

V2 BEYOND BORDERS: THE *HISTOIRE ANCIENNE JUSQU'À CÉSAR**

ADAM LEDGEWAY
UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
AND DOWNING COLLEGE

ABSTRACT While the V2 status of medieval Romance and old French in particular is widely supported by detailed empirical and statistical studies, there are still some dissenting voices, such that the introduction and detailed scrutiny of new data, especially involving a range of more diverse textual sources, is a welcome addition in that it can provide important confirmatory evidence in favour of the V2 hypothesis. The present article therefore undertakes a detailed examination of the word order of a non-canonical old French prose text, the *Histoire Ancienne jusqu'à César* (henceforth *HA*), of particular interest since its earliest manuscript witnesses were produced outside of France providing us with a precious example of a supralocal use of French. Within this context, the study of word order and, in particular, the evidence for a V2 constraint in the *HA* offers us a discrete scientifically-controllable variable by which to measure the extent of structural unity across those mutually intelligible medieval koinés, of which the language of the *HA* is but one example, albeit from outside of France. An examination of the word order of the *HA*, in itself an original result, is shown to follow a V2 syntax, thereby underlining the salience of this structural constraint as a distinctive and stable feature of the grammars of medieval French texts produced both inside and outside of France. At the same time, this strengthens, in turn, claims for the existence of a common medieval Romance syntax characterized by a shared structural norm in the form of the V2 constraint, arguably the common denominator and hallmark of all medieval Romance grammars.

* I should like to thank two anonymous reviewers and Pierre Larrivée for their most helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this article. My sincere thanks also go to Simone Ventura for many insightful discussions of a number of points relating to the nature and language of the *HA*. Finally, I should like to thank the audiences of *The Values of French Seminar*, King's College London (23–24 June 2017) and the *Secrets of Success Workshop*, University of Oslo (11–12 January 2019) where the results of the present research were originally presented. Any remaining errors are of course my sole responsibility.

1 INTRODUCTION

There is considerable consensus and increasing evidence within the descriptive¹ and theoretical² literature that the syntax of medieval Romance, as well as late Latin (cf. Ledgeway 2017), was characterized by a verb-second (V2) constraint. Accordingly, in root clauses, and in certain types of embedded clause, the finite verb is argued to raise systematically to the vacant C (complementizer) position, a movement operation which is variously accompanied by the fronting of one or more pragmatically-salient constituents to the left of the raised verb to target topic and focus positions situated in the left periphery. Now, while the V2 status of medieval Romance and old French in particular is widely supported by detailed empirical and statistical studies like those cited in footnote 2, there are still some dissenting voices, notably Martins (1994; 2002), Kaiser (1999; 2002; 2002–3), Sornicola (2000), Eide (2006), Rinke (2009), Rinke & Elsig (2010), Sitaridou (2012), Zimmermann (2014), such that the introduction and detailed scrutiny of new data, especially involving a range of more diverse textual sources, is a welcome addition in that it can provide important confirmatory evidence in favour of the V2 hypothesis. It is for this reason that the present study undertakes a detailed examination of the word order of a non-canonical old French prose text, the *Histoire Ancienne jusqu'à César* (henceforth *HA*), a universal history whose textual transmissions travelled widely throughout Europe and the Mediterranean in the medieval period (Ventura 2019; Gaunt *In press*).³ Composed in Flanders between 1208–13, a region which was not then politically part of France, the first redaction of the *HA* is therefore of particular interest since its earliest manuscript witnesses, based on the Paris manuscript BNF f. fr. 20125, were produced outside of France in Acre (in the Kingdom of Jerusalem),⁴ providing us with a precious example of a supralocal use of French transmitted by scribes who were often multilingual, or in any case not necessarily from France, and intended for a broad linguistic readership across France, Italy and the eastern Mediterranean, many of whom would not have had French as a

1 Cf. Price (1971: 259f.), Skårup (1975), Herman (1990), Lombardi & Middleton (2004).

2 Cf., among others, Vanelli, Renzi & Benincà (1985), Vanelli (1986; 1999), Adams (1987), Fontana (1993; 1997), Roberts (1993), Benincà (1995; 2006; 2013), Lemieux & Dupuis (1995), Ribeiro (1995), Vance (1995; 1997), Salvi (2004; 2012; 2016: 1005–9), Labelle (2007), Ledgeway (2007; 2008), Radwan (2011), Salvesen (2013), Bech & Salvesen (2014), Poletto (2014), Steiner (2014), Wolfe (2015a, 2015b, 2015c, 2015d; 2018a), Cruschina & Ledgeway (2016: 571f.). For an analysis of V2 in old Romanian, see Nicolae (2015: 155–98), Nicolae & Niculescu (2015) and Dragomirescu & Nicolae (2015).

3 See *The Values of French Literature and Language in the European Middle Ages*. ERC Advanced Grant at King's College London. Accessible at the address: <http://www.tvof.ac.uk/>.

4 Or at the very least, copied in northern France from a manuscript from Acre.

native language. It is for this reason that [Gaunt \(2015: 49\)](#) concludes that ‘the French of the *Histoire* [...] represents a deliberate supralocal koinization of the language, one intended to be at home wherever it travels’.⁵

Within this context, the study of word order and, in particular, the evidence for a V2 constraint in the *HA* offers us a discrete scientifically-controllable variable by which to measure the extent of structural unity across those mutually intelligible medieval koinés, of which the language of the *HA* is but one example, albeit from outside of France, conventionally considered to constitute a single ‘language’, namely old French. If an examination of the word order of the *HA*, in itself an original result, can be shown to follow a V2 syntax, then this underlines the salience of this structural constraint as a distinctive and stable feature of the grammars of medieval French texts produced both inside and outside of France, including by perhaps less than fully native scribes.⁶ At the same time, this strengthens, in turn, claims for the existence of a common medieval Romance syntax characterized by a shared structural norm in the form of the V2 constraint, arguably the common denominator and hallmark of all medieval Romance grammars. Consequently, in what follows I undertake a systematic study of the *HA* to determine the proper characterization of the word order of the text and to consider in particular whether it can be legitimately considered to present a V2 syntax on a par with the well-studied grammars of other medieval French texts. The results, based on detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses of a sample of the Paris f. fr. 20125 manuscript (dated between 1270–90) and, where relevant, integrated with appropriate comparisons with other closely related manuscripts based on the first redaction, confirm the V2 nature of the syntax of the *HA*, whose surface word order patterns can only be interpreted as the output of an asymmetric V2 grammar.

