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Abstract: New comparative data concerning the distribution of V1 and V3 orders in the Medieval Romance languages is presented in order to propose an analysis of the role these ‘deviant’ orders play in Verb Second (V2) grammars. It is proposed that neither V1 nor V3 orders are incompatible with a V2 grammar and that the synchronic variation found with regard to the licensing of V1 and V3 in Romance and cross-linguistically is linked to whether the locus of the V2 property is either ‘low’ in the C-domain on Fin or ‘high’ on Force.
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1. Introduction

1.1. The V2 Hypothesis for Medieval Romance

There are few issues more controversial in Romance syntax than how to correctly analyse the syntax of the Medieval Romance languages. Since at least Benincà (1983-4), it has generally been acknowledged that some or all of the medieval languages were Verb Second (V2) systems. Drawing on early work in the Germanic tradition, she argues that the medieval languages feature finite verb-movement to C and phrasal movement of a pragmatically salient constituent to the specifier of the same head (cf. Den Besten 1983:60; Benincà 1983-4:§4).

In parallel to the substantial literature on Germanic V2 that has emerged in the last four decades, a vast literature has also emerged on the syntax of the Medieval Romance languages following this seminal work (Benincà 1983, 1983-4, 1995, 2004, 2006, 2013). Rather than attempt a full review, in the section that follows we briefly outline a number of unresolved issues which are relevant to the present paper.

1 I gratefully acknowledge support from the European Research Council Advanced Grant No. 269752 “Rethinking Comparative Syntax” for funding the writing of this research and thank the project members alongside Adam Ledgeway, Cecilia Polito, Christine Salvesen, Luigi Rizzi and two anonymous reviewers for comments and feedback on various aspects of the research. Errors that remain are of course entirely my own responsibility.

1.2. The (Medieval Romance) V2 ‘Problem’

The first issue constituting the ‘Romance V2 Problem’ concerns the relationship between the Medieval Romance languages and the Germanic languages. Although the intuition in Benincà (1983-4) that both groups of languages are V2 has for the most part been accepted, the V2 literature on Modern Germanic shows the finite verb to be in second position in a striking though not exclusive majority of cases in matrix declaratives (Koster 1975; Den Besten 1983; Zwart 1993; 1997; Haider 2010:Ch1). In Medieval Romance, however, V1, V3 and even V4* orders are robustly attested (Benincà 1995, 2004, 2006, 2013; Ledgeway 2008; Salvi 2012; Poletto 2014). How exactly to account for the formal difference between Modern Germanic and Medieval Romance in this regard has never been adequately resolved and following the work of Kaiser (2002:134, 2009:140) the mere attestation of V1 and V3* orders has been viewed as key evidence against a V2 account. Witness for example the observation by Rinke and Elsig (2010:2566) that ‘[a]s regards verb-initial and verb-third orders, they are clearly not a freely available option of verb-second grammars’.

A further issue concerns differences amongst the Medieval Romance languages both synchronically and diachronically. Roberts (1993), Vance (1997) and Sitaridou (2012:578) all note that V1 declarative clauses are exceptionally rare in Later Old French, whereas in Old Italo-Romance and Ibero-Romance they are seemingly widespread (Fontana 1993:§3.4.2; Benincà 2004:275; Ledgeway 2007:134; Franco 2009:48f; Poletto 2014:21). Similar remarks apply to V3* orders,3 which appear again to be highly restricted in later Old French and later Old Spanish (Fontana 1993:111f; Vance, Donaldson & Steiner 2009; Donaldson 2012) but, put simplistically, much less restricted in Old Italo-Romance (see Benincà 1995, 2004, 2006 and Poletto 2005, 2006, 2014 amongst others). Again, there is no account in the literature which analyses these distinctions in formal terms.

Following the seminal work of Rizzi (1997) on the fine structure of the left periphery, a further issue emerges of very general significance, namely the question of which functional head in the C-domain hosts the moved verb and merged constituent in V2 clauses. For Cardinaletti & Roberts (2002), Ferraresi & Goldbach (2002), Ledgeway (2007, 2008) and Salvesen (2011, 2013) finite verb-movement targets the lowest head in Rizzi’s hierarchy, Finiteness. In a similar though not identical account, Foc(us) is the locus of V2 for both Benincà (2004, 2006, 2013) and Poletto (2005, 2006, 2014). In a parallel proposal to one put forward in the Germanic literature (see Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl 2013:113, Biberauer & Roberts 2014, 2015 and references below), Rouveret (2004) suggests that in Later Old French the locus of V2 is a high head in the C-domain, namely Force. Thus establishing the exact role distinct heads in the left periphery play in the licensing of the V2 phenomena across Medieval Romance remains an open issue.

1.3. Aims and Methodology

Against this background, the present article sets out to analyse the left periphery of the Medieval Romance languages, with particular focus on the licensing of V1 and V3* orders.

---

3 In line with standard conventions in the Medieval Romance literature, V3* is used in the article to indicate clauses where three of more constituents precede the finite verb.
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It will be argued that the intuition in much recent work that there are striking points of continuity between the languages which separate them from their modern SVO counterparts is indeed correct (cf. Benincà 2004, 2006; Salvi 2004, 2011, 2012), but that there is significant microvariation between the languages as regards V1 and V3* which we link to the locus of the V2 property in the left periphery.

For the purposes of the present analysis, we draw on a small corpus (c. 1000 clauses) of six Medieval Romance texts representing Old Sicilian, Venetian, Occitan, French and Spanish. Although the dates of composition vary somewhat (see Texts Cited), the analysis offered here is predominantly synchronic with some diachronic observations made at the end of the article.


