) and the “IV Incontro di Dialettologia” (University of Bristol, September 2002). Thanks to those audiences for stimulating questions and observations, and to Guglielmo Cinque, Nicola Munaro, Hans Obenauer and Cecilia Poletto, who provided relevant comments on earlier versions of this paper.
Even if this is not explicitly discussed here, I assume that sentence structure is universal, fully available in all languages and present in its entirety in all type of sentences.¹

In this paper I present some descriptive generalisations based on medieval Romance concerning the left periphery, as a contribution to the outline first proposed by Rizzi (1997). I will try to show that from these varieties we can gather a more precise picture of the functional structure and get further evidence in favour of the proposals I made in Benincà (2001).

The general assumptions and the procedure adopted are inspired by Cinque’s (1996, 1999) extensive investigation on IP functional structure: no variation is assumed to be allowed by Universal Grammar in the number and type of functional projections and their relative order in natural languages; to determine the hypothetical hierarchy is a matter of empiric investigation, based on observed order restrictions between the occupants of the functional projections (heads and/or specifiers).

I will use data of medieval Romance varieties, including medieval dialects of Italy, going from the 12th to the early 14th C. Some of the

---

¹ This position can be integrated in the Minimalist program as outlined in Cinque (1999, 6.3; 2002a): the full structure is itself part of the numeration; an element is merged (or ‘base generated’) via feature checking; empty functional heads receive a ‘default’ interpretation (see Cinque, 1999, 6.1). Cinque (2003) discusses thoroughly the idea that the order of functional projections cannot be accounted for in terms of logical order of their semantic scope, even if in some particular cases (for example, the order Tense-Aspect) this could seem to be the case; the order of functional projections is a construct of the computational system, as is the choice of particular modalities and functions among all those that could be linguistically encoded in the system.
phenomena are well known by Romance philologists, some are even part of the knowledge of 19th C Romanists; syntactic theory gives us a way to see in all of them some new and interesting regularities, which confirm or further precise the conclusions reached so far on CP structure.

I will argue that the whole of medieval Romance languages share important features of sentence structure and properties of the lexical constituents and functional elements, so that they can be considered a set of variants of an abstract ‘Medieval Romance’; on the basis of these common characteristics, we can at least try to exploit what is clear and evident in one variety in order to enlighten what is more obscure or elusive in another. The paper has the following structure:

I first briefly sum up the general frame sketched in Rizzi’s (1997) work on the left periphery (CP fine structure) together with the specifications that have been suggested in Benincà (2001) and further developed in Benincà & Poletto (2002), mainly on the basis of modern Italian and Italian dialects.

In sect. 3 I present the main properties of medieval Romance languages, which induce us to consider them for some respects an homogeneous area, a set of dialects sharing syntactic features relevant for our topic2. I will also point out in some details the peculiar

---

2 It is not possible to include Rumanian in the set of languages considered, because in its first written texts, which are of the 16th C, there is no trace of the phenomena that characterise old Romance; presumably it was in any case too late, as all other Romance languages at that time had already proceeded in their evolution and undergone a change in this part of the grammar. It is interesting to underline, in relation to this, that this set of languages shows an impressive synchrony in the
characteristics that distinguish sub-areas of this linguistic family: these differences have to be carefully considered in order to correctly interpret the data and use them for our purposes.

In sect. 4 I discuss in more detail the phenomena that are relevant for the hypothesis and try to show how they can be described adopting the theory of an articulated series of specialised functional projections, thus confirming the structure proposed in Benincà (2001). The centre of the analysis will be the position of complement clitics in main clauses; with regard to that, a set of generalisations can be stated that are valid for all medieval Romance in a very precise way if we make reference not to surface positions or roughly to a CP/IP distinction but to specific functional positions in an articulated CP structure: enclisis and proclisis are sensitive to verb movement and the content of CP: when the verb moves to C, we have enclisis if and only if the Focus field is empty.

Finally, in sect. 5 I point out what these phenomena can further indicate with respect to the processes we assume to happen in CP, giving rise to the data we have been observing.

It is important to preliminarily underscore that I use the labels Topic and Focus to refer to syntactic objects, putting aside their precise pragmatic values. It appears that the relation between syntactic

evolutionary pace in this part of syntax, the only partial exceptions being some Rhaeto-Romance Dialects, which are still V2, and European Portuguese (with Galician and dialects), which preserve, simplified, till today the general pattern of the relation between the syntax of clitics and V2 (see a synthetic outline in Benincà 1993; more details and theoretical proposals in Costa 2000, in particular the articles by Barbosa, Duarte & Matos, Raposo).
constructions of the left periphery and their pragmatic interpretation is not obvious. Unfortunately, these constructions have inherited labels that seem to refer to pragmatics more than to syntax, and misleadingly suggest an overlapping of these two levels. I take here the position of using these labels only as indices of syntactic positions, whose pragmatic and semantic interpretation is in certain respects language specific (or depends on other language specific characteristics). The data provided are meant just to illustrate the phenomena, being positive evidence insufficient to prove a generalisation, and being impossible to get grammaticality judgements on dead languages. The generalisations are then necessarily tentative; nevertheless, I will assume that what has not yet been found is ungrammatical: if one doesn’t try and bet, one will never know. If we accept the challenge and try to falsify it, we get in any case more accurate observations and descriptions, and even if the conjecture ends up by being falsified, we will have increased, in some respect, our knowledge of how languages work.

2. The fine structure of CP: evidence from Modern Italian.
Rizzi (1997) proposes a first articulation of CP as shown in (1):

(1) \[\text{ForceP } \text{[TopP* [FocP [TopP* [FinP]]]]}\]

In the leftmost projection the Force of the sentence is encoded; as Rizzi suggests, it 'looks outside', connecting the sentence with the
context or marking it with respect to the 'clausal type'. The rightmost projection looks inside, towards the content of the IP (the choice of the complementiser, for example, has to do with the modality and tense in IP, a sort of agreement between C° and I°, as it has been traditionally seen).

TopP in Rizzi's system can appear in two different positions and in both cases is recursive (it can contain many arguments, without ordering restrictions).

In Benincà (2001) I have argued that Topics can only be inserted to the left of FocP. Furthermore, the area of topics is articulated in two distinct fields, with distinct syntactic properties; I call the higher field for merged topics FrameP. The structure can be synthesised as follows:

(2)  \[\text{ForceP} \ [\text{FrameP} \ [\text{TopP} \ [\text{FocP} \ [\text{FinP}]]]]\]

The recursivity of Top in Benincà & Poletto (2002) has also been reconsidered, developing the idea that these projections locate in fact ‘Fields’, sets of projections sharing specific semantic and syntactic characteristics; data are there provided suggesting that in the Topic Field different kinds of Topics can appear in specific and strictly ordered functional projections, as is the case for different kinds of

---

3 The theory concerning the location of ‘clause typing’ has been recently developed by Munaro, Obenauer, Poletto, Pollock, Portner, Zanuttini, in various papers on Romance languages and dialects, showing that ‘clausal typing’ markers seem to appear in different positions in the CP system, not just in the leftmost Field. It could be the case that the explicit markers are secondary offsprings of an abstract primary marking, located in ForceP. More work is needed to further explore this topic.
Foci in the Focus Field.\textsuperscript{4}

To reach a clear characterisation of these projections on the basis of semantics and pragmatics is a difficult task, as the same traditional labels are ambiguous and judgments are elusive and slippery (not only when we deal with languages without any native speaker to consult). I will then put aside any attempt to characterise the positions in semantic or pragmatic terms and instead try to localise them on the basis of their syntactic properties.

Even phonology is not crucial in determining the nature of preposed constituents through stress or intonation. Dealing with languages only accessible through written records it is obviously impossible to get evidence of this kind; even in spoken languages an intonational pitch is not a necessary nor a sufficient feature to determine, for example, if an element is in the Focus field or not.

Looking for purely syntactic evidence to identify projections and Fields, we can start from considering a \textit{wh} element (or a contrastive Focus) as a Focus \textit{par excellence}, a typical occupant of the Focus Field, and take Italian Hanging Topic and Clitic Left Dislocation (LD) as typical Topics, in the Frame Field and in the Top Field respectively. Extending the properties of these prototypical elements, I propose that the Focus Field hosts elements that are moved with operator-like properties; Topics of various kinds are, on the contrary, base generated\textsuperscript{5} and hosted in Fields all located above the Focus Field.

\textsuperscript{4} See Benincà (2001), and below, § 2.1.1 and fn. 9.