⁵ Nonetheless, in many other respects the Paris BNF f. fr. 20125 manuscript proves quite conservative, preserving, for example, north(east)ern dialectal forms in its lexis. For a detailed examination and discussion of the nature of the language and its place within the continuum of dialects and varieties of old French, see [Ventura \(Forthcoming\)](#).

⁶ While the author of the original text was no doubt a native speaker of French (possibly Wauchier de Denain), it is less clear whether the scribe(s) of the Paris manuscript BNF f. fr. 20125 was (/were) native or not, although the relatively conservative nature of the language of the manuscript would *a priori* suggest a native or near-native proficiency (S. [Ventura](#), p.c.). For a detailed and exhaustive treatment of this question, see [Ventura \(Forthcoming\)](#). For an extreme case of an old French text, or rather Italo-French text, highlighting the non-native linguistic competence of its author, see [Bougy \(2005\)](#).

2 THE HISTOIRE ANCIENNE

2.1 A quantitative analysis

For the purposes of the present study a representative sample of the *Eneas* Section (§§588-611) of the *HA*, consisting of some 12,521 words from the interpretive edition of the Paris f. fr. 20125 manuscript,⁷ was analysed and all examples of finite declarative root and embedded clauses were recorded, with the exception of relative clauses which arguably present some quite different properties in that they generally seem to be more resistant to V2 (for discussion and references, see Holmberg 2015). Also omitted from our sample were root and embedded clauses introduced by *si* (< sic), although some preliminary observations about such clauses are presented in §3, as well as coordinated V1 clauses such as (1) involving (asyndetic) coordination with a preceding clause, in which the theme of the first clause is interpreted as the theme of the coordinated clause. In (1), for instance, the thematic subject *Eneas* of the first clause is also understood as the thematic subject of the second coordinated clause, but it is impossible to tell from the superficial order at what level coordination operates in such examples (e.g. CP, TP or even *vP*) and, consequently, whether the fronted subject *Eneas* ranges over both coordinates or just the first. Given the difficulties in confidently assessing whether such coordinated clauses instantiate cases of V1 or V2(*), all such cases have been excluded from all counts in this study.

- (1) *Eneas les regretoit par lor nons [et ramentevoit*
 Aeneas them= bewailed by their names and recalled
lor forces]
 their strengths
 ‘Aeneas mourned for them remembering them each by name and
 recalled their strengths’ (§594.2)

The statistical information regarding verb position in root clauses gleaned from our textual sample is presented in Table 1, where clauses have been further classified according to whether they contain a transitive, unaccusative or athematic predicate.⁸

7 The *Histoire ancienne jusqu’à César*. A digital edition, BnF, f. fr. 20125. Interpretive edition, ed. by Hannah Morcos with the collaboration of Simon Gaunt, Simone Ventura, Maria Teresa Rachetta and Henry Ravenhall; with technical support from Paul Caton, Ginestra Ferraro, Marcus Husar and Geoffrey Noël. Accessible at the address: <https://tvof.ac.uk/textviewer/?p1=Fr20125/interpretive/section/6>.

8 I use ‘transitive’ here as a short-hand term to refer to all predicates with an external argument, irrespective of whether they additionally assign one or more internal arguments (viz. unerga-

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals	V-final
V1	4 (0.7%)	2 (0.4%)	4 (0.7%)	10 (1.9%)	–
V2	170 (31.5%)	67 (12.4%)	192 (35.5%)	429 (79.4%)	6,8,6: 20 (3.7%)
V3	45 (8.3%)	25 (4.6%)	30 (5.6%)	100 (18.5%)	5,7,2: 14 (2.6%)
V4	–	–	1 (0.2%)	1 (0.2%)	–
Totals	219 (40.6%)	94 (17.4%)	227 (42%)	540 (100%)	34 (6.3%)

Table 1 Position of finite verb in root clauses

From the overview presented in Table 1, it is immediately clear that from a purely statistical perspective superficial V2 orders predominate over all other orders, occurring in ca. 80% of all root declaratives. By the same token, V1 and V4 orders are almost inexistent, a finding which readily lends itself to the apparent V2 nature of the text if we assume a distinction between V-in-Force and V-in-Fin V2 languages (cf. Roberts 2012; 2015; Wolfe 2015d; 2018a; Dadan 2019: ch. 3): according to this typology, the *HA* would display a V-in-Force V2 grammar where the higher landing site of the finite verb within the left periphery correctly predicts the ill-formedness of V1 and V4 structures (for detailed explanation of this point, see the discussion in §2.2.5). Nonetheless, these superficial observations cannot be taken as indisputable evidence for a V2 syntax given the hardly negligible occurrence of V3 orders in just over 18% of cases, the distribution of which also needs to be explained within a V2 grammar (for discussion, see §2.2.5). Note, finally, that although the totals given in the fifth column in Table 1 include V-final structures (cf. final column in Table 1), such clauses are not structurally ambiguous since OV had already been largely replaced by VO in late Latin (Ledgeway 2017: 169) and certainly by the time of our earliest Romance textual records, at least in root clauses (Ledgeway 2012: ch.5). It therefore follows that V-final structures in the *HA*, which amount to just 6.3% of all root clauses, are not to be interpreted as archaizing OV orders. Rather, as indicated in the final column of Table 1, the majority of V-final sequences in our sample are found in unerga-

tives, mono-, and ditransitives). ‘Athematic’ is used here to refer to those functional (viz. raising) predicates, including ‘*BE*’, which do not assign either an external or internal argument but, rather, inherit their argument structure directly from their non-finite verbal complement (infinitive, participle, or gerund) or small clause.

tive/unaccusative (2/23: 73.5%) rather than transitive (9: 26.5%) structures, inasmuch as the former take less arguments than the latter thereby producing V-final structures more frequently whenever one or more constituents are fronted, as well as in V3 structures where the final position of the verb is a natural consequence of multiple fronting.