(i) $C_{\text{Frame}} > C_{\text{Force}} > C_{\text{Top}} > C_{\text{Foc}} > C_{\text{Fin}}$

Importantly, we assume that the highest ‘Frame’ field is associated with a scene-setting function which anchors the speech act in terms of locative and temporal deixis and speech participants (Haegeman 2000:§5.5.1; Benincà & Poletto 2004:§4.2; Poletto 2002:221f; Giorgi 2010; Sigurdsson 2011).

Following recent work by Roberts (2010) we also assume a theory of Defective Goals. The basic intuition is that in a Probe-Goal Agree relation if the features of a Goal form a proper subset of the features of the Probe, the Goal is rendered ‘defective’, incorporates on the probing head and is standardly then deleted at Phonetic Form (PF) due to a process of ‘Chain Reduction’ (cf. Nunes 2004). This will be particularly significant in building our analysis of V1 in Medieval Romance.

Following a recent formulation by Holmberg (2015), we assume that the V2 property is a bi-partite one, constituting verb-movement into the left-periphery as a consequence of a Φ-Probe on a C-head and a requirement for merger of a phrasal constituent in the C-domain, as a consequence of an Edge Feature (henceforth EF) on a C-head (cf. also Cardinaletti & Roberts 2002:153 amongst others). Following proposals by Poletto (2002, 2013), Roberts (2010) and Biberauer & Roberts (2014, 2015) we suggest that the locus of the V2 property may vary between languages and that minimally this variation concerns the ability for either Force or Fin to be the locus of V2.

Section 2 briefly outlines the evidence present in the corpus which motivates the working assumptions of the article that the Medieval Romance languages considered were indeed forms of V2 grammar. Sections 2 and 3 present the descriptive generalisations concerning V1 and V3* orders respectively before offering an analysis of the phenomena which links the distribution of V1 and V3 orders to the locus of the V2 property within the left periphery of each of the languages. Section 4 considers the wider implications of the proposal for a theory of the Verb Second phenomenon linked to Medieval Romance syntax.

2. The V2 Grammar of Medieval Romance

In all of the texts considered, compelling evidence is found of an underlying V2 grammar. As many of the arguments in favour of the V2 hypothesis are more established in
the literature than observations concerning variation within these V2 systems, we present them only briefly here.

Firstly, all the languages discussed show a preference for the finite verb to occur in second position of the matrix clause, as in other Germanic and Rhaeto-Romance V2 systems (Haiman & Benincà 1992:150; Vikner 1995:41; Holmberg 2015:1). As Table 1 reveals there is however considerable variation with regard to the frequency with which the verb appears in second position, which will be the main focus of this article:

Table 1. Verb Placement in Medieval Romance Matrix Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old French</th>
<th>Old Occitan</th>
<th>Old Sicilian</th>
<th>Old Venetian</th>
<th>Old Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.52%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>75.16%</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>53.29%</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>24.53%</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>29.47%</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.84%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, the preverbal field is not a specialised subject position, as in SVO systems where the verbal prefieId is made up of functional projections in the T-domain (Guasti & Rizzi 2002; Cardinaletti 2004), but rather hosts a wide variety of grammatical categories with distinct pragmatic values, as is frequently observed for the prefieId of uncontroversial V2 systems (Diesing 1990:44; Müller 2004:§2; Frey 2004:3; Haider 2010:1). Note the following clauses in this regard where a non-subject occurs in initial position:

(1) a. Motas autras consolacions li=fes le Senhers
    many other consolations her=make.3SG.PST the lord
    ‘the Lord made her many other consolations’ (Old Occitan, 47)

b. et eso mismo fizo a las arcas
   and that same do.3SG.PST to the chests
   ‘and he did the same to the chests’ (Old Spanish, 204)

---

4 In all the data from the corpus that follows, the variety is given along with the page number of the edition cited in the bibliography.
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(2) a. A kista Tarsilla si **apparsi** [ uno] bisavu di sanctu Gregoryu...
to this Tarsilla si appear.3SG.PST an ancestor of Saint Gregory...
‘An ancestor of Saint Gregory appeared to this Tarsilla’ (Old Sicilian, 258)
b. A me li=**deré-vu**!
to me them=give.2SG.FUT you
‘You will give them to me’ (Old Venetian, 49)

(3) a. Adonc dis **le_lectors** mot consolatz que...
then say.3SG.PST the clerk very comfortingly that
‘The clerk then said, very comfortingly, that…’ (Old Occitan, 150)
b. E **così feso**=no dentier
and thus go.1PL.PST=we inside
‘And we then went inside’ (Old Venetian, 44)

(4) a. Et por ce vos=**pre** le...
and for that you=ask.1SG I
‘And because of this, I ask you…’ (Old French, 152)
b. Vinendu lu tempu di la morti di kistu Stephanu, **vinniru** multi
come.PROG the time of the death of this Stephanu come.3PL.PST many
**pirsuni** a visitari=lu…
people to visit.INF=him
‘As the time of Stephanu’s death was coming, many people came to visit
him’ (Old Sicilian, 261-262)

Particularly significant are clauses such as the following where direct object fronting occurs without clitic resumption, examples of which are flatly ungrammatical or highly marginal in all but the most formal registers in the modern languages (Benincà 1988, 2001:§1.2.1; Zubizarreta 1998:103-5; Benincà & Poletto 2004:§2),

(5) a. Motas autras consolacions li=**fes** **le_Senhores**
many other consolations her=make.3SG.pst the lord
‘the Lord made her many other consolations’ (Old Occitan, Douceline 47)
b. Ceste avision **vit** li _rois Mordrains_ en son dormant;
this vision see.3SG.PST the king Mordrain in his sleep
‘The King Mordrains saw this vision in his sleep’ (Old French, 135)
c. Questo **avró**=e
this have.1sg.fut I
‘I will have this’ (Old Venetian, 45)
d. Zo **fichi** chillu previtì a czo ky
that do.3SG.PST that priest so that
‘That priest did this, in order to…’ (Old Sicilian, 161)
e. et eso mismo **fizo** a las arcas

---

5 Note that with new information direct objects, such orders are licit in Modern Sicilian due to the fact that is licenses Information Focus-Fronting (cf. Bentley 2007 and Cruschina 2006, 2011, 2012).