\textsuperscript{5} I am radicalising here the difference between all kinds of Topics on the one hand, and Focus on the other, in terms of base generation for the former vs. movement for
These properties are connected with different surface phenomena, which can be exploited in order to reconstruct the hierarchy of functional projections.\(^6\)

An argument in CP is in a Spec of a functional projection strictly of the X-bar form (one head one Spec); a head in the Romance CP can be occupied either by a complementiser or by the verb (depending, first of all, on the nature of the sentence, as a main or a dependent clause). More than one Focus and more than one Topic can appear, in their respective Fields, even if the possibility for them to co-occur is subject to language specific restrictions, which in some languages can be very strong. The functional projections are strictly ordered, and this is part of the latter. Cinque (1990) has proposed an analysis of LD in terms of base generation; the problem remains as to how to account, even in descriptive terms, for the syntactic differences between the two classes of Topics, namely HT and LD (which will be discussed in section 2.1 below). HT appears to be base generated in a more obvious way, as the sentence to which it belongs is always a ‘closed sentence’, while LD is connected to a sentence that in precise cases can be an ‘open sentence’, with gaps corresponding to, for ex., LD PPs. Even if we were to adopt a movement analysis for LD (as proposed by Cecchetto 1999), we would have to hypothesise a type of movement different from Focus/WH-movement, in order to account for these specific properties that distinguish it from HT. It could be the case, for example, that LD involves a kind of movement that leaves behind functional material, which is either realised as a clitic or remains silent, depending on the grammatical relation the element entertains with the sentence (see also, for similar aspects resumptive clitics in Celtic relative clauses, the solution proposed by Rouveret 2002).

This problem is in fact not directly relevant to the subject of this paper. I maintain that different kinds of elements occupy specific fields within CP, and only those elements that are legitimately moved leaving a trace occupy the lower field. The others, which for the sake of simplicity are all claimed to be base generated, occupy higher fields.

\(^6\) Rizzi (2002) has approached some restrictions on sequences of arguments in CP as consequences of Relativised Minimality, blocking movements of operators in particular cases. It would be very interesting to compare in detail this theory in
of Universal Grammar.

As we shall see, the hypothesis that the Focus Field can host various kinds of Foci is relevant in particular for medieval Romance languages. This area appears to be more easily activated in those languages than in modern Italian, so that we find there not only contrastive Focus or wh elements, but also less ‘marked’ elements (an identificational, informational or ‘unmarked’ focus, an anaphoric operator, or even elements with the pragmatic characteristics of a topic ‘put into relief’). At the moment we have very limited possibilities to order the possible occupiers of Focus, as there are strong restrictions on the possibility for them to occur together; nevertheless, we are able to localise them in this field, using various types of evidence. A firm conclusion, though, is that the wh projection is below all other projections in the Focus Field (see 2.2 and 5.1).

Some elements specified as occupants of precise positions in the Fields hosting Topics have been identified in modern Italian: they are circumstantial adverbs and Hanging Topics in the Frame Field, and Listed topics and Left Dislocated topics in the Top Field. As they can more freely co-occur in Italian than in other Romance languages, we are able to provide an order of these functional projections (the order in which I have listed them, going from left to right). In the next paragraphs, the distinctive features are presented which permit us to identify, in the appropriate cases, the various kinds of topics in modern Italian, and to localise them in CP with respect to other head
and specifier elements. We will then explore Medieval Romance using—where possible—the same features to distinguish constructions and localise positions.

2.1 A typology of Italian Topics
There are in Italian two different types of thematised arguments: Hanging Topics and Left Dislocated ones. In what follows I will indicate how and when we can distinguish them.

a) in the case of LD an entire argument appears on the left (as in (3a)), HT can only be a DP (as in (3b)); the two constructions are distinguishable in this respect only when a prepositional phrase is involved, as in the following cases:

(3) a Di Mario/di questo libro, non (ne) parla più nessuno   LD
    Of Mario, not of.him-talks any more nobody

   b Mario/questo libro, non ne parla più nessuno   HT
    Mario, not of.him-talks any more nobody
    “Nobody talks about M. /this book any more

b) LD requires a resumptive pronoun only with direct and partitive objects, the clitic is optional in the other cases (obviously impossible if that type of argument has no appropriate clitic). If present, the clitic agrees with the Topic in gender, number and case (see 4a); HT

7 Another interesting aspect of Romance comparative syntax is that, in using the distinctive characteristics established on the basis of modern Italian, we obtain consistent results when transferring them to interpret Old Romance.
necessarily requires a resumptive pronoun, expressing the syntactic relation of the preposed argument with the sentence; the case is only expressed by the pronoun, which is not necessarily a clitic (see 4b, c):

(4) a Mario, *(lo) vedo domani
   Mario, I see (him) tomorrow
b MARIO, (*lo) vedo domani
   MARIO, I see (him/it) tomorrow
c Mario, nessuno parla più di lui/ne parla più
   Mario, nobody talks anymore of him/of him.talks

c) There can only be one HT, while there can be more than one LD element:

(5) a *Mario, questo libro, non ne hanno parlato a lui
   M., this book, they of.it haven’t talked to.him
b A Gianni, di questo libro, non gliene hanno mai parlato
   To M., of this book, they to.him-of.it haven’t talked

d) HT can co-occur with LD: the order is HT-LD:

(6) a Giorgio, ai nostri amici, non parlo mai di lui
   ‘G., to our friends, I never talk of him’
b *Ai nostri amici, Giorgio, non parlo mai di lui
   *To our friends, G., I never talk of him’

2.1.1 Topics cannot be inserted below FocusP

In Benincà (2001) I concluded that a syntactic Topic cannot appear
below Focus\(^8\); the following examples show that the order LD-Focus is grammatical, and the opposite order is ungrammatical; for some reasons still unclear, the contrast is stronger if the sequence is tested in the left periphery of a dependent clause:

(7) a Il tuo amico, a MARIA, lo presenterò!   \(\text{LD-Foc}\)
Your friend, to M., I will introduce him!

b *? A MARIA, il tuo amico, lo presenterò!   *? \(\text{Foc-LD}\)
TO M., your friend, I will introduce him!

c *IL TUO AMICO, a Mario, gli presenterò!   *\(\text{Foc-LD}\)
YOUR FRIEND, to M., I will introduce to him!

d *Ho deciso che A MARIA, il tuo amico, lo presenterò *\(\text{Foc-LD}\)
I have decided that TO M. your friend I will introduce him

What is more important, if the resumptive clitic is missing, (7a) becomes ungrammatical (as in (8a)), as expected, because a clitic is obligatory if the LD element is a direct object; if we change the order of Topic and Focus, the omission of the clitic corresponding to the hypothetical topic renders (7b,c) grammatical (as in (8b,c); there is no difference in this case between main and dependent clauses):

(8)  a *Il tuo amico, a MARIA, presenterò!

b A MARIA, il tuo amico, presenterò!

c Ho deciso che A MARIA il tuo amico presenterò

---

\(^8\) In Benincà (2001) evidence is given to identify a position in IP for some kinds of – apparently topicalised – adverbs, as in the following example:

(i) a [\(\text{CP}\) La casa [\(\text{IP}\) Gianni domani la compra]

The house G. tomorrow will buy it

A consequence is that subject appearing on the left of adverbs of this kind is not necessarily in CP (TopP or FocP) but can be in subject position in IP.
A possible conclusion is that the sequence of elements in CP appearing in (8b, c) is not [Focus LD], as the pragmatic interpretation would suggest, but \{Focus Focus\}, as indicated by their syntactic behaviour. This conclusion is a natural one if Focus is not a single projection, but a Field, in which more than one element can be moved, binding a variable; inside the Field, the elements appear to be ordered, since only one can be intonationally focalised, namely the leftmost one: this instantiates the ‘emphatic focus position’ (I Focus).\(^9\)

The hypothesis is, then, that we are locating fields containing more projections, ordered in relation to their semantic interpretation: the following scheme shows the fields in braces and projections in square

\(^9\) More evidence comes from cases in which weak crossover effects can be observed, showing that the supposed Topic appearing on the right of Focus has the properties of a moved element, not of a base generated topic. See Benincà 2001, sect. 1.2.1.2, Benincà & Poletto 2002, sect. 2. Recent works present interesting results which are consistent with ours. Krapova (2002) analyses phenomena of Bulgarian providing very clear evidence against the idea that proper Topics (base generated themes) can also appear below Focus. Interesting data from Russian (Jacopo Garzonio, p.c.) show that elements that cannot be topics but only focus in CP (indefinite operators such as ‘some (kind of)’) can appear on the right of a contrastive Focus (cf. (ia-c)); the same can be observed with respect to Italian *nessuno* ‘nobody’ cf. (iia-c):