We now turn to the superficial linear position of the finite verb in embedded clauses as illustrated in Table 2.

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals	V-final
V1	1 (0.2%)	5 (1.1%)	3 (0.7%)	9 (2%)	0,0,2: 2 (0.4%)
V2	119 (25.8%)	65 (14.1%)	213 (46.2%)	397 (86.1%)	16,11,9: 36 (7.8%)
V3	28 (6.1%)	9 (2%)	17 (3.7%)	54 (11.7%)	9,6,2: 17 (3.7%)
V4	1 (0.2%)	–	–	1 (0.2%)	1,0,0: 1 (0.2%)
Totals	149 (32.3%)	79 (17.2%)	233 (50.5%)	461	56 (12.2%)

Table 2 Position of finite verb in embedded clauses

Given standard V2 analyses, the minimal expectation is that V2 will fail to be licensed, or at the very least prove more restricted, in embedded contexts, since raising of the finite verb is blocked by the presence of a subordinator lexicalizing the relevant C-position otherwise targeted by the verb. Nonetheless, this expectation is fully in line with the statistical finding highlighted in Table 2 that superficially V2 linear orders continue to predominate: indeed, with respect to root clauses we observe both an increase in the distribution of superficial V2 orders (viz. 79.4% > 86.1%) and a concomitant decrease in V3 orders (viz. 18.5% > 11.7%). *A priori* this distribution finds a natural account in a SVO language with an asymmetrical V2 grammar, inasmuch as embedded surface V2 orders ostensibly instantiate in the vast majority of cases underlying SVO order, an unmarked linearization which explains both the prevalence of superficial V2 orders (and the almost complete absence of V1 and V4 in our sample) and the relative rarity of V3 orders which can only be derived through the more marked option of embedded V2 (cf. §2.2.6).

Although these superficial quantitative interpretations of the data provide some significant insights into the word order of the *HA*, and indeed in some respects are arguably indicative of an asymmetrical V2 grammar, qualitative interpretations of the data undoubtedly prove far more reliable in

assessing the V2 status or otherwise of the *HA*, especially when coupled together with relevant quantitative information. It is to this approach that we turn in the following sections.

2.2 *A qualitative analysis*

It might be objected that the prevalence of root V2 orders noted in Table 1 is not necessarily a surface effect of a V2 constraint, but simply reflects a high percentage of root clauses in which some element, most notably the (non-pronominal) subject, precedes the finite verb, giving rise to a surface structure which *a priori* proves equally as legitimate in a V2 language as in a non-V2 SVO language like modern standard French. However, there are several pieces of evidence which seriously undermine such a view, which we shall now consider in turn.

2.2.1 *Constituent-fronting*

Out of a total of 429 superficially V2 root clauses only 165 (66 transitives, 19 unaccusatives, 80 athematics), namely 38.5%, were found to be subject-initial, a somewhat surprising result if the syntax of the *HA* were not V2. Rather, as is to be expected in a V2 language, the immediately preverbal position in the *HA* is not a dedicated subject position as in SVO languages, but, rather, functions as a pragmatically salient position specialized in licensing the thematic and rhematic interpretations of the constituents it hosts (henceforth represented by underlining and small caps, respectively). As such it is potentially available to all syntactic categories irrespective of their syntactic functions, witness (2) where the preverbal position variously hosts a subject (2a), direct object (2b), oblique prepositional complement (2c), locative complement (2d), predicative complement (2e), adverbial quantifier (2f), manner adverb (2g), adverbial adjunct (2h), and a circumstantial adverb (2i).

- (2) a. *Mais Icarus chai en la mer fors de la nef*
 but Icarus fell in the sea out of the ship
 ‘But Icarus fell from the ship into the sea’ (§609.5)
- b. *Ceste choze ot mout Eneas en sa memoire retenue*
 this thing had much Aeneas in his memory retained
 ‘Aeneas had kept a strong memory of this’ (§611.17)
- c. *et DE LOR GENS la puplerent*
 and from their people it= they.populated
 ‘and they populated it with their own people’ (§591.7)

- d. *La vint Eneas*
there came Aeneas
'Aeneas arrived there' (§595.12)
- e. *Rois en fu premerement Janus*
king thereof= was first Janus
'First Janus was the king of that place' (§611.2)
- f. *mais MOUT estoit prous chivaliers et de grant force*
but much he.was brave knight and of great strength
'but he was a very brave knight of great strength' (§589.2)
- g. *E TANTOST prist il port*
and at.once took he port
'And at once he entered the port' (§610.6)
- h. *MAINTES FOIS ai oï parler de vos*
many times I.have heard to.talk of you
'I have heard talk of you on many occasions' (§598.5)
- i. *APRES CE QUE LI ROIS BELUS FU MORS, tint*
after this that the king Belus was died held
Pigmalion le regne
Pygmalion the kingdom
'After King Belus had died, Pygmalion reigned over the kingdom' (§594.10)

The unrestricted accessibility of the immediately preverbal position exemplified in (2 a-i) is further confirmed by examples like those illustrated in (3 a-d) which present subextraction via scrambling of individual constituents under focus in apparent violation of the Left Branch Condition (cf. Ledgeway 2014; 2018). The result is discontinuous structures (so-called *hyperbata*) in which, for example, adverbial modifiers and prepositional complements and adjuncts are separated from their associated APs and nominal heads, respectively (cf. *Mout...grant dolor*; *trop...grant matere*; *Du rois Jarbas...le mariage et de pluisors autres*; *de celle terre o ariva Eneas...sires* vs modFr. *Très grande douleur*; *trop grande matière*; *le mariage du roi Jarbas et de plusieurs autres*; *sire (= maître) de cette terre où Eneas arriva*).