6 The exception to this is Modern Portuguese which we do not consider here. See Ambar (1992) and Costa (1998, 2004) for discussion.
and that same  do.3SG.PST to the chests  
‘and he did the same to the chests’ (Old Spanish, 204)

Thirdly and perhaps most tellingly of all, we find widespread evidence for ‘inversion’ structures as noted in much previous work on Medieval Romance (Benincà 1983:4-195; Roberts 1993:56; Vance, Donaldson & Steiner 2009:313-316; Salvesen 2013:136). Most significant are cases such as the following which instantiate so-called ‘Germanic-inversion’. Here we see the subject ‘straddled’ between verbal complements or adverbials standardly taken to the delimit the left boundary of the v-VP-complex (Cinque 2001, 2006:12; Cardinali & Shlonsky 2004:525; Ledgeway in press) and the finite verb, suggesting that the subject must be in a T-related specifier with the verb raised to a C-related head: 7

(6)  
a. quasi per virtuti de Deu non potissi lu focu passari chillu 
as-if by virtue of God NEG can.3SG.PST.SBJV the fire pass.INF that place  
locu duvi era lu episcupu 
place where be.3SG.PST the bishop  
‘Seemingly through the virtue of God, the fire was not able to spread through that place where the bishop was’ (Old Sicilian 36) 
b. e cosi er3sg rivà a casa de Macho de Robin 
and so be.1SG.PST=I arrive.PTCP at house of Macho de Robin  
‘and I thus arrived at the house of Macho de Robin’ (Old Venetian, 22)  
c. Ja vos=avoid il si longuement servi 
‘He has already served you such a long time’ (Old French, 119) 
d. Acostumat avia li sancta de pagar a Dieu las horas 
accustom.PTCP have.3SG.PST the saint to pay.INF to God the hours  
‘The Saint had become used to reciting her hours to God’ (Old Occitan, 159)  
e. Tanto es el casamiento mejor 
such be.3SG the wedding better  
‘And in making these assurances, he has already thought...’ (Old Spanish, 139)

Crucially these differ markedly from the postverbal subjects found in the Modern Romance languages in so-called ‘free inversion’ structures, where the subject obligatorily follows verbal complements such as those in (6) (Zubizarreta 1998:151f; Hulk & Pollock 2001:3; Sheehan 2006:99; Leonetti 2014:§2.1).

Finally, note that all the texts under examination show clear evidence of strong matrix/embedded asymmetries which once more are the hallmark of many Germanic V2 systems (Koster 1975; Den Besten 1983; Wikner 1995; Holmberg & Platzack 1995; Bentzen 2005; Julien 2007). As noted by many previous scholars, V2 matrix clauses give way to a dominant SVO order in embedded clauses (7):  

---

7 See Poleto (2014:3-11) for recent discussion of this kind of inversion in Old Italian and Wolfe (2015b:§2) for Old Spanish.
(7) a. eu ti=comandu … KY tu prindi kystu pani…
   ‘I command you … to take this bread’ (Old Sicilian, 88)
b. E’ digo CH'g’ era a casa mia
   ‘I say that=I be.1SG.PST at house my
   ‘I say that I was at my house’ (Old Venetian, 31)
c. Le paieres volia QU’ili servis los paures
   the father want.3SG.PST that-she serve.3SG the poor
   ‘Her father wanted her to serve the poor…’ (Old Occitan, 45)

These asymmetries fall out naturally if we assume that the target of verb-movement in matrix clauses is frequently filled with a complementiser or relativiser in embedded clauses which straddles the finite verb within the T-v-V domain.9

On the basis of these syntactic properties which unite all the varieties considered (see also Benincà 2004, 2006), we suggest that the point of continuity across all the Medieval Romance languages is that a C-related head bears a φ-probe which triggers finite verb-movement higher than the T-layer. The mere presence of V1 and V3* orders should therefore not preclude a V2 account as, fitting with the formulation of the V2 constraint in §1, there is strong independent evidence for verb-movement into the C-domain. As will now be shown, beyond this V-to-C movement there is significant microvariation and V1 and V3 orders are in fact crucial in determining this.

3. V3* Orders in Medieval Romance
3.1. V3* in French, Spanish and Venetian

In this section we outline the key empirical observations regarding V3 orders in French, Spanish and Venetian.

The observation that the elements triggering V3 in later Old French belong to a highly restricted class is by no means new (Skârup 1975:435-459; Roberts 1993:144; Vance 1997:61-62). Our reading of La Quête confirms this observation, with three environments permitting V3 orders: (i) the presence of an initial wh-clause, reason clause or if-clause (8), (ii) the presence of an initial Hanging Topic (9) and (iii) the presence of an initial speaker-orientated adverb (10):

(8) Et [quant il est apareillez],[ill] prent ses armes et monte
   and when he be.3SG appear.PTCP he take.3SG his weapons and ride.3SG.PST
   ‘When he appeared, he took his weapons and rode…’ (Old French, 129)
(9) [Li chevalier qui sont en pechité mortel], [ce] sont li terrien…
   the knights that be.3PL in sin mortal they be.3PL the earthly…”

---

8 See Salvesen & Walken (in press) for argumentation along these lines for Old French and Wolfe (2015a) for Medieval Romance in general. In Wolfe (2015b) it is shown that Old Spanish is not a symmetrical V2 language, pace Fontana (1993) et seq. but shows the same asymmetries as found elsewhere in Medieval Romance.