(i)  
| a | *kakujuto knigu IVAN kupil | “some book IVAN bought” |
| b | KAKUJUTO KNIGU IVAN kupil | “SOME BOOK IVAN bought” |
| c | IVAN kakujuto knigu kupil | “IVAN some book bought” |

(ii)  
| a | *A nessuno Mario parlava | “To nobody Mario spoke” |
| b | A NESSUNO parlava | TO NOBODY he-spoke |
| c | MARIO a nessuno parlava | MARIO to nobody spoke |

On the other hand, in a different framework, Dryer 2003 argues for the existence of double Focus preposing in English, which is consistent with the proposal that some apparent cases of Focus followed by a Topic pointed out by Rizzi are double Focus cases, individuating a Focus field where moved elements appear. Some of the examples of Dryer (2003) are in fact to be interpreted as contrastive Topics in the light of Italian (our List interpretation); in Italian, the distinctive feature of this construction is the obligatoriness of the clitic, a piece of evidence not available in
brackets:

(9){Frame[HT]..} {Topic-[LD]..} {Focus-[ContrastFocus]..[UnmFocus]..}

2.2. Interrogatives, relatives and Complementisers

Further evidence in favour of the ordering of the elements appearing in the left periphery comes from the observation of the relative order of the same elements in relation to interrogative and relative \textit{wh}- and with respect to heads located in CP, such as complementisers and verbs.

In a main question, a lexicalised \textit{wh}- cannot be separated from the verb; a HT or a LD must precede the sequence \textit{wh}- verb:

(10) a  Questo libro, a chi l'hai dato?   LD \textit{wh} - \textit{V}  
   This book, to whom have you given it?  
   b  *A chi questo libro, l'hai dato?   * \textit{wh} – LD \textit{V}  
   To whom, this book have you given it?

(11) a  Mario, quando gli hai parlato?   HT – \textit{wh} – \textit{V}  
   M., when to-him have-you spoken?  
   b  Questo libro, a Mario, quando gliene hai parlato? HT – LD – \textit{wh} - \textit{V}  
   This book, to M., when to-him of-it have you spoken?

(12) *Quando questo libro, ne hai parlato?   *\textit{wh}- HT  
   When this book of it have you spoken?

The resulting sequence is then (13)

English. Even subtracting these cases, the evidence provided by Dryer remains
As shown by Rizzi (1997), the relative \textit{wh}- occupies a section of the functional field which is higher than that of the interrogative \textit{wh}; in the same area we also find the relative complementiser \textit{che}:

\begin{enumerate}[(a)]
\item The boy to whom the book I will bring it tomorrow
\item The boy the book to whom I will bring it tomorrow
\item The book that to Mario I will never give...
\item The book to Mario that I will never give...
\end{enumerate}

It is interesting to compare indefinite relative clauses with the (restrictive and appositive) normal relative clauses, on the one hand, and interrogative sentences, on the other: indefinite relatives, in Italian as in many other languages, use \textit{wh}- elements of the interrogative paradigm as relative pronouns; nevertheless, the position of the \textit{wh} in indefinite relatives is in the Spec of the projection in which the relative complementiser appears when present (a quite high position; it precedes LD) and not that of the interrogative \textit{wh}--:

\begin{enumerate}[(15)]
\item I will ask it to whom these things knows well
\item *I will ask these things to whom knows well
\end{enumerate}

sufficient and convincing.
I will ask it these things to whom knows them well

I wonder to whom these things you have said

I wonder these things to whom you have said

This observation will help us to understand the behaviour of a particular class of interrogatives in medieval Romance (see below, 5.1.1).

The complementiser introducing a subordinate clause also occupies a head in the higher portion of CP: it precedes LD (see Rizzi 1997) and can be preceded by a HT

(16) a *Sono certa di questo libro che non (ne) ha mai parlato nessuno *LD-che
   I am certain, of this book, that nobody (of.it) has spoken

b Sono certa questo libro che non ne ha mai parlato nessuno  HT - che
   I am certain, this book, that nobody (of.it) has spoken

c Sono certa che di questo libro non ne ha mai parlato nessuno  che - LD
   I am certain that, of this book, nobody (of.it) has spoken

---

10 HT is not taken into account by Rizzi (1997; cf. also Rizzi 2001); the example of LD he uses with a direct object are ambiguous with HT; this probably explains - at an abstract level – apparent disagreement with his data, for example with respect to a sentence like the following, which is for me colloquial but grammatical:

(i) Maria dice il tuo libro che lo leggerà domani
   M. says your book she will read it tomorrow

The example is a case of HT and as such it does not falsify the generalisation that LD follows the sentential (and relative) complementiser, as can be immediately established using a PP preposing:

(ii) Maria crede, il tuo libro, che non ne parlerà nessuno
   Mary thinks, your book, that nobody will talk about it

(iii) *Maria crede, del tuo libro, che non ne parlerà nessuno
   Mary thinks about your book that nobody will talk about it
The co-occurrence of Interr-wh and Focus is highly restricted in Italian (as in many languages); I will not try to determine whether they share the same position or not, but it is possible to conclude that the wh-projection is the lowest one in CP. The evidence (which will be dealt with below) is the fact that in dependent interrogatives in all Romance languages, any access to the CP system is blocked. If we hypothesise that the wh head is the lowest one, its engagement in dependent interrogatives blocks all the upper projections. This engagement, moreover, appears overtly in those Romance dialects (Northern Italian in particular) that require a lexical complementiser to introduce dependent interrogatives (see Benincà and Poletto 2004).

2.3. The free order of arguments in TopP is possibly only apparent

The apparent recursivity of TopP* assumed by Rizzi (1997) has been scaled down above. There is a syntactic difference between HT and LD which allows us to isolate two distinct and ordered projections; HT is probably in a field (call it Frame) where Scene Setting Adverbs also find their location (ordered above HT (17a)). However, with respect to LD, recursion does not appear to be completely reduced. In Benincà & Poletto (2002), we have exploited some semantic-pragmatic differences among LD arguments that appear together, and have identified a particular Topic with List Interpretation (LI), showing that its position is below the ordinary LD (17b, c). The resumptive clitic has the same conditions with both kinds of Topics; they can thus be located in the same Topic Field.
The pragmatic differences between the various categories of Topics are in most cases irrelevant, but can become distinctive in particular contexts; so, the recursion could be reduced completely, going further into details with the observation and grammatical description.

On the basis of the arguments briefly outlined here, and discussed in more detail in Benincà (2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2002), we can sketch the following structure of the left periphery: braces include fields, square brackets include single projections; a slash separates arguments whose reciprocal order is unclear; with C° I indicate any head in the CP system:

(18) [Force C°[Relwh C°]/ {Frame [ScSett][HT] C°} {TOPIC [LD] [LI] C°}]
{Focus [I Focus][II Focus][Internal wh] C°}[Fin C°]


As has been shown by syntactic research on these languages, all the varieties of Romance languages in the Middle Ages (until the
beginning of the XIV century at least) present characteristics in their syntax that have been explained hypothesising that they share a V2 syntax, with V movement to some position of the left periphery in main clauses. As such, these languages have ‘subject-V inversion’ in main clauses when a constituent different from the subject appears in first position. Since all of them are pro-drop languages (some have an asymmetric pro-drop, licensed by V-movement: see 3.1.1), this surface evidence of V2 syntax is not always immediately visible.11

In what follows, some aspects of Romance V2 syntax are illustrated by examples from some medieval Romance languages.

3.1 V2 syntax: Subject-V inversion in main clauses

In a main clause, an object, an adverb, or a ‘filler’ in first position is immediately followed by the verb; in this context, the subject can be omitted (see below); otherwise, it appears immediately after the inflected verb12. We analyse this structure as resulting from movement of the Verb to a head in CP; while any constituent (including the subject) can appear in a Spec of CP. In the following examples, the

11 See Benincà 1983-84, Vanelli, Renzi & Benincà 1985, Adams 1987, Benincà 1989, Benincà 1995; the hypothesis has been developed and refined in works on single Romance languages (for example Vance 1989 on French, Salvi 1990 on Hiberian languages, Fontana 1993 on Spanish, Paul Hirschbühler in various papers on Old and Middle French).