- (3) a. *Mout ot au cuer grant dolor*
very she.had to.the heart great pain
'Her heart was laden with great sorrow' (§604.15)

- b. *Mais TROP lairoie ariere grant matere d' Eneas*
 but too I.would.leave behind great matter of Aeneas
et des Romains
 and of.the Romans
 'But I would leave out too much material about Aeneas and the Romans' (§591.20)
- c. *Dou ROI JARBAS refusastes vos le mariage et de*
 of.the king Jarbas refused you the marriage and of
pluisors autres
 several others
 'You declined Jarbas' offer of marriage and that of several others' (§601.12)
- d. *Segnors et dames, de celle terre o Eneas*
 gentlemen and ladies of that land where Aeneas
ariva *estoit sires un rois*
arrived was sire a king
 'Ladies and gentlemen, a king was lord of that land where Aeneas arrived' (§610.7)

Such discontinuous structures underline how the immediately preverbal position is available to all types of constituent, including scrambled categories in accordance with the assumed V2 nature of medieval Romance. Significantly, scrambling, at least of the liberal type exemplified here, also seems to be typologically correlated with the V2 parameter (cf. west Germanic languages),⁹ and its availability in the *HA* must consequently be considered another piece of indirect evidence in support of our proposed V2 analysis.

By way of further illustration of the unrestricted nature of the preverbal position, we provide below in Table 3 a detailed breakdown of immediately preverbal constituents by grammatical function in all superficial V2 root clauses:

⁹ Although some studies on Germanic (cf. Haider 2010; 2013) take scrambling to correlate with OV order (but see Cognola 2013).

	Subject	Direct object	Indirect object	Oblique object	Adjunct	Totals
Transitives	66 (38.8%)	13 (7.7%)	–	10 (5.9%)	81 (47.6%)	170
Unaccusatives	19 (28.4%)	–	–	14 (20.9%)	34 (50.7%)	67
Athematics	80 (41.6%)	9 (4.7%)	–	37 (19.3%)	66 (34.4%)	192
Totals	165 (38.5%)	22 (5.1%)	–	61 (14.2%)	181 (42.2%)	429
83 (19.3%)						

Table 3 Distribution of immediately preverbal constituents in superficially V2 root clauses

In a massive 61.5% of all V2 root clauses the preverbal position is filled by a constituent other than the subject, typically an adjunct but not infrequently also an internal argument. These findings are reminiscent of Wolfe’s (2015a; 2018a) examination of five medieval Romance V2 varieties (French, Occitan, Sicilian, Spanish, Venetian) where non-subject-initial clauses account for at least 30% of matrix V2 clauses in individual varieties (ranging from 29.87% in Venetian to 76.22% in Occitan), with adjuncts equally representing a large proportion (on average 30.88%) of such cases (ranging from 7.2% in Venetian to 53.9% in Spanish). By the same token, in Wolfe’s sample preverbal subjects across all five medieval Romance varieties make up an average of 44.13% of all V2 root clauses (ranging from 23.78% in Occitan to 70.13% in Venetian), a figure considerably higher than that observed for the *HA* (38.5%). Overall, the evidence of our text is therefore highly suggestive of a V2 grammar, inasmuch as the distribution of preverbal constituents closely mirrors similar distributions attested in medieval Romance varieties which have independently been shown to be V2.

Evidence from embedded contexts equally points to the asymmetric V2 nature of our text. The relevant facts are set out in Table 4 which provides a breakdown by grammatical category of the distribution of all immediately preverbal constituents in superficially V2 embedded contexts.

	Subject	Direct object	Indirect object	Oblique object	Adjunct	Totals
Transitives	108 (90.7%)	2 (1.7%)	–	2 (1.7%)	7 (5.9%)	119
Unaccusatives	57 (87.7%)	–	1 (1.5%)	4 (6.2%)	3 (4.6%)	65
Athematics	189 (88.7%)	4 (1.9%)	2 (0.95%)	6 (2.8%)	12 (5.65%)	213
Totals	354 (89.2%)	6 (1.5%)	3 (0.8%)	12 (3%)	22 (5.5%)	397
21 (5.3%)						

Table 4 Distribution of immediately preverbal constituents in superficially V2 embedded clauses

As can be observed, the number of immediately preverbal subjects is statistically revealing, inasmuch as out of 397 embedded clauses with superficial V2 order 354 (viz. 89.2%) are subject-initial, variously exemplifying pronominal (4a), thematic (4b) and focalized (4c) subjects. Furthermore, this distribution is constant across all predicate types in that it is neither significantly greater in conjunction with transitives (90.7%) nor significantly more restricted in conjunction with unaccusatives (87.7%), whose surface subjects are underlying objects and crosslinguistically more apt to occur in postverbal position. On the assumption that V2 (namely, movement of the finite verb to C°) is normally precluded, or at the very least, heavily restricted in embedded clauses on account of the C position already being lexicalized by a complementizer or subordinator, the distribution in Table 4 is entirely in line with our asymmetric V2 analysis of the grammar of the *HA* according to which, in contrast to the unrestricted nature of the immediately preverbal position in root contexts (cf. Table 3), the immediately preverbal position functions as a dedicated subject position in embedded contexts where underlying SV(O) order obtains by default.

- (4) a. *Et si volés que je vos die les grans dolors*
and if you.want that I you= say the great pains
'And if you want me to recount the great sorrows' (§599.12)
- b. *Quant Eneas sot en quel terre il devoit traire*
when Aeneas knew in which land he had.to to.lead
'When Aeneas discovered the land to which he had to travel'
(§590.6)

- c. *se li une de ces trois choses nos fust demoree*
 if the one of these three things us= were remained
 ‘if we had kept one of these three things’ (§599.14)

Finally, interpreting the surface linearizations of the *HA* as the output of a V2 rule provides us with a principled explanation of why, in contrast to the variability of the constituent(s) occurring before the finite verb, word order in the sentential core (T-*v*-VP domain) following the raised finite verb in declarative clauses is subject to a relatively fixed order, namely S+Adv+Inf+*Compl+*Adjunct (Salvi 2016: 1006), precisely the same order we find in embedded clauses *modulo* the position of the finite verb (cf. 5). The representative sentences in (6a-d) cumulatively exemplify different partial instantiations of this order in root clauses.