9 Note that the asymmetries could also fall out from Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990 et seq.) if merger of a complementiser/relativiser causes intervention effects which block additional merger operations in the left periphery.
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‘the knights who are mortal sinners, they are the earthly ones’ (Old French, 143)

(10) Et [neporec] [Nostre Sires] avoit mis tant de bien en toi…
and nevertheless our Lord has.3SG.PST put.PTCP such of good in you
‘And nevertheless our Lord has put so much good in you…’ (Old French, 126)

Fontana (1993:111f) and Benincà (2004:275) also note that V3 in Old Spanish is
restricted to a specific class of initial elements. In the Spanish text under examination,
initial wh-clauses, adverbial clauses, reason clauses and if-clauses and scene-setting
adverbs are also the principal environments triggering V3 (11), along with speaker-oriented
adverbials (12). There are no cases of initial Hanging Topics in our corpus:

(11) a. Et [luego que llego a la puerta] [el diablo] abrioge=la
and soon that arrive.3SG.PST at the door the devil open.3SG.PST=it
‘And as soon as he arrived at the door, the devil opened it’ (Old Spanish, 204)
b. Et [agora] [los que quieren dezir mal de mí] fablan en manera
and now those that want.3PL speak.INF bad of me speak.3PL in manner
de escarnio of derision
‘and now those who wish to speak ill of me, speak in jest’ (Old Spanish, 177)

(12) [Cierta mente] [este omne] non es culpado
certain ADV this man NEG be.3SG guilty
‘Certainly, this man is not guilty’ (Old Spanish, 205)

The later Old Venetian text examined, Lio Mazor, also patterns with the Spanish and
French texts in only permitting V3 with a highly restricted set of initial constituents. V3 is
only found with an initial adverb (13), Prepositional Phrase with an adverbial function (14)
or an initial temporal or wh-clause (15):

(13) [It(em)] [lo dito Çaín] acusà Menegin Beli
also the said Çaín accuse.3SG.PST Menegin Beli
‘The aforementioned Çaín also accused Menegin Beli’ (Old Venetian, 39)

(14) (E) [a ste parole] [lo capet(an)] esí fora de sot el portegal ad
and at these words the captain go.3SG.PST out of under the colonnade at
mood irato
‘and when these words were said the captain came out from under
the colonnade, angrily…’ (Old Venetian, 21)

(15) (E) [siando là], [lo dito Pero (e) Çulian(n)] bra(n)chà lo viger
and be.PROG there the said Pero and Çulian snatch.3PL.PST the hatchery
‘And being there, the said Pero and Çulian grabbed the [fish] hatchery’ (Old
Venetian, 59)

Following these observations about the elements that trigger V3 in the languages under
examination, note briefly what is not found. Firstly note that although Table 1 shows V3 to
be robustly attested in all the languages, this cannot be said for V4* orders which in later
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Old French, Spanish and Venetian are hardly attested (0.21 - 0.63%). Secondly, note that the Topic + Focus orders which are frequently discussed in the literature as characteristic of Old (Italo-)Romance V2 (Benincà 2004:275f; Ledgeway 2007:124; Salvi 2012:105; Poletto 2014:16), are also not found in any of these three texts, a key point of contrast with Occitan and Sicilian considered below.

3.2. V3* in Sicilian and Occitan

Our Sicilian text, Sanctu Gregoria, patterns with the varieties considered above in licensing V3 with an initial adverbial expression, but differs in two crucial respects. Firstly, V3* orders resulting from the co-occurrence of a Topic and Informational Focus are frequent in the text (16), as in many other Old Italo-Romance varieties (Benincà 2004:275f, 2006; Ledgeway 2007:124; Salvi 2012:105; Poletto 2014:16). Secondly, V4* orders constitute 11.7% of the matrix corpus and are thus robustly attested (17), in contrast to the French, Spanish and Venetian where such orders are near-entirely absent:

(16) [killi pirsuni] [pir la grandi pagura ki āppiru] [si] partèru
those people for the great fear that have.3PL.PST SI leave.3PL.PST
‘Those people left because of the great fear that they felt’ (Old Sicilian, 262)

(17) [tamen poy di la morti loru], [li ossa loru] [pir virtuti divina]
then after of the death their the bones their by virtue divine
operannu miraculi
perform.3PL miracles
‘Then after their death, their bones perform miracles through divine virtue’ (Old Sicilian, 262)

The somewhat simplistic notion that Old Occitan is descriptively less ‘strict’ as regards V2 when compared to its sister language Old French is already hinted at in the literature (Sitardou 2005, 2012:572; Vance, Donaldson & Steiner 2009:317). This descriptive generalisation is confirmed by our analysis, where our Old Occitan texts features both Topic + Focus orders (18) and a robust proportion of V4* orders (9.72%) (19), thus patterning with Old Sicilian in this regard:

(18) [ili], [per amor del Senhor], lur=lavava los pes
she for love of the Lord them=wash.3SG.PST the feet
‘Through her love of the Lord, she washed their feet’ (Old Occitan, 45)

(19) E [adoncs] [ili], [ab amars critz], dizia a la Verge
and thus she with bitter cries say.3SG.PST to the Virgin
‘and she cried in a bitter tone to the Virgin…’ (Old Occitan, 136)

To summarise, in the French, Spanish and Venetian texts V4* is not found and V3 is restricted to occurring with an initial class of adverbial expressions and speaker-oriented adverbials. This contrasts with the Sicilian and Occitan texts, where V4* is robustly attested and V3* orders also permit the co-occurrence of a Topic and Focus.

3.3. Analysis

Here we draw on the intuition that the formal features responsible for triggering the V2
property can be present on different functional heads in the left-periphery (see Poletto 2002, Roberts 2004 and Biberauer & Roberts 2015 amongst others), yielding ‘high’ or ‘low’ V2 systems. The differences as regards V3 orders fall out from this proposed distinction.