12 I will not consider the cases of subjects (DP only) in final position, which have to be considered instances of lexical subjects linked to an expletive pro subject licensed by the V in C°: the argument is tangential to the present one. A sentence like (20a) is in fact ambiguous as for the position of the subject, while (20b, 21a,b), where the subject precedes the object, are more explicit. Sentences with tensed auxiliaries would be even more explicit in this respect, but given the tense system of these languages, we have a relative scarcity of composed tenses.
inflected V is in small capitals, the inverted subject is italicised (clitics and negation are not to be taken into account in this respect):

Old French (*La Mort Artu*)

(19)  

a Autre chose *NE POT li roi trouver* (p. 101)  
Other thing not could the king find

b Un pou après eure de prime fu Mador venuz a cort (p.103)  
Slightly after first hour was M. arrived at the court

Old Provençal

(20)  

a Mal cosselh *DONET Pilat* (*Venjansa*, 106)  
Bad advice gave3sg Pilatus

b Si SA1 eu la meillor razon (Gaucelm Faidit, p. 47)  
So know1sg I the best reason

Old Spanish (from Fontana 1993)

(21)  

a Este logar *MOSTRO dios a Abraam* (GE-I 62v)  
This place showed God to Abraam

b Vino y agua *DEVE el clerigo mezclar en el caliz* (Leyes 13v)  
Wine and water must the clerk mix in the chalice

Old Portuguese (*Diálogos de São Gregório*)

(22)  

Con tanta pacença *SOFRIA ela esta enfermidade*  
with so-much patience suffered she this disease

‘She suffered this disease so patiently’

Italian varieties:

(23)  

a Bon vin *FA l'uga negra* (old Milan.: Bonvesin, p. 96)  
Good wine (obj) makes the grape black (subj)

b et cosi *LO MIS e' ço* (old Ven.: *Lio Mazor*, p. 31)
and so it-put I down

c  Ciò TENNE il re a grande maraviglia (old Florent.: Novellino, II)

That held the king to great marvel

The examples above represent the ‘ideal’ case. Sometimes the Verb is in first, or in third, fourth position. We will come back to this variation, which is typical of Italian medieval dialects; we will see that it gives us the way to discover more interesting properties and restrictions.

3.1.1 V2 Syntax: The asymmetric pro-drop of northern Italian and French

A different kind of evidence of a V2 syntax in Romance is provided by those Romance varieties which present an asymmetric pro-drop, which can be seen as a function of V movement to a C°.

Part of Romance languages, distributed in a continuous area going from France to Northern Italy, have an asymmetric pro-drop: main clauses are pro-drop; in dependent clauses in which the verb is assumed not to have moved to C° (dependent clauses), the subject has to be expressed (Vanelli, Renzi, Benincà 1985). This asymmetry has to be taken as further evidence for V movement to C° in main clauses:

Old French

(24) a  Or poez __ veoir a terre un des freres del chasteld' Escalot

(Artu, p.14)

Now you-can see on the ground one of the brothers of the
castle of Escalot

b  Ceste merveille poés __ veoir (Artu, p.186)
“This marvel can.2pl see”

(25) a  Si errerent _ tant en tele maniere qu'il vindrent en la praerie
de Wincestre (Artu, p.13)
so wandered3pl _ so-much in such way that they came in the
prairie of Winchester
b  Or avoit _ tant les doiz gresli z Qu`il s` en issi sanz force fere
(Béroul, Tristan, p. 63)
Now had3sg so the fingers frozen that he cl cl went-out
without strength
Old Milanese (Bonvesin)

(26)  Quand tu veniss al mondo, se tu voliss pensar, negota ge
portassí _ , negota n poi _ portar (p. 179)
When you came to.the world, if you wanted to-think-about-it,
nothing there brought2sg / nothing from-there can2sg bring
Old Venetian (Lio Mazor)

(27)  et levà _ lo rem et de-me _ sulo col et menà-me _ ço per lo
braço , si ch`el me lo scaveçà (p. 18)
and raised3sg the oar and hit3sg.me on.the neck and
stroke3sg.me down the arm, so that he to-me.it broke3sg
Old Florentine (Schiaffini 1954)

(28) a  E cosi ne provò _ de’ più cari ch’elli avea (p. 74)
And so of-it tested3sg _ some-of-the dearest that he had”
The sample of sentences shows the asymmetry: in the main clause the
subject is expressed only if it is semantically necessary, in the dependent clause a subject pronoun is inserted even when the subject is the same of the main clause and it is not required for semantic reasons. This phenomenon has been connected with V movement to C°: when the inflected V locally governs the subject position, it transmits correctly its features and licenses a subject pro. This hypothesis accounts for the asymmetry of pro-drop as V movement to C° is in principle a root phenomenon.

This description is an idealisation, because in a number of cases the subject is dropped in dependent clauses as well. The theory of an articulated structure of CP gives the possibility of a more complex hypothesis, which accounts for the apparent counterexamples in an interesting way. V movement to C° is not obligatory in dependent clauses, but is possible provided that the lowest projection head is not occupied; the only case in which V movement is prohibited is a dependent interrogative. In dependent clauses involving portions of the structure higher than the locus of wh-movement the V is allowed to move at least to the FocusP head, licensing then a pro in subject position. In medieval Romance languages that do not show the asymmetry of pro-drop, a pro subject is always licensed in Spec IP.

As the access to the CP system, both in main and dependent clauses, is much freer in old Italian varieties than in other Romance medieval

---

13 This conclusion is consistent with generalisations on V2 in Germanic languages: the last case in which a Germanic language extends V2 in subordinate clauses is a dependent interrogative (see Vikner 1995). If a language presents embedded V2 in an interrogative, it will present V2 in any other type of dependent clauses. An apparent exception in Old Romance will be briefly dealt with below, in 5.1.1.
languages, we use the data of medieval Italy to observe the consequences of this hypothesis and test it on a wider data base.

3.2 V2 syntax: Preverbal elements

A few - very frequently used - lexical elements, when preverbal in a main clause, always appear strictly adjacent to the inflected verb (with its clitics): they are for example (ain)si “so”, French lors “then”, Venetian an, French ainz “on the contrary”\(^{14}\). Complement clitics, if present, are always proclitic in this context. Occurrences are innumerable, with no exceptions (clitic elements are in italics):

\[(29)\]
\begin{align*}
a & \text{ Ainz n’en osastes armes prendre (oFr.: Béroul, Tristan, p. 94)} \\
& \text{On the contrary not.cl dared2sg _ weapons to.take} \\
& \quad b \text{ An’ me credev-eo servirte (oVen.: Rainaldo e Lesengrino, p. 172)} \\
& \quad \text{“On-the-contrary myself thought I to serve you} \\
& \quad c \text{ an lo dies tu ben! (oVen., Lio Mazor, p. 18)} \\
& \quad \text{On-the-contrary it said you well}
\end{align*}

\[(30)\]
\begin{align*}
a & \text{ Si se conseillerten _ entr’ex comment il feroient (oFr.: Artu, p. 253)} \\
& \quad \text{So themselves consulted _ between them how they would do} \\
& \quad b \text{ il conut bien icle beste, si en crola .ii. foiz la teste (oFr. :}
\end{align*}

\(^{14}\) Both classes of elements are also used as nominal or adverbial modifiers; in these cases they have obviously a different distribution. Moreover, in the manuscripts si is written without the accent, thus resulting homograph of the reflexive clitic or the complementiser “if”; this has to be kept in mind, because the form of the edited texts depend on the decisions of the editors (and in some edited texts all types of si are written without the accent).
Pierre de Saint-Cloud, *Renart*, p. 3)
he knew well that beast, so of-it shaked3sg twice the head

(c) Si en fu la reïne moult corrociee (*oFr.: Artu*, p. 166)
so of-it was the queen very upset

d et enaysi, senher, fo tot lo tezaur de Iherusalem maniatz e
gastats par las gens (*oProv.: Venjansa*, 117)
and so, sir, was all the treasure of Jerusalem touched and
spoiled by the people

e et così cors-e' là e si g’ entremeçaj _ (*oVen.: Lio Mazor*, p. 30)
and so run.I there and so them pulled.apart

The other element that always appears adjacent to the main verb when
preposed in a main clause is a direct object without a clitic copy, to
which we dedicate the next paragraph. We hypothesise that these
elements occupy the specifier of Focus P, or better, a Spec in the
Focus Field, as sentential operators or moved arguments.