- (5) *Que [la roine] [Dido] [ne vout] [mie] [prendre] [le*
 that the queen Dido NEG= wanted NEG to.take the
roi de Sesile] [por la proiere de ses homes]
 king of Sicily by the plea of her men
 ‘On the request of her men, Queen Dido did not wish to capture the
 king of Sicily’ (§602; S+V+Adv+Inf+O+Adjunct)
- (6) a. *ce poés [vos] [bien] [croire]*
 this can you well to.believe
 ‘you can indeed believe it’ (§604.15; (XV)S+Adv+Inf)
- b. *la devoit [il] [aireter] [la contree]*
 there had.to he to.inherit the land
 ‘there he was to inherit the land’ (§604.1; (XV)S+Inf+O)
- c. *TOTES CES PAROLES eschaufoient [plus et plus] [la*
 all these words warmed more and more the
roine]
 queen
 ‘The queen was increasingly stirred by all these words’ (§603.1;
 (XV)Adv+O)
- d. *Après ce comensa [Eneas] [a raconter] [a la roine]*
 after this began Aeneas to to.recount to the queen
[tot] [en ordene]
 all in order
 ‘After this Aeneas began to recount everything to the queen in
 order’ (§600.1; (XV)S+Inf+IO+O+Adjunct)

In summary, the evidence considered in this section reveals how the *HA* bears all the hallmarks of an asymmetric V2 grammar.

2.2.1.1 Informational focus

A notable concomitant of the unrestricted nature of the immediately preverbal position in medieval Romance V2 systems, also witnessed above in §2.2.1 for the *HA*, is its ability to host informationally-new fronted constituents that introduce into the narrative a referent that has not previously figured in the discourse (or at least is not currently active and/or accessible in the working memory), giving rise to an example of what is generally known as informational focus (see Vanelli 1986; 1999; Lambrecht 1994: 201; Benincà & Poletto 2004: §3; Cruschina 2012; 2016: 605f.).¹⁰ Below follow some representative examples, including cases such as (7 d-f) involving direct objects where the lack of a resumptive pronoun crucially supports the non-topical nature of the fronted object:

- (7) a. *UNS FORS TANS comensa a lever*
a strong weather began to to.raise
'a strong storm began to gather' (§603.7)
- b. *Es NES entra Eneas et tote sa maisnee*
in.the ships entered Aeneas and all his household
'Aeneas and all his household boarded the ships' (§604.13)
- c. *ADRIANA estoit nomee cele*
Adriana was called that.one
'she was called Adriana' (§608.17)
- d. *et NOSTRE ROI MEISEMENT, QUI ENEAS AVOIT A*
and our king himself who Aeneas had to
NON, perdimes nos
name lost we
'and we even lost our king, who was called Aeneas' (§597.5)
- e. *ESTRUMENT i sonoient por aus esbaudir*
instruments there= they.played for them= to.entertain
'they played instruments there to encourage them' (§599.7)
- f. *TOTES i veoit peintes les batailles*
all there= he.saw painted the battles
'he saw all the battles painted there' (§596.6)

¹⁰ In contrast to Romance and late Latin, informational focus-fronting is not however an option in Germanic where focus-fronting has to be contrastive (cf. Frey 2006).

Although rhematic objects can equally occur in postverbal position,¹¹ especially when they occur in wide focus together with their associated predicate, they also frequently occur in preverbal position as part of a syntactic strat-

- 11 Cf. the contrast in the following pair of existential examples where the rhematic object (viz. the pivot) is fronted to the preverbal position in (i.a), but occurs in postverbal position in (i.b), an option which proves particularly frequent in embedded clauses (i.c) where the accessibility of the left-peripheral focus position is greatly restricted (cf. §2.2.6).

- (i) a. *·c· HUIS i avoit*
100 doors there= it.had
'there were a hundred doors' (§608.14)
- b. *Adonc ot GRANT DOLOR par tote la cité de Cartage*
thus it.had great sorrow through all the city of Carthage
'Thus there was great sorrow throughout the entire city of Carthage' (§605.3)
- c. *Cil qui eschaperent se rassamblèrent ensamble tant qu' il*
those who escaped self= assembled together so.much that it
i ot MOUT GRANS GENS
there= had very big people
'Those who escaped gathered together such that there was a huge crowd'
(§591.17)

Although in the latter two cases the focus interpretation of the object appears to be licensed *in situ*, root and embedded examples such as (ii.a-b) and (ii.c), respectively, suggest otherwise. In particular, the position of the locative, predicative and direct objects in (ii.a-c) to the left of the participle betrays the movement of the rhematic complement to a dedicated focus position within the lower left periphery (Belletti 2004; 2005). Particularly revealing in this respect are examples such as (ii.d) where the direct object is formed from two conjoined DPs, only the first of which (*Eneas*) is singled out for particular focal prominence and thus raised to the lower left periphery stranding the informationally backgrounded second conjunct (*ses paroles* 'his words') in its *in situ* position (namely ...*ENEAS entendu* [*Eneas et ses paroles*]).

- (ii) a. *lor nés estoient AU PORT DE LA CITE arivees et ancrees*
their ships were at.the port of the city arrived and anchored
'their ships had arrived in the port of the city where they were now anchored'
(§596.9)
- b. *cele estoit Lavine apelee*
that.one was Lavine called
'she was called Lavine' (§610.7)
- c. *Et bien sachés que maint haut baron li avoient sa*
And well know that many high barons to.him= had his
FILLE demandee
daughter asked
'And take note that many a noble baron had asked for his daughter's hand in marriage' (§610.7)
- d. *Tuit cil qui la estoient orent ENEAS entendu et ses paroles*
all those who there were had Aeneas heard and his words
'All those who were there had heard Aeneas and his words' (§601.1)

egy which serves to isolate the object from its verb when the former alone constitutes under narrow focus the central informational focus of the clause (Vanelli 1999: 84–86). Significantly, this strategy is systematically found in medieval Romance V2 languages, but is typically not available in the modern Romance SVO languages where rhematic direct objects, whether under wide or narrow focus, are restricted to occurring in postverbal position,¹² and direct objects can only be fronted under particular pragmatic conditions such as when they bear contrastive focus or when they are topicalized through clitic left-dislocation.