Assume first, building on the long-held intuition in the Germanic literature that the V2 property is linked to finiteness (Platzack 1986, 1995; Holmberg and Platzack 1995; Vikner 1995), that in a subclass of V2 languages the functional head hosting the φ-probe and EF responsible for V2 is the lowest head in the articulated left periphery of Rizzi (1997, 2004, 2006) and Benincà & Poletto (2004), namely CFin. Assuming the ‘bottleneck’ approach to V2 pursued by Haegeman (1996, 2012:109-111), Roberts (2004) and Cardinaletti (2010) under which all constituents reaching the left-periphery via internal merge must move into the C-domain via Spec-FinP, CFin probes for a finite verbal Goal which undergoes Head Movement before CFin triggers merger of a phrasal constituent in its specifier. If the merged constituent bears discourse-related formal features it will then move further into the Topic-Focus layer.

The key observation for our purposes is that in the derivation in (20), where the initial constituent is a Focus, there is nothing a priori preventing first-merge of additional constituents higher in the functional structure within the Frame or Topic fields, yielding V3 or V4* orders:

\[
(ii) \quad [\text{FrameP} (\text{Frame-Setter}) [\text{FocCP} [\text{Top} (\text{XP}_{\text{Topic}})] [\text{FocP} \ \text{XP}_{\text{Focus}} [\text{FinP} \ \text{XP}_{\text{Focus}} [\text{CFin} \ V]] [\text{TP} \ \text{XP}_{\text{focus}}]]]]]
\]

This is of course precisely the kind of system instantiated within our Sicilian and Occitan texts and also closely matches observations by others on V3 orders in, amongst other varieties, Old Italian (Benincà 2004:275f; Poletto 2006, 2014:16) and Early Old French (Labelle 2007:303; Donaldson 2012:1038 and Mathieu 2012:339-341). These varieties are frequently described as ‘relaxed’ V2 grammars (cf. Benincà 1983-4; Franco 2009:9; Casalicchio & Cognola 2014; Cognola 2015), an intuition we propose can be formalised as describing a grammar where the head bearing the features responsible for the V2 property is low in the functional structure, and thus permits lexicalisation of an array of functional projections structurally higher than the moved verb.\(^{10}\)

However, as noted above, the initial constituent in V3 clauses in the later Old French, Spanish and Venetian texts examined is more restricted. Taking together the adverbial clause and scene-setting adverbials above in (9, 12, 14, 15, 16), we see that these perform a deictic function in anchoring the clause in terms of its spatial and temporal coordinates. It is precisely these pragmatico-semantic characteristics which are standardly associated with the structurally highest projections in the C-layer in much cartographic work (see Haegeman 2006b:1662-1663; Poletto & Zanuttini 2010:222f and in particular Giorgi 2010, 2012). It is this observation in fact that leads Poletto (2000:100, 2002:222-225) and Benincà & Poletto (2004:66) to postulate a ‘scene setting position’ for adverbs which, significantly for our purposes, is located structurally higher than CFin (Poletto 2002:226; Benincà & Poletto 2004:66).

Now witness the examples in (11, 13). These explicitly encode the attitude of the

\(^{10}\) A consideration of Early Germanic data is also relevant here. See Fuss (2008), Petrowa (2011) and Walkden (2014) on various earlier Germanic languages which were clearly Verb Second, yet permitted V3* constructions to a greater extent than their modern counterparts.
speaker to the utterance and are thus ‘speaker-oriented’ adverbs in the terms of Jackendoff (1972:89), Cinque (1999:11-12), Haegeman (2006a:32, 2006b:165, 2012:172-175, 224-225) and Ernst (2014:110) amongst others. Again, based on assumptions that functional projections associated with the deixis and viewpoint of the speech participants precede the Topic-Focus layer (Sigurðsson 2004, 2011; Haegeman & Hill 2013:381-382), it can be hypothesised in line with similar proposals by Haumann (2007:277) that these initial adverbs in V3 constructions lexicalise projections within the Frame-field.  

Furthermore, the example in (10) is an instance of a Hanging Topic. These are again analysed by many scholars as preceding the Topic-Focus layer (see Frascarelli 2000:169 and Ledgeway 2010:279 amongst others) and are shown clearly by Poletto (2002:235) to occupy a structurally higher position than C_{Force}. We illustrate here with a Topic-initial clause:

\[
\text{(iii) } \text{[FrameP (Frame-Setter) [ForceP XP_{\text{Topic}} [C_{\text{Force}} V] [\text{TopP XP_{\text{Zopic}} [\text{FocP [\text{FinP XP_{\text{Zopic}} [\text{Spec-C_{\text{Force}}}} [\text{[TP... XP_{\text{Zopic}}]]]]]]]}}
\]

The fact that only elements lexicalising functional projections higher than C_{Force} can trigger V3 in the systems examined is one very strong piece of evidence that they are Force-V2 systems, similar to the Rhaeto-Romance varieties described in Poletto (2000, 2002) and the West Germanic languages described by Biberauer & Roberts (2015). Under Poletto’s (2002) account, once an internally merged constituent satisfies the V2-related features on C_{Fin} and reaches a position within the Topic-Focus layer, it then moves higher to Spec-C_{Force}P, with the finite verb also moving to C_{Force}°:

Such a proposal straightforwardly accounts for the data outlined above, as only elements within the Frame-field would be predicted to trigger V3, as shown in (iii). The nature of V3 in Force-V2 languages is therefore restricted and the empirical generalisation regarding its occurrence can be formulated as follows:

\[
\text{(iv) } \text{In Force-V2 languages, V3 orders only occur with an initial constituent}
\]

\[
\text{lexicalising the Frame-field of the left periphery}
\]

The proposal is therefore that there is systematic variation between two types of V2 systems in Medieval Romance as regards the type of V3 licensed and that this variation is conditioned by whether the varieties feature a Fin or Force-V2 grammar. We will now propose that this bi-partite Fin/Force distinction also conditions variation as regards V1 orders.