3.2.1 V2 syntax: Preposed objects

A feature shared by all medieval Romance languages is the fact that a
preverbal object in a main clause (generally but not necessarily in first
position: see for ex. (38b)), if immediately followed by the verb,
normally appears without a resumptive clitic. Pragmatically, it can
have various interpretations: it can represent a contrastive, or an
unmarked focus, a 'relevant' theme, an anaphoric theme. It does not
appear, then, pragmatically identifiable as in modern Italian and other
modern Romance languages by intonational contrast\textsuperscript{15}.
In the following examples, the preposed object is italicised, and the
verb (with clitics, if present) is in small capitals (some examples given
above are here repeated):

Old French

(31) a La traison \textsc{li a conté} que \textsc{li vasals a apresté} (Eneas, 23-24)
The treason \textsc{him} has told that the vassal has prepared
b Mes \textsc{lancelot} ne connut \textsc{il mie}, car trop estoit enbrons (Artu 11,3)
But Lancelot (obj.) not recognized \textsc{he} (subj.), because too much
was sullen

Old Provençal

(32) \textit{Mal cosselh \textsc{donet Pilat}} (\textit{Venjansa de la mort de Nostre Senhor})
Bad advice gave Pilatus

Old Spanish (from Fontana 1993)

(33) a \textit{Este logar \textsc{mostro} dios a Abraam} (GE-I 62v)
This place showed God to Abraam
b \textit{Vino y agua \textsc{deve} el clerigo mezclar en el caliz} (Leyes 13v)
Wine and water must the clerk mix in the chalice

Old Portuguese (Huber 1933)

(34) \textit{Tal serviço \textsc{lhe pode} fazer \textsc{hûn homen pequenho}}
Such a service to-him can do a small man

Old Piedmontese (\textit{Sermoni subalpini}).

(35) \textit{una fertra \textsc{fei} lo reis Salomon \ldots \textit{Las colones \textsc{fei} d'argent e}

\textsuperscript{15} It seems that some southern Italian varieties, such as Sicilian or Sardinian, are still
l’apoail FEI d’or; li degrai per unt hom i montava COVRÌ de purpura (p. 232)
a sedan-chair made the king Salomon. The columns made of silver and the support made of gold; the steps through which man there mounted covered with purple.

Old Lombard (oMiL: *Elucidario*)

(36) *Questa obedientia de morire REGUIRIVA lo Padre a lo Fiolo* (p. 123)
This obedience to die required the Father to the Son

Old Venetian (*Lio Mazor*)

(37) *et lo pan ch’e aveva en man DÉ per la bocha a Madalena.* (p. 27)
and the bread that I had in my-hand hit1sg on the mouth to Maddalena

Old Florentine (*Novellino*)

(38) *L’uscio MI LASCERAI aperto istanotte (XXXVIII)*
The door to.me will.leave2sg open tonight.

Old Sicilian (*Scremin*)

(39) *La salamandra AUDIVI, che infra lo foco vivi...* (Jacopo da Lentini)
The salamander heard1sg which into the fire lives

b *Guiderdone aspetto avere da voi (ibid.)*
Guerdon expect1sg to-have from you

The pattern represented by the examples above has some apparent

more similar to old Romance in the pragmatic interpretation of syntactic Focus.
counterexamples; while the preverbal object without a copy is necessarily adjacent to the verb, some cases can be found in which the preposed object, even if adjacent to the verb, has a clitic copy, which is always enclitic (in the following sentences, the clitic copying the preposed object – in square brackets - is italicised):

(40)  a  [Lo primo modo] chiamolo estato temeroso (oUmbr., Jacopone)
      the first mode call1sg.it state timorous

   b  A voi [le mie poche parole ch’avete intese] holle dette con grande fede (oFlorent., Schiaffini, p. 282)
      To you the my few words that have2pl heard / have1sg.them said with great faith

   c  e  [a los otros] acomendo-los adios (oSpanish, Estoria de España, II.2v)
      and to the others commended3sg.them to god

The generalisation based on surface order is that an object can only be preposed to the verb in a main clause without a clitic if nothing (apart from clitics and negation) intervenes between them; but an object in this configuration can –though rarely – be preposed and clitic-doubled. If we make a formal hypothesis on the structural position an object occupies in order to be preposed without a copy, we can formulate an absolute generalisation.

Making reference to the functional structure, we can hypothesise that a direct object can be moved leaving a trace, incompatible with a resumptive clitic, only in the projection immediately preceding the
head to which a Verb moves in main clauses (that is, FocusP in the Focus field); we expect to find no cases of a preposed object without clitic if something intervenes; as FocusP is the projection adjacent to V in main clauses, only the intervening element could occupy this position, forcing the object on the left to be located in TopP (and have a clitic copy). But if nothing intervenes in the surface, only pragmatics decides where the object has to be located in the structure; we assume that the syntactic correlate is the presence/absence of the clitic copy. Another type of evidence comes from the position of the copy, either pro- or enclitic: if a preposed object is adjacent to the verb and resumed by a clitic, this is always enclitic. This will be illustrated in the following paragraph.

3.3 The position of clitics (Tobler-Mussafia Law)

Complement clitics cannot appear in first position in a sentence; since they must be adjacent to the verb,\(^{16}\) when the V is first they become enclitic. This statement corresponds to a first approximation to an accurate description of clitic syntax in medieval Romance and goes

\(^{16}\) It is necessary to make abstraction from interpolation, the occurrence of lexical material between the clitic and the inflected verb; this possibility is found in old Spanish and Portuguese and - in my view - the phenomenon occurs in CP; it is interesting to observe (see Raposo 2000, 279) that the lexical material is inserted only if the clitic is on the left of the verb. Interpolation is also found in ancient varieties of Italian and modern Romance languages – including modern Spanish and Portuguese; this type is limited to a very restricted class of adverbs and occurs in IP. For interpolation in old Portuguese see Rivero 1986, Martins 1994, Raposo 2000, 277; for the type found in modern Italian dialects (which corresponds to what is found in old Italian and modern Portuguese) see Ledgeway and Lombardi 2002. More reflection is needed on this interesting topic, which can be kept distinct from other general aspects of clitics syntax.
back to the 19th C philology and the works of Adolf Tobler on old French and Adolfo Mussafia on old Italian. We will see that the description can reach a more detailed and interesting level. Tobler-Mussafia generalisation is based on data like the following (the verb is in small capitals, enclitics are italicised):

Old French

(41) a **REMANBRE li de la reine** (Chrétien, *Erec et Enide*, p. 28)

Occurred3sg-to.him of the queen

b **Sire, AI le ge bien fait?** (Chrétien, *Conte du Graal*, p. 366d, 1449)

Sir, have1sg-it I well done

Old Spanish (from Fontana 1993)

(42) a **RESPONDIO les el que lo non farie** (GCU, 6)

answered.them he that it not he-would-do “He answered that he wouldn’t do that”

b e **VENCIERON lo** (GE I, 65 r)

and won3pl.him'

Old Portuguese (Martins)

(43) **DOU uos ende esta mha carta**

give1sg.you.of-it this my paper

Old Piedmontese (Sermones Subalpini)

(44) a **TORNÉ-s-en, si ané a l'autre so ami (...), si li ai coità so desasi** (p. 238)

went3sg-back.clit.clit, so went to the other his friend, so to him has told his desease
b e si la lavé e forbi e RETORNÉ-la en sen loc (p. 252) and so it washed3sg and wiped and put-back.it to its place
Old Venetian (Lio Mazor)

(45) a COMANDÀ-li ser Marcho Lugari ...ch'el no fes briga coi prediti (p. 18)
   Ordered3sg.him sir M.L. that he ....

b et he li tras la fosina de man et BRANCHAI-lo per li caveli
   et TRAS-lo en la sentina...(p. 18)
   and I to-him snatched the harpoon from hand and sized.him and pulled.him down ... Old Florentine

(46) a LEVÒssi questa femmina e AIUTOLlo (Novellino, 38)
   Rised.herself this woman and helped.him

b e si mandò per una bellissima pulcella e FECEglile venire
   inanzi e DOMANDOLlo se gli piacea e assai il ne scongiurò
   (Schiaffini, p. 76)
   and so sent3sg for a very beautiful maid and made3sg.to.him.her come in.front and asked3sg.him if to-him
   pleased3sg and much him.of-it implored
Old Umbrian (Jacopone)

(47) GRAVAME forte lo balestrire
   Burdens.me heavily the arbalester
Old Sicilian (Scremin: Stefano Protonotaro)

(48) PURRIAMI laudari d'Amori bonamenti
   could.me praise of love kindly
The distribution appears very regular: if something precedes the verb, clitics are generally proclitic; if the V is initial, clitics are enclitic. If we try to push the generalisation further on, we face an asymmetrical situation: with no exception, in all the written Romance text until at least the 14th C., if the verb is initial in a main clause, there is enclisis\textsuperscript{17}; however, enclisis cannot depend on the impossibility for clitics to appear in first position, because we find cases of sentence internal enclisis. Even if the latter case is quite rare, it is found in all Romance languages of the Middle Ages:

(49) a [Quelgli il quale andasse per Firenze in die di lavorare],
\textit{debbialgli} essere soddisfatto... (oFl., Schiaffini, p.54)
He who would-go through Florence in a working day, must.to-him be paid

b E [despues] \textit{mando-lo} fazer a sus discipulos (oSp.; from Fontana 1993: \textit{Leyes})
And afterwards sent.him to-do to his disciples

Using the distinctive features established on the basis of modern Italian, and anticipating in part what I will show in the following

\textsuperscript{17} This specification is necessary, as some medieval Romance languages (old Venetian, old French, etc.) show systematically proclisis in initial position of yes-no questions; moreover, some varieties treat differently the first position of coordinate sentences: old Florentine, Venetian and all the medieval varieties of Southern Italy behave like old Spanish and Portuguese and have obligatory enclisis if the Verb appears immediately after a coordinating conjunction (irrespectively of the syntactic nature of the clause to which they are coordinated, whether a main or a dependent clause). Old French, Piedmontese and Lombard do not have obligatory enclisis in this context. I will not further comment here on this difference, which involves the syntax of coordinated structures. I do not examine here these particular cases (even if they can easily be accounted for in the proposed framework), as they are not directly bearing on the subject.
paragraphs, I claim that in (49a) the constituent preceding the V with the enclitic has to be a HT, as there is no Case matching between it (a bare DP) and the clitic that resumes it (a dative). In (49b), the constituent in first position (followed by a V with an enclitic) is presumably a HT too, as it is one of the few elements (a circumstantial adverb) that allows V3 in old Spanish. Trying to describe the context at a more abstract level, and exploiting the descriptive conclusions we can reach regarding the functional structure of the left periphery, we are able to conclude that we have enclisis when the Verb has moved to C° and the preceding material is not in the Focus Field (but rather in Topic or Frame). The examples in (49) are cases of sentence internal enclisis in which a V is in second position but the Focus Field is empty. With this formulation, which will be illustrated below for other cases, the generalisation has no exception.

4. Medieval Romance of Italy: the multiple accessibility of CP.

The V2 syntax of Italian Romance appears less rigid than in other Romance languages: V1, V3, V4 is very common in all the languages of medieval Italy. These options are not totally impossible in other Romance languages, but governed by stronger textual and pragmatic requirements

18 See for ex. Fontana (1993, 3.4.2) for V1, where it is underlined that V1 appears to be, as in Germanic V2 languages that admit it, a means to get a strong textual cohesion: this can be interestingly related to the hypothesis I will make that V initial sentences have an empty topic; Fontana (1993, 3.4.3) shows that V3 sentences in old...
The aspect that we will first consider concerns the multiple accessibility of CP in Italian Romance, illustrated by the following examples:

(50) a  [L’altre ami] [si] est la moiller (oPiem.: *Serm. Sub.*, p. 238)
    The other friend so is the wife

   b  [A lè] [per tug li tempi] me rend e me consegno (oMilan.: Bonvesin, p. 163)
    To her for all the times I me-surrend and me-deliver

   c  E [Pero Capel] [en la fiata] branchà uno uiger de pes (oVen.: *Lio Mazor*, p. 35)
    and P. C. immediately sized a hamper of fish

   d  [Allora] [questi] andò e ricambattè (oFlorent.: *Novellino*, 37)
    Then this went and fought-again

   e  [Ad ogni matto] [i savi] paiono matti, [si come] [ai savi] [i matti] paiono veramente matti. (oFlorent.: *Novellino*, 40)
    “To each mad.person the wise.persons seem mad, so as to the wise persons the mad.persons seem really mad”

   f  Et [chi facesse contra] [la prima volta] gli sia imposta penitença, et la seconda sia cacciato (oFlorent.: Schiaffini, p. 46)
    And who should act against the first time to-him be imposed a penance, and the second be pulled.away”

   g  [La speranza che avìa de lo tuo gran perdonare] [a peccar] me conducia (oUmbr.: Jacopone)

Spanish and French admit only a precise type of elements in first position (see
The hope that had1sg of your great forgiveness to sin drove me

h [La figura piacente] [lo coro] mi dilanca (Scremin: Jacopo da Lentini)

the pleasant figure (subj) the heart (obj) to-me tears

Notice that this structure does not represent a late evolution of Italian syntax, as the oldest Italian text (Placitum from Capua, 960) shows it, in a dependent clause:

(51) a  Sao ko [kelle terre per kelle fini que ki contene], [trenta anni] 
le possette parte Santi Benedicti

I know that those lands for those boundaries that here contains, thirty years them-owned party of Saint B.

Two constituents precede the inflected verb, in a dependent complement clause; we have located the unmarked complementiser head in a very high position in CP, thus the access to lower projection is open for moved and base-generated constituents.

This liberty of Italian permits to refine the generalisations concerning the properties of the elements in the left periphery suggesting that, even if the Verb can be frequently initial and more than one constituent can precede the verb in main (and even dependent) clauses, the syntax continues being V2 (i.e., with obligatory V movement to a head in CP in main clauses). This conclusion can be reached observing – for example - that precise classes of elements have to appear strictly adjacent to the verb, never separated by other
elements, and the position of clitics, either proclitic or enclitic, is related to their presence.

5. Summing up the generalisations concerning CP in medieval Romance.

5.1. The Accessibility of CP in main and dependent clauses

We can map the sentence of the Placitum into the structure that has been proposed above in (18) on the basis of modern Italian:\footnote{The constituent in TopP is probably a HT, as often is the case in other examples with a DP or PP containing a relative clause (or other material) that renders it ‘heavy’. If so, the presence of a Hanging Topic after a complementiser in this early text is notable. We cannot be sure of the exact categorial status of the complementiser at this stage of the development of Romance languages: an element such as ko (in contrast with the following que) could still have pronominal features; it could have the function of a pro-sentence, and structurally be a sister of the entire clause.}

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
(51) \text{b} \quad \text{Sao} & \quad [\text{ForceC° co} \quad [\text{TopP}kelle \text{ terre per kelle } \text{ fini que ki contene} \quad \\
& \quad [\text{FocP trenta anni} \quad \text{C° le possette} \quad [\text{IP[SPECparte Sancti Benedicti]]}]
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

Italian varieties, if treated, with all possible caution, as a consistent sub-group of Romance, show us with greater clarity what in other varieties appears more vague. In Italian varieties in dependent clauses the CP is only blocked for V movement in interrogatives (see below in 5.1.1 a systematic exception).

In other dependent clauses – in which only higher functional projections are involved - constituents can be moved in CP if pragmatics requires it and, as the data of the asymmetry of pro-drop shows, the V can move to C°. Old Spanish, Portuguese and French
have very few cases of V3; in most of the cases the first constituent in these cases is a circumstantial adverb or phrase (see Fontana 1993, 3.4.3), which in our structure occupy a very high position in Frame.

In Italian Romance we can find two Noun Phrases preceding the verb: if neither has a clitic copy, the leftmost one is the subject, the object is adjacent to the verb:

(52) [La mia cattivanza] [l' alma] ha menata (oUmbr., Jacopone)
    My wickedness (subj) the soul (obj) has lead

There is no ambiguity in the interpretation of this kind of sentences: the subject precedes the object; were the first DP an object, it would have a clitic copy.

The only type of subordinate clauses in which the access to CP is blocked is a dependent wh- interrogative (in 5.1.1 an apparent exception is analysed). This is again consistent with the functional structure we have outlined: the projection hosting a wh- is the lowest in the structure. As can be deduced from modern varieties, a dependent interrogative involves not only a Spec but also a head (in modern dialects of northern Italy a lexical complementiser che “that” also appears, accompanying the wh). Neither a phrase nor a head can move to C° in a dependent interrogative, as exemplified by the following sentences:

(53) a Sire, ge sai bien [qui ceste demoisele fu ](oFr.: Artu, p. 89)
    Sir, I know well who this damsel was

b Et sez tu [de quel part Booz et Lionnaix et Estors se son mis?] (oFr.: Artu, p. 12)
and know you in what part B. and L. put themselves?

c Domandà lo dito Pero [que eli deveva far del pes] (oVen.: Lio Mazor, p. 37)

Asked the aforementioned P. what they must do of the fish

In dependent complement sentences governed by bridge verbs and even dependent relatives the accessibility of CP appears more restricted than in main clauses, but only in quantity, not in quality: the same structures are allowed even if they are not frequent in Italian varieties and nearly absent in the other Romance languages. We could informally conclude that the accessibility of CP in non-interrogative dependent clauses is the same in all Romance languages as in Italian, and the differences are only governed by pragmatics.