From this observed contrast between modern Romance SVO languages on the one hand and medieval Romance V2 varieties on the other, it is possible to infer that fronting of rhematic constituents in the *HA* involves movement to a left-peripheral focus position licensed by prior movement of the finite verb to the C-domain, an operation which generally proves impossible in SVO languages where generalized verb movement to C° in declarative root clauses, namely V2, also fails to obtain.

2.2.1.2 Apparent V1 and negation

Above in §2.1 we noted how, despite the otherwise predominance of superficial V2 orders in root clauses, our sample also presents a very small number of unexpected examples of V1. The relevant examples, 10 in total and representing just 1.9% of all root declaratives, are given in (8 a-j).

- (8) a. *Ne vos en ferai autre alongance de sa*
 NEG you= of.it= I.will.do other continuation of her
 dolor par parole
 pain by word
 ‘I will not say any more of her suffering’ (§604.16)
- b. *Ne dirai plus ore de la roine Dido*
 NEG I.will.say more now of the queen Dido
 ‘I will not say anymore now of queen Dido’ (§606.1)
- c. *Anna, douce amie, ne sai quels visions m’*
 Anna, sweet friend, NEG I.know which visions me=
 ont anuit en dormant trop espoentee
 have damaged in sleeping too frightened

12 Notable exceptions are Sicilian (Cruschina 2006; 2012; Bentley 2007), the dialects of southern Italy in general (Ledgeway 2016a: 269), Sardinian (Jones 1990; Mensching & Remberger 2010) and Romanian (Zafiu 2013); cf. also Cruschina (2016: 606f.).

'Anna, sweet friend, I cannot tell you the hurtful visions I saw
and how they caused me to sleep in so much fear' (§601.6)

- d. *N' i laissa Eneas a raconter nulle creature*
NEG there= let Aeneas to to.recount no creature
ne d' estors ne de batailles qui li un
neither of attacks nor of battles which the ones
feissent vers les autres
did towards the others

'In so doing Aeneas did not allow any mention of either the
attacks or the battles that they fought against one another'
(§600.1)

- e. *Mais n' orent mie les trois parties dou jor*
but NEG they.had NEG the three parts of.the day
corues, quant il lor leva si tres orible
run when it to.them= raised so very horrible
tempeste
storm

'But three thirds of the day had not passed before they were
caught in a very horrible storm' (§590.7)

- f. *N' i remest ni relief ni autre chose*
NEG there= remained neither leftovers nor other thing
'Neither leftovers nor anything else remained' (§611.13)

- g. *Mais ne demora mie après ce granment quant Dido*
but NEG remained NEG after this greatly when Dido
gisoit en son lit que ses barons s' aparut
lay in her bed that her husband self= appeared
aussi com en vision a li
also as in vision to her

'But shortly afterwards when Dido was lying in her bed her
husband also appeared to her as in a vision' (§594.13)

- h. *Ne li sovenoit mais de sa cité fermer ne de*
NEG to.her= recalled more of her city fortified nor of
ses grandes tors enhaucier vers les nues
its great towers raised towards the clouds

'She no longer had any memory of her fortified city nor of its
great towers reaching towards the clouds' (§603.4)

- i. *Mais n' est mie certe choze li quel en orent*
but NEG is not certain thing the which of.it= had
tres adonc la segnorie
pulled then the possession

‘But it is not certain which of them had thus taken possession of it’ (§589.8)

- j. *E puet bien estre qu’ adonques en celui tans i*
 and can well to.be that then in that time there=
ariverent et vindrent et des uns et des autres
 arrived and came and of.the ones and of.the others
 ‘And it may be that at that time both arrived there’ (§589.8)

A striking fact characterizing the first 9 of the 10 examples above is the observation that they all involve a negated clause introduced by the sentential negator (NON >) *ne* ‘not’ (or its prevocalic allomorph *n’*). This can hardly be coincidental but highlights, I argue, a structural regularity in the distribution of these 9 examples of apparent V1. Following ideas developed in detail in [Ledgeway & Ventura \(In prep.\)](#), it is my claim that in the *HA* (and in early attestations of old French in general) reflexes of NON may give rise to a tripartite distinction along the lines of the three-way categorial distinction (viz. strong, weak and clitic) proposed in [Cardinaletti & Starke \(1994\)](#). Thus, despite its formal invariance, we maintain that the orthographic form *ne* conceals an (increasingly) obsolescent ternary distinction in the typology of negators which can be variously classified as strong in its functions as a constituent negator (9a; cf. modFr. *non pas*), and weak (9b) and clitic (9c) in its functions as a sentential negator.