4. V1 Orders in Medieval Romance

4.1. V1 in French, Spanish and Venetian

In this section the descriptive facts concerning the distribution of V1 orders in the texts studied are outlined, before the discussion and analysis is presented in §4.3.

\[\text{Note that one could easily propose a more fine-grained approach under which evaluative, evidential and epistemic uses of ‘speaker-oriented’ adverbs occupy different functional projections in the leftmost reaches of the left periphery. See Speas (2004) expanding on ideas in Cinque (1999) for such an approach.}\]
In line with previous observations in the literature which show V1 in matrix declaratives in later Old French to be either entirely absent or exceptionally rare (Skårup 1975:291; Vance 1997:18-20; Rouveret 2003:193-195), no V1 at all is found within *La Quête*.

Within the later Old Spanish text considered, V1 is found but is again rare (2.29%). All examples involve verba dicendi which are discourse-initial and we term Narrative V1:

(20) **Fablava** otra vez el conde Lucanor con Patronio [su consejero]
    Speak.3SG.PST other time the count Lucanor with Patronio his adviser
    'Count Lucanor spoke another time with Patronio, his adviser' (Old Spanish, 172)

Following the analysis of Reis (1995, 2000a, b) these are analysed as clauses which 'express/recount a proposition that is true' rather than explicitly asserting its truth value (Reis 2000a:97). This construction of course reflects a well-known V1 environment in Germanic V2 systems (Sigurdsson 1990:46; Önnerfors 1997; Axel 2007:215).

Venetian, as Table 1 shows, shows quantitatively widespread V1 (24.37%), which is nevertheless qualitatively restricted. The vast majority of V1 clauses (142/154) begin with verba dicendi and are thus Narrative V1 clauses:

(21) **Doman(n)dà** s’el vito ch’…
    ask.3PL.PST if-he see.3SG.PST that
    'They asked if he saw that…' (Old Venetian, 21)

The remaining V1 clauses feature a Null Topic which is co-referent with a nominal expression in the preceding discourse. This construction is rare and appears characteristic of direct speech and appears deictically anchored in the 'here and now', again reflecting a construction found in a number of Modern Germanic languages (Sigurdsson 1989:145f, 2011:279; Sigurdsson & Maling 2010:60f). We term this Deictic Topic Continuity V1:

(22) ela… la quala dis… «çeto che viti che Maria…»
    she the which say.3SG.PST accept.1SG that see.1SG.PST that Maria…
    'she, who said "I accept that I saw that Maria…"' (Old Venetian 47)

To summarise, V1 matrix declaratives are absent in later Old French, restricted to **Narrative V1** in later Old Spanish and appear restricted to Narrative V1 or a particular kind of **Topic Continuity V1** in later Old Venetian.

### 4.2. V1 in Sicilian and Occitan

Old Sicilian shows the most qualitatively varied distribution of V1. First, cases such as (25) are found where a **Narrative V1** clause is licensed, similar to that found in Spanish and Venetian:

(23) **Dichi.** adunca, sanctu Gregoriu ki
    say.3SG.PST then Saint Gregory that
    'Saint Gregory said again that.' (Old Sicilian, 254)

Secondly, clauses such as (26) are widespread which are a form of **Topic Continuity V1**
with a less restricted distribution than that found in Old Venetian. These are not restricted
to direct speech and in keeping with their pragmatic characteristic of continuing topicality
these never occur discourse-initially and are always found within a paragraph of text, again
mirroring similar constructions in Germanic (Santorini 1989:55; Sigurdsson 1990:62;
Koeneman 2002:195):

(24) **Tornav** al monisterio
    return.3SG.PST to-the monastery
    ‘He returned to the monastery’ (Old Sicilian, 86)

A third class of V1 clauses are also found where the clause serves ‘to introduce not-yet
activated referents into a discourse’ (Lambrecht 1994:113) and is thus rhematic. Rhematic
clauses which are verb-initial are widespread in the earlier stages of the Germanic
languages (Axel 2007:120f; Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2010):

(25) **Mandau** Deu unu liuni da unu voschu
    send.3SG.PST God a lion from a forest
    ‘God sent a lion out from the forest’ (Old Sicilian, 265)

The Occitan text does not show Narrative V1, but does show both **Topic Continuity V1**
(28) and **Rhematic V1** (29) with seemingly identical distribution to V1 clauses in Old
Sicilian:

(26) **Corregron** tantost après per seguir=las
    run.3PL.PST soon after to follow.INF=them
    ‘They ran soon after to follow them’ (Old Occitan, 54)

(27) **Era** oracion en toto cauzas sos refugz
    be.3SG.PST prayer in all things her refuge
    ‘Prayer was her refuge in all things’ (Old Occitan, 106)

In summary, Sicilian shows evidence of Narrative V1, which is also found in Spanish
and Venetian. Both Sicilian and Occitan also show evidence for a kind of **Topic Continuity V1**
and **Rhematic V1** which is not found in French, Spanish or Venetian.

4.3. Analysis

There is therefore significant variation between the Medieval Romance varieties
considered concerning the licensing of V1, which once again can be linked to the locus of
the V2 property.