Some examples follow: (54) are complement subordinate clauses, (55) are relatives:

(54) a v’aven noi scritto che[‘l fornimento che vi bisogniasse traeste di Bari e dell’altri fiere (oFl.: Lettera di Consiglio de’ Cerchi, 1)

to.you we have written that [the supply that to.you was.necessary] you.should.get _ from Bari

b mes ge croi qu’[encor] le fera il mieuz en la fin (oFr.: Artu, p. 16

but I think that even it will-do he better at the end (“he will do it even better”)

c vos poez bien dire (...) que [riens qu’il me requiere] je ne feroie (Artu, p. 142)
you can well say that nothing that he asks me I will (not) do

(55) ....a cil qui [meint grant cop] avoit doné (Artu, p. 255)
those who numerous big strokes had given

b ...li chevalier qui [a la guerre] devoient aler (Artu, p. 138)
the knights who to the war had to go

5.1.1. An exceptional V2 in dependent interrogatives

A class of apparent exceptions to the generalisation above (which states that V movement is blocked in a dependent interrogative) involves dependent interrogatives introduced by come ‘how’:

(56) a Vedi tu (...) come [per le dette vie] fà /Avarìza/ le sue operazioni (...)?
     (Bono G., Trattato, p. 46)
     Can you see how through the said ways makes Greed its operations?

b Pregoti che mi dichi come queste cose tu le sai (Novellino, II)
     Pray1sg.you that you to-me tell how these things you them know

In particular, the object queste cose ‘these things’ in (56b) is in TopP, as is revealed by the presence of the resumptive clitic; in contrast, the subject is in the Focus field. In (56a), the subject follows the inflected V, which has

---

20 I am grateful to Nicola Munaro for sharing data, taken from his chapter on interrogative clauses in Old Florentine (in Renzi & Salvi, in preparation), and for discussing the analysis with me. As Paul Portner suggested to me (p.c.), relative clauses with come may represent instances of base generation of the relative pronoun in Topic or Frame with subsequent movement to the higher relative wh-projection.

21 It is interesting that in a different code of the Novellino the order appears as ‘normal’: come tu sai queste cose.
moved to $C^\circ$. I assume, without strong motivation, that the preposed PP in 
(56a) is in Focus (the adjective *predette* ‘aforementioned’ suggests this 
opportunity, in analogy with Modern Italian Anaphoric Anteposition; see 
Benincà 2001); nothing changes if one prefers to consider it a Topic. 
There are reasons to hypothesise that these interrogatives have in fact the 
structure of a headless relative. The structure of (56 a,b) would be as in 
(56c,d) respectively:

(56) c [Rel\textit{wh} \textit{come} $C^\circ$] \{\textit{Frame}\} \{\textit{TOPIC}\} \{\textit{Foc per le dette vie} $C^\circ$ \textit{fa} \} [IP \textit{Avarizia} \textit{tV} $\textit{le sue operazioni}$]

d [Rel\textit{wh} \textit{come} $C^\circ$] \{\textit{Frame}\} \{\textit{TOPIC queste cose}\} \{\textit{Foc tu} $C^\circ$ \textit{le sai} \} [IP \textit{tV} $\textit{t}$]

With respect to modern Italian, the structural location of the wh-
pronoun in headless relatives has been briefly illustrated above; in 
pattern, it appears in the same position as the wh- of a regular 
relative clause (i.e., in a very high projection in CP). In support of this 
hypothesis, we can consider the following cases of relative clauses 
introduced by \textit{come} ‘how’ in other Old Romance languages, in which 
we observe that the subject appears in postverbal position. This 
means that we have here V in $C^\circ$ in a dependent clause; so, even if the 
wh- belongs to the interrogative paradigm, its position is very high, 
and access to CP is open to the V:

(57) a de si lointeingnes terres comme sont les parties de Jerusalem (o 
Fr.: \textit{Artu}, p.1)

from so far lands how are the parts of Jerusalem

b si comme sont cil del roialme de Logres (ibid., p. 15) 
so how are those of the kingdom of L.
5.2. Arguments in CP and their clitic copies

From Italian varieties we are able to conclude that an object can be in CP separated from the verb by another constituent: in this case it is obligatorily doubled by a clitic:

Old Sicilian (Scremin)

(58)  a [La mia gran pena e lo gravoso affanno c'ho lungiamente per amor patuto], [madonna] lo m'ha in gioia ritornato (Guido delle Colonne)

b [Madonna per cui stava tuttavia in allegranza], [or ] no la veggio né notte né dia (Giacomino Pugliese)

c [La vertude ch'il'ave d'auciderme e guarire], [a lingua dir] non l'auso (Re Enzo)

In the structure we have hypothesised, an object preceding the verb, even if nothing intervenes between them, can either be in the Focus Field (via movement) or be base generated in the Topic or Frame Field. In the former case it behaves like a wh- and there is no resumptive clitic; in the latter case, as a base generated Topic, it has to be doubled by a clitic.

On the basis of data from all Romance languages (examples are scarce in some languages, but there is virtually no exception) the following generalisation holds: A direct object immediately followed by a verb and doubled by a clitic requires enclisis. This completes the
generalisation proposed in 3.2.1 (some of the examples are repeated here for convenience):

(59) a [Lo vostro amor ch'è caro] donatel o al notaro ch'è nato da Lentino (oSic., Jacopo da Lentini)
    your love that is dear give.it to the notary who is born in Lentino
b [Lo primo modo] chiamolo estato temoruso, [lo seconno] pareme amor medecaruso, [lo terzo amore] pareme viatico amoruso, (oUmbr., Jacopone)\(^{22}\)
    the first mode call1sg.it state timorous, the second seems.me love medicamentous, the third love seems.me viaticum amorous
c A voi [le mie poche parole ch’avete intese] holle dette con grande fede (oFlor., Schiaffini)
    To you the my few words that have2pl heard / have1sg.them said with great faith
d e [a los otros] acomendo-los adios (oSpan., *Estoria de España*, II.2v)
    and the others commended.them to god

We have enclisis of the clitic to a verb that is not in first position; the element in first position is one of those that permit V3, in our view, one of those that can be inserted in the Frame Field; then, the verb is not first, but the Focus field is empty, and this configuration triggers

---

\(^{22}\) The sentence appears to be a sequence of List Interpretation Topics (see above 2.3): the topic of the first clause is an object, the following ones are subjects, and the clitics are always enclitic.
enclisis.

5.3. Reformulating the T&M generalisation

In the light of a theory which hypothesizes an articulated functional structure of CP, we can formulate the following descriptive generalisations mapping surface phenomena in an abstract sequence of positions in CP.

*When the verb is in C° and is preceded by an element that has to be in a Spec of the Focus field, enclisis is impossible.*

These elements are for ex.: preverbal *si, così, ainsi*, etc., preverbal object without a clitic copy (general Romance), *or* (oFr.), *an* (oVen.).

After these elements, clitics – if present - are always proclitics:

(60) a  *et così lo mis e' ço* (oVen.: *Lio Mazor*, p. 31)

and so it put.I down

b  *an me credev-eo servirte* (*Rainaldo e Lesengrino*, p. 172a)

on-the-contrary myself thought.I to-serve.you 'on the contrary I thought to myself that I was useful for you

c  *...e sì la lavé e forbi e retorné-la en sen loc* (oPied.: *Serm. Sub.*, p. 252)

and so it washed3sg and wiped and put-back.it to its place

d  *E così ne provò _ de' più cari ch'elli avea* (oFlor: Schiaffini, p. 74)

And so of-it tested3sg _ some-of-the dearest that he had"

e  *Sì en est li rois moult a malese* (oFfr: *Artu*, p. 100)

so of-it is the king very uncomfortable
(61) a  *tutto ciò che m'hai chiesto t'ho dato.* *La signoria di Roma t'ho
data.* *Signore t'ho fatto di molte dilizio* (oFl.: *Novellino*, 124)
all that to-me have2sg asked to-you have1sg given. The
domination of Rome to-you have1sg given. Master you
have1sg made of many delights.
‘I gave you everything you asked me. I gave you the
domination of Rome. I made you the master of many
delights.’

b *Tal serviço lhe pode fazer hún homen pequenho* (oPort:
Huber)
Such-a service to-him can do a small man

*Complementarily, if a verb is preceded by a constituent which has to
be in a Spec higher than the Focus field, and this verb has clitics, they
are obligatorily enclitic.* Elements that have to be higher than Focus
are HT and preposed objects with a clitic copy:

(62)  /Quelgli il quale andasse per Firenze in die di lavorare/,
debbia*lgli* essere soddisfatto (oFlor., Schiaffini, p. 54)

He who would go through Florence in a working day,
must to-him be paid...