- (9) a. *quant Troies la grande fu arse et destruite, ne*
 when Troy the great was burnt and destroyed NEG
mie encore tote
 NEG still all
 ‘when Troy the great was burnt down and destroyed, still not in its entirety’ (§588.1)
- b. *Ne dirai plus ore de la roine Dido*
 NEG I.will.say more now of the queen Dido
 ‘I will not say anymore now about queen Dido’ (§606.1)
- c. *Mais je ne le peu aprocher*
 but I NEG= him= can to.approach
 ‘But I cannot approach him’ (§600.4)

If correct, the orthographic representation *ne* in (9a-c) can be hypothesized to be associated with distinct prosodic realizations, e.g. [noj/nō], [ne] and [nə], respectively. Indeed, [Martineau & Mougeon \(2003: 123f.\)](#) argue that it is only from the end of the middle French period (end of 15th century) that

ne eventually assumes its unambiguously unstressed form, but before then could be both stressed and unstressed.¹³ Further evidence in support of this view comes from the observation that in its strong (10a) and weak (10b), but significantly not in its clitic, guises the negator is sometimes represented by the fuller orthographic representation *non*.¹⁴

- (10) a. *ele jamais fust mariee se par sa volenté non en*
 she never was married =self by her will NEG in
totes lor vies
 all their lives
 ‘never would she marry of her own will not in all their lives’
 (§602.6)
- b. *Silvius la fundast primes, mais non fist*
 Silvio it= founded first but NEG did
 ‘Silvio founded it first, but he did not’ (§644.4)

Also relevant here is a comparison with similar ambiguous orthographic representations such as the third-person pronominal *li* (cf. 11), which visibly functions both as a dative clitic pronoun and as a feminine singular tonic pronoun:

- (11) *Mais li home la roine se traistrent a li et si*
 but the men the queen self= betook to her and si
li distrent que [...]
 to.her= said that
 ‘But the men of the queen went to her and told her that...’ (§602.2)

In light of these considerations, the 9 apparent V1 structures in (8a-i) now find a coherent explanation in terms of the regular output of the V2 constraint, if we assume that *ne* in such examples instantiates the weak sentential negator (an XP), and not the clitic variant (a X°). The non-clitic nature of the negator in (8a-i) is further suggested (and complicated) by its formal (partial) merger with reflexes of the stressed negative coordinator NEC ‘and not, nor, also not’, variously represented orthographically in our text and in old

13 For similar arguments that *ne* might conceal a binary tonic/strong vs weak/clitic distinction, see Salvi (2011: 352) and Ingham (2014). For a critique of this view, see Zimmermann & Kaiser (2010).

14 Alongside *ne*, we also find in old French the form *nen* which, according to Buridant (2000: §452), functions as its (optional) prevocalic allomorph.

French more generally as *ne/né* and *ni*.¹⁵ Given that all examples in (8 a-i) involve the introduction of a new utterance, it is not inconceivable therefore to interpret the negator as the stressed negative coordinator (e.g. ‘And I will not say.../Nor will I say...’, ‘And Aeneas did not.../Nor did Aeneas...’, etc.). Consequently, whether interpreted as a weak sentential negator (< NON) or as a tonic negative coordinator (< NEC), in the computation of the V2 constraint the preverbal negator in examples (8 a-i) systematically qualifies as a first-position element, thereby satisfying the V2 requirement to yield a surface V2 order. Under this interpretation, the 9 examples in (8 a-i) turn out after all to be the expected outcomes of the V2 rule, rather than inexplicable exceptions to the otherwise robust ban on V1 orders in the *HA*. The percentages in Table 1 need therefore to be revised to reflect the presence of just 1 example of V1 (0.2%) and a further 9 examples of V2 (81.1%). As a result, V1 orders constitute a genuine exception in our sample of 540 root clauses, as demonstrated by the fact that the sole example in our sample (viz. 8j), partially repeated here as (12 a), forms a minimal contrast with regular V2 examples such as (12 b), taken from outside our sample of the *Eneas* Section, in which the surface V2 requirement is satisfied by fronting of the adverb *bien* ‘well’.

- (12) a. *E puet bien estre qu’* [...]
 and can well to.be that
 ‘And it may be that [...]’ (§589.8)
- b. *Mais bien peut estre que* [...]
 but well can to.be that
 ‘But it may be that [...]’ (§643.8)

It is also significant to note that 4 of the relevant examples, namely (8 f-i), involve an impersonal structure where the V2 constraint is satisfied by last-resort merger of the non-clitic negator as an alternative to the more frequent strategy of merging an expletive subject as in (13) where the negator is necessarily to be interpreted as a clitic head.¹⁶ The greater frequency of the latter

15 Cf. the entry for reflexes of NEC in the *Dictionnaire Étymologique de l’Ancien Français* (DÉAF), v. <https://deaf-server.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/lemme/ne#ne>. Note furthermore that the semi-diplomatic edition gives the spelling *ni* rather than *n’i* in examples (8 d,f).

16 For independent reasons relating to the obligatory overt realization of pronominal subjects in embedded clauses explored in §§2.2.3-4, there are no examples in our sample of non-clitic *ne* satisfying V2 in conjunction with impersonal (or thematic) predicates in embedded clauses (for examples, from the *HA* see however [Ledgeway & Ventura In prep.](#)). That said, there are 9 examples of apparent V1 orders in embedded contexts in our sample. Putting aside the 5 (most probably lexicalized) unaccusative examples to be discussed in §2.2.4, the remaining 4

strategy in our text confirms our claim above regarding the increasing obsolescence of the non-clitic instantiations of *ne* in the original ternary typology of negators, with a decrease in frequency of the tonic and weak forms of *ne* to the advantage of clitic *ne*.

- (13) *Il n' est nulle doutance que [...]*
 it NEG= is no doubt that
 'There is no doubt that [...]' (§591.2)

To sum up, the evidence considered above in relation to our fine-grained analysis of negation lends additional strong supporting evidence for our V2 analysis of the *HA*, where the robustness of the V2 constraint is such that V1 orders have been shown to be all but absent from our textual sample.

examples (cf. i.a-d) all involve sequences in which the finite verb is preceded by a pronominal *se*, *le*, *la* and *les* which, on a par with our discussion of the three-way classification of the negator *ne* in terms of Cardinaletti and Starke's original pronominal typology (e.g. *se* 'self': tonic [soj] (cf. modFr. *soi* [swa])), weak [se] and clitic [sə]), might be analysed as weak phrasal instantiations of the pronominal which legitimately satisfy as a last resort the V2 requirement in such examples.

- (i) a. *quant se fu par li soule desmentee*
 when self= she.was by the own tormented
 'after she had tortured herself' (§604.16)
- b. *si se remist a la voie sans le seut le roi Minos*
 si self= reput to the route without it knows the king Minos
 'he starts out again without the King Minos knowing' (§608.21)
- c. *quant la vit en son sanc toellier et estandre*
 when her= she.saw in her blood to.soil and to.lie
 'when she saw her lying and soiled in her own blood' (§605.2)
- d. *si com les voloit mener fortune*
 thus as them= wanted to.lead fortune
 'as fortune wanted to lead them' (§590.7)

Note furthermore that an alternative to the embedded clause analysis of (i.b) introduced by a null complementizer, namely *sans (que)* 'without (that)' (cf. Glikman 2008; Salvesen 2014: §3.2; Cruschina & Ledgeway 2016), pointed out to me by Sylvie LeFèvre is to analyse it as a nominal structure (cf. *sans le seu/seü/sceu (de)* 'without the knowledge (of)'; v. the entry for *seü* in DÉAF, <https://deaf-server.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/lemme/savoir#savoir>) followed by an oblique-possessive along the lines of (ii).

- (ii) *...sans le seut le roi Minos*
 without the knowledge the king Minos
 '...without the knowledge of king Minos'

2.2.2 Verb-Subject Inversion

Another significant piece of evidence which points to the V2 nature of the *HA* comes from the well-known observation that, when a constituent other than the subject is fronted, this produces verb-subject inversion whenever the subject is overtly realized (cf. 2b,d,g, 3c, 6a,b,d, 7b,d, 8d,f above), contrary to what happens in SVO languages.¹⁷ Below follow some representative examples (subjects in bold):

- (14) a. *La oïst on les grans cris que les dames faisoient*
 there heard one the great cries that the ladies made
 ‘There could be heard the great cries coming from the ladies’
 b. *Adonc sot li rois Jarbas ceste choze*
 then knew the king Jarbas this thing
 ‘The King Jarbas discovered this’ (§602.7)
 c. *Ensi parla Ilioneus a la roine*
 thus spoke Ilioneus to the queen
 ‘Thus Ilioneus spoke to the queen’ (§597.6)

17 However, on par with other medieval (and modern) Romance varieties (cf. [Ledgeway 2007](#): n. 18), when the subject occurs in narrow focus (cf. i.a-b), as is frequently the case in unaccusative structures, or when the subject is ‘heavy’ (cf. i.c-d), the subject occurs in an extraposed clause-final position and hence does not necessarily immediately follow the verb:

- (i) a. *Adonc n’ ot en Didon que corrocier*
 thus NEG= it.had in Dido that affliction
 ‘Dido was thus consumed entirely by sorrow’ (§604.12)
 b. *Après Saturnus en fu rois Picus*
 after Saturn thereof= was king Picus
 ‘After Saturn Picus became king [of Italy]’ (§611.3)
 c. *Ou port entra Eneas atot .vii. nés, qui li*
 at.the port entered Aeneas together.with 7 ships that to.him=
estoint remeses de .xxii. qu’ il en ot meues de sa
 were returned of 22 that he thereof= had moved from his
terre
 land
 ‘Aeneas entered the port together with 7 ships, which remained from the 22 which he had taken from his country’ (§592.9)
 d. *et ens ou porche estoit tote peinte cele estorie dou roi*
 and in to.the porch was all painted that story of.the king
Minos que vos avés oïe
 Minos that you have heard
 ‘and inside the entrance hall that story of King Minos which you have heard was painted [on the walls]’ (§610.1)

- d. *Mais PARMi TOTE LA DOLOR mistrent il le cors de*
 but among all the pain put they the body of
la roine en cendre
 the queen in ash
 'But amongst all the pain they placed the queen's body in the
 pyre' (§605.4)
- e. *De ces issirent li Troien*
 from these exited the Trojans
 'From these the Trojans are descended' (§591.3)

Under the proposed V2 analysis, subject inversion in such examples follows straightforwardly: assuming an underlying SVXP order (at least for non-unaccusative structures), verb movement to C° followed by fronting of some postverbal constituent (XP) to clause-initial position within the C-field will invariably result in the subject immediately following the verb, namely [_{SpecCP} XP [_{C'} V [_S V XP...]]]. Even more revealing in this respect are examples of so-called 'Germanic' inversion (Roberts 1993: 56; Salvesen 2013: 136) such as (15 a-e), where the in-situ subject occurs sandwiched between a finite auxiliary/functional predicate raised to the C-domain and its associated non-finite lexical verb in the sentential core.

- (15) a. *MOUT l' avoit Agamenon acueilli a haine*
 much him= had Agamemnon welcomed to hatred
 'Agamemnon had received him with considerable hatred'
 (§588.1)
- b. *TROP avoit son cuer mis en amer Eneas*
 too.much had her heart put in bitter Aeneas
 'her heart had greatly embittered Aeneas' (§604.15)
- c. *et la fu il noiés*
 and there was he drowned
 'and there he was drowned' (§608.2)
- d. *E de sa pues tu veir les chozes dont on*
 and from that can you to.see the things whence one
puet plorer et dolor faire
 can to.cry and pain to.make
 'And from this you can see the things which make us cry and
 suffer' (§596.4)
- e. *et dedens ce fist ele comencier les autes tors*
 and in this made she to.begin the other towers

et les espés murs de Cartage
 and the thick walls of Carthage
 ‘and therein she had them begin the construction of the other
 towers and the thick walls of Carthage’ (§595.4)

Examples like these, however, do not allow us to establish unambiguously whether the postverbal subject has raised to SpecTP or whether it occurs in SpecvP, the in-situ position of the subject in the case of transitives like (15 a-b) or an intermediate position in the case of unaccusatives like (15 c),¹⁸ inasmuch as the surface order (XPV_{Fin})S+V_{PtP/Inf}(+Compl+X) is compatible with both underlying structures (assuming the non-finite participial/infini-tival verb does not raise outside of the *v*-VP complex). The same holds for (XPV_{Fin})S(Compl+X) examples such as (14 a-e) where, in the absence of lower pre-*v*-VP adverbs, there is no independent way to discriminate between the SpecTP and SpecvP positions. In order to distinguish between these two options, it is therefore necessary to consider inversion cases involving lower pre-