Recall that both the Fin-V2 systems, Old Sicilian and Old Occitan, license V1 in three
contexts, which were termed **Topic Continuity V1**, **Rhematic V1** and **Narrative V1**. Building
2014:21-23) amongst others, one can propose that both the **Topic Continuity** and **Rhematic V1**
constructions in Medieval Romance involve a variant of pro. Following Poletto (2014)
one can think of this as a form of **Shift Topic** in the terms of Frascarelli & Hinterhölzl
(2007:88). In addition to the **D-feature** and φ-features borne by pro in canonical Null
Subject Languages (Roberts 2010), this variant of pro also bears an unvalued Topic feature.
There are in fact two motivations for the postulation of a uTop feature. The first is a
pragmatic motivation, namely that Null Topics are frequently realised in Medieval
Romance in contexts where a Null Subject would not be licit in the modern Romance languages (see Poletto 2014:20-22 who compares Old Italian data with Modern Italian data in Frascarelli 2007 for discussion). The second point is a theoretical one, namely that under Roberts’ (2010) theory of Defective Goals, a Null Subject undergoes deletion in Spec-TP and would as such be unable to satisfy CFin’s EF if it remained in this position. The presence of the additional unvalued Topic feature, however, effectively ‘delays’ this process of deletion and motivates the movement of proTop into the Topic-layer via Spec-FinP, which thus satisfies Fin’s EF.

Pulling this argumentation together, the key notion is that in the Fin-V2 languages the majority of V1 cases can be assumed to have a derivation like the following, with verb-movement into the C-layer and a Null Topic present in the Topic-layer of the CP:

\[
(v) \quad \text{[FrameP [ForceP [TopP proTop [CTopVFin] [FocP [FinP proFinVFin] [CFinVFin] [TP]]]]]]
\]

A final class of V1 found within the Fin-V2 systems is Narrative V1. Following Zwart’s (1997:220) analysis of a similar construction in Dutch, assume that these clauses involve a null discourse-operator in Spec-ForceP. Thus, the null elements all lexicalise projections to the left of the moved verb in CFin.

In the Force-V2 systems, the situation concerning V1 is very clearly more restricted. The same analysis as offered for Narrative V1 above presumably applies to the Force-V2 languages, with the crucial observation being that a null Discourse Operator in Spec-CForceP is within the assumed verbal prefix of Force-V2 languages (Frame-Force).

The particularly restricted characteristics of the ‘deictically-anchored’ Null Topics in Venetian suggest they may require a partially distinct analysis to those Null Topics found within the Fin-V2 languages. In a similar spirit to the analysis offered in Sigurdsson (2011), suppose that this subtype of Null Topic may have an additional unvalued feature, which following Sigurdsson (2004, 2010) we can hypothesise as \{μA\}, which must receive its value from functional projections in the Frame-field associated with the discourse-participants. If we again assume this to be a variant of pro, it will need to move cyclically through both Spec-CFinP and Spec-CForceP before reaching its eventual position. What both these analyses have in common is that, in a parallel fashion to the analysis proposed above regarding V3 for overt left-peripheral constituents, we see once again that null constituents in the Force-V2 languages can plausibly be analysed as occupying a position in the Frame-Force-field.

The observation that the locus of the V2 property limits the null elements which can occur in the prefial goes a long way towards accounting for a long-held observation about what is not found preverbally in the Force-V2 systems. Note the widespread observation that Null Subjects do not occur preverbally in later Old French (Vanelli, Renzi & Benincà 1985:175; Adams 1987:12; Roberts 1993:84f; Vance 1997:200), a claim which also applies to later Old Spanish (Wolfe 2015b). If, as suggested above, proTop constitutes a Defective Goal in relation to CTop and then deletes in Fin-V2 systems, it will never be realised preverbally. This is because the site for deletion is lower than the landing site of the moved verb in CForce. As such, a Null Topic of the Sicilian and Occitan kind will never be able to
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satisfy the higher EF in a Force-V2 language:\textsuperscript{13} 14

\[
\text{(vi) } \quad \text{[FrameP (Frame-Setter) \{ForceP pro\text{Top} \{C_{\text{Force}} v_{\text{Fin}}\}\text{TopP pro\text{Top}\ldots\}]]}
\]

The overall analysis offered is therefore that the types of null elements which can satisfy the V2 constraint in both Fin and Force-V2 languages are sensitive to the locus of V2. Far from providing evidence against the V2 hypothesis (Kaiser 2002), the V1 orders found in fact provide revealing evidence which improves our understanding of the types of V2 systems under consideration.

5. \textit{V1 and V3 in V2 Grammars}

A body of independent evidence was presented in §2 that the varieties considered feature verb-movement into the C-domain, corroborating amongst very many others the recent studies of Benincà (2004, 2006, 2013), Poletto (2006, 2014), Labelle (2007) and Labelle & Hirschbühler (in press). Far from presenting compelling evidence against the V2 hypothesis as argued by Kaiser (2002) and subsequent works, the licensing of V3\textsuperscript{*} and V1 orders instantiates the different strategies encoded in the V2 grammar for lexicalising the hierarchy of functional projections to the left of the finite verb. In Fin-V2 languages this ‘space’ is structurally rich, with both overt and null constituents merged in the full Frame-Force-Topic-Focus layer. In Force-V2 languages, the verbal prefield can be conceptualised somewhat simplistically as structurally ‘smaller’, due to the landing site of the verb in C\textsubscript{Force}, constituting only the Frame-Force layer. What are the more general consequences of this proposal for a revised theory of Medieval Romance V2 and the V2 phenomenon more generally?