The constituent preceding the Verb is a Hanging Topic, which can
only be base generated in the Frame Field; as no lexical material
intervenes between it and the Verb, there is enclisis.

Circumstantial adverbs too have their natural location in a Spec in
Frame, but this is not a strong syntactic constraint; whether they
receive a Frame, Topic or Focus interpretation depends on pragmatics.
In the following sentence we have enclisis to a verb immediately preceded by a circumstantial adverb; this implies that this adverb is not in Focus but base generated in Frame:

(63) E *despues* MANDO-LO fazer a sus discipulos (from Fontana 1993: *Leyes*)

and afterwards sent.it to-do to his disciples

In other cases, adverbs of the same kind are immediately followed by clitic and Verb (proclisis); they are examples of the other option, of a circumstantial adverb located in FocusP.

A similar treatment is required for circumstantial clauses, a long-standing puzzle: if a V with clitics follows a circumstantial clause, we can find both enclisis and proclisis. The position of clitics depends on the pragmatic interpretation: the following couple of sentences shows the two options, in the same text: in the first, the circumstantial sentence is in a Spec of TopP or FrameP, in the second the circumstantial sentence is in FocP:

(64) a ed essendo poveramente in arnese, *misesi ad andare ad* Alessandro (oFl.: *Novellino*, IV)

and being in poor condition, set.himself to go to A.

b la famiglia volendoli bene, *l'insegnaro a campare* (ibid.)

the family loving.him, him.taught3pl to get-by

The following structure, the same that we have proposed in (18) for modern Italian, accounts for the subtle facts we have pointed out in medieval Romance:
There is a particular fact that deserves some reflection here: enclisis is never found in dependent clauses with overt complementisers.\[23\]. This is not an immediate consequence of what we have argued so far: since V2 is possible in dependent clauses (apart from interrogatives), and enclisis is triggered by an empty focus, enclisis should be in principle possible in dependent clauses, too. Interestingly, the absence of enclisis in all dependent clauses can instead be linked to the fact that V movement to C° in dependent clauses is in fact possible but not obligatory; the requirement is that the complementiser be in a head higher than that of the interrogative. In main clauses, enclisis is triggered by an empty Focus; the hypothesis can be that, while enclisis is fed by V movement to C°, it is the effect of a further movement that is required in main clauses, but rendered unnecessary (i.e., impossible) if a C° head (and a Spec) is realised higher in CP. I will briefly elaborate this idea in the following, concluding paragraph.

5.4. Some consequences and speculations
The descriptive generalisations on medieval Romance pointed out in this paper are accounted for if we assume that the lowest field in CP – the Focus Field - is specialised for constituents that are moved there

---

23 This conclusion had been already reached by Schiaffini (1954, p. 68), who asserted that in old Italian enclisis is never observed after a che.
leaving a trace; the higher fields host elements that are base generated (or moved with a different kind of movement, see fn. 5) and resumed by a clitic. The requirements for clitic doubling in MedRom are identical with ModRom: only direct objects in Topic or Frame are obligatorily doubled; HT are distinguished from LD by the lack of case matching. Direct objects in Focus are moved and cannot be clitic doubled.

In the light of an articulated structure of CP we have obtained a unitary description of enclisis of complement clitics in Romance, which accounts for enclisis and proclisis on purely syntactic grounds. Enclisis is a phenomenon – still to be understood as a morpho-syntactic process – triggered by a V in C° and an empty Focus. It seems reasonable to suppose that it is the result of a further movement of the V to the left, to reach the head in whose Spec a Topic (LD or HT) is base generated.

In dependent clauses enclisis is not attested24; as such we conclude that this further movement is not required (and thus not possible). If we think of this topic as a pro, this context recalls various cases in Romance of pro licensing via government; in the dependent clause, a null topic can be licensed via government by a higher head with features. A sentence beginning with a V is not, in fact, a sentence without a Topic, but a sentence whose Topic is interpreted by default. A Focus, being in any case relevant information, has to be instead

24 Apart from the case of coordination of subordinate clauses: the second member is treated, in some varieties only, as a main clause (if the verb is initial, eventual clitics are enclitic: see fn. 19).
explicitly supplied. When nothing precedes a V, an argument is necessarily supplied in a Spec in the CP system (possibly to satisfy some version of EPP). While a ‘null topic’ can be inserted and interpreted on the basis of the linguistic context or general knowledge, a ‘null Focus’ seems impossible on various grounds: being a moved element it must not be inserted as a last resort; being relevant information it cannot be interpreted by default. A V initial sentence is then a sentence that has a Topic (superficially empty) and has nothing in the Focus field, and as such the position of the clitics – if present – conforms to the generalisation: they must be enclitic. In (Benincà 1989) enclisis was described as the result of a further movement of the V to the Spec of Top; with an articulated structure, the V can be thought of as moving to a higher head, thus preserving head movement in its classical version.

The enclitic position of complement clitics that results from this further movement of the V suggests the existence of a location for clitics in CP, which completes the locations of clitics that are being identified in (the functional structure of) IP and VP.

25 A natural consequence is that there cannot be any prosodic reason for the position of clitics with an inflected verb and the choice between enclisis and proclisis; the generalisations we have seen render this kind of explanation even weaker than it could already appear to the contemporaries of A. Mussafia, who cast some doubts on it (see the discussion in Mussafia (1886, 298)). If the enclisis were a way to avoid clitics in sentence initial position, we would not expect enclitic pronouns in sentence internal position. This is instead possible, as pointed out here, but only in specific syntactic contexts, when what precedes the Verb is not in FocusP.

26 Raposo (2000) develops this idea for what concerns the very similar case of modern Portuguese.

27 I am referring to phenomena reported and analysed by Tortora (2002), for the Piedmontese variety of Borghomanero, De Crousaz & Shlonsky (2002) for some
Trying to sketch a very rough typology of the three layers of clitics I am proposing, in the VP functional area we find clitics for complements and in very few cases clitics for subjects; in the IP area we find the complete series, complements and subjects; only clitics corresponding to subjects have been located in CP for modern Romance (namely, northern Italian dialects). It should not be surprising to find that complement clitics too used to be realised in CP in Medieval Romance, in particular cases; this characteristic has been lost together with other features of the old syntax.

In a restrictive theory of Parameters (see Chomsky 1995, 160 Kayne 2003), parameters are seen as features of functional elements. If we compare medieval Romance languages with their modern descendants, it seems to be the case that the V2 phenomena we have been dealing with—shared by all varieties and contemporarily lost or modified by all of them—are to be accounted for by a change in parameter setting. Two sorts of phenomena can be recognised that may depend on parametric features: the first is V movement to C° when the lowest C° is free, the second is V movement to higher C° heads in CP. Both phenomena appear to be a consequence of properties of Verbal Inflection, which in the medieval stage of Franco-Provencal dialects, which seem to suggest the existence of a layer for clitics in the functional area of VP, besides the clitic area in IP. Cinque (2001) also makes this hypothesis on the basis of standard Italian data. A location for clitics in CP has been proposed for some northern Italian dialects by Poletto (2000), for the so-called ‘vocalic subject clitics’, and Munaro, Poletto and Pollock (2001), Penello (2003) for enclitic subjects in questions. It seems a natural possibility to have a functional structure of a pronominal nature – which in languages like Romance give rise to clitics – in the three main layers of the structure of the sentence.
Romance could be assumed to be endowed with features to be discharged in CP and with features able to licence an argument in its Spec. The relative independence of these two types of features appears reflected in the varieties of Romance that still preserve some residue of the older syntax: Rhaeto-romance, which still is V2 but has no residue of the medieval clitic syntax, and Portuguese, which maintains the medieval clitic syntax but has a limited V2 phenomenology (no inversion after Focus, etc.). The higher frequency of V initial in the medieval languages of Italy corresponds to a wider range of ‘dropped’ Topics the V is able to legitimize in the corresponding Spec in this set of languages, then, to a ‘stronger V inflection’.28

All that I have been saying so far only makes sense if we restrict the possible orders of constituents appearing in CP. Topics are merged in the Topic Field or in the Frame field; the Focus field is the lowest one and only hosts moved elements. This is consistent with what we had independently concluded on the basis of modern Italian.

28 Kayne (1984, 221-2), commenting on the syntactic status of subject clitics in northern Italian dialects (which in contrast with French are part of agreement), suggested that “this would appear to be related to Italian being a ‘pro-drop’ language.” At the time it seemed to me that this idea could not have any sense, as the dialects of Italy each have their own history, independent and parallel to Italian. Today it still does not have much sense, but seems to be confirmed by the common characteristics of medieval Italian varieties.
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