The point of commonality between all the languages considered concerns the featural makeup of C\textsubscript{Fin}. In both Fin and Force-V2 systems, the latter of which can be thought of as entailing a double ‘bottleneck’ (cf. Poletto 2002), C\textsubscript{Fin} always probes the finite-verb and also requires merger of an overt or null constituent in its specifier due to its EF. We can thus think of one of the very significant changes to have taken place from Medieval to Modern Romance to be the ‘downstairs’ shift of loosely-termed ‘EPP-effects’ and $\varphi$-agreement from the upper CP-phase to the lower T-V-V domain. This may well constitute the core of Benincà’s (2004:245) ‘abstract “Medieval Romance”’. Close examination of a number of closely related varieties, however, reveals rich variation beyond this point of

\textsuperscript{13} This proposal in fact has an additional very desirable effect, namely that it suggests that once V2 languages undergo reanalysis from a Fin-V2 to a Force-V2 system (Wolfe 2015a), Null Subjects will become unstable in the system as they will only ever be realised in postverbal position. This may go someway towards accounting for why in French (Adams 1987; Vance 1997; Roberts 1993), Northern Italian Dialects (Vanelli, Renzi & Benincà 1986; Poletto 1995) and the majority of the Germanic V2 languages (Sigurdsson 1993; Fuss 2004; Walkden 2013) Null Subjects gradually disappeared from the medieval period onwards, leading some (incorrectly) to claim that there is an inherent incompatibility between a V2 syntax and Null Subjects \textit{tour court} (Juegali & Safir 1989:33).

\textsuperscript{14} Note however that this does not rule out in a Force-V2 system a form of Null Topic receiving its referents for projections higher than Force, related with SpeakerDeixis. This may be the correct analysis for Modern Germanic Null Topics for example (cf. Sigurdsson 2004, 2010) and also, as I suggest above, Old Venetian.
continuity.

In Fin-V2 systems the verb must only obligatorily raise as high as C\textsubscript{Fin}. In these languages multiple constituents can be merged to the left of the finite verb, providing Relativised Minimality (Rizzi 1990; Starke 2001) is respected, yielding V3, V4 and even V5 orders. The data outlined above suggest that there is in fact also a direct correlation between 'low' Fin-V2 systems and the V1 orders licensed, with a Null Topic that merges in Spec-C\textsubscript{Top} only licensed in Fin-V2 languages in both rhematic and topic continuity clauses. We therefore reach a different conclusion to Vikner (1995:90) who states ‘[t]he possibility of V1 declaratives is determined by some property, maybe a lexical one, which is entirely unrelated to other differences between V2 languages’.

Force-V2 systems, following the spirit of Poletto (2002), which emerge in the later stages of Old Venetian, Old Spanish and Old French constitute ‘stricter’ V2 systems. As evidenced in Table 1, the preference for linear placement of the finite verb in second position is generally more rigid in these languages and V3 orders are limited to first-merged Frame-elements. Seemingly only a Null Discourse operator in Spec-ForceP can trigger V1 in these systems. It was suggested above that implementing Robert’s (2010) theory of Defective Goals with Null Topics provides at least a first attempt at an answer as to why V1 clauses appear much more widespread in some V2 systems than others; assuming a high locus of V2 in ‘strict’ V2 systems, has the very desirable result of deriving the restrictions on V1 in some V2 systems from independently-motivated properties of Narrow Syntax.

Our proposals concerning the left periphery of the V2 Romance languages can thus be schematised as follows:

(vii) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Frame}\text{-}\text{Setter/Hanging Topic/}p_{\text{Top}}(\text{A}) \text{ } \text{Force} \text{-}\text{P} \text{ } \text{Merged Phrasal} \\
\text{Constituent (Force-V2)} \text{ } \text{Discourse Operator}_{\text{P}} \text{ } \text{Asserted} \text{ } \text{Force} \text{-}\text{P} \text{ } \text{V}_{\text{Top}} \text{-}\text{P} \text{ } \text{assert} \text{ } \text{Force} \text{-}\text{P} \text{ } \text{V}_{\text{Top}} \text{-}\text{P} \\
\text{Topic/}p_{\text{Top}}(\text{A}) \text{ } \text{Focus} \text{ } \text{FinP} \text{ } \text{Merged Phrasal Constituent} \\
\text{V}_{\text{Fin}} \text{-}\text{P} \text{ } \text{assert} \text{ } \text{FinP} \text{-}\text{P} \text{-}\text{P} \\
\end{array}
\]

6. Summary and Consequences

Our overall conclusion is that the mere attestation of V1 and V3* orders should not be viewed as evidence against a Verb Second grammar tout court, providing that the variation found is systematic and that there is independent evidence that the verb moves at least as high as C\textsubscript{Fin}. In fact, we have proposed that the types of V1 and V3 orders attested provide a valuable lens through which to analyse the type of Verb Second system under examination. There are at least two domains for future research which will allow this hypothesis to be developed.

The first future research avenue concerns diachrony, in particular what kinds of changes are observed throughout the history of the Medieval and Modern Romance Verb Second languages and how this is linked to the Fin/Force distinction. A first attempt at this account is offered in Wolfe (2015a, b), where it is proposed that all the varieties considered here are initially Fin-V2 systems, licensing the expected thematic and topic continuity V1 structures and Topic + Focus V3(*) orders and that the Force-V2 systems emerging in the 13th century are ‘innovations’ from this starting point.

The second topic for future research concerns the wider cross-linguistic implications for
the hypothesis, with particular reference to Germanic Verb Second systems. Very tentatively it seems to be the case that the predictions developed on the basis of the Romance data hold cross-linguistically, with V1 and V3 cases of the types found in the Fin-V2 Romance systems attested in the Early Germanic languages (Kroch & Taylor 1997; Axel 2007; Petrova & Solf 2008; Walkden 2014), with similar though not identical restrictions on V1 and V3 at play in the Modern West Germanic languages which are taken to be Force-V2 systems by Biberauer & Roberts (2015) amongst others. Note the important point however that the hypothesis predicts that functional projections constituting the verbal prefield will be the same in Fin and Force-V2 systems cross-linguistically, but how particular languages lexicalise these projections may be distinct from one system to another.\(^{15}\)

The overall claim of the article is that there is a richer array of variation concerning the left periphery of Verb Second languages both in Romance and beyond than has previously been acknowledged, but that this rich variation is systematic and falls out from independently motivated features of the grammar.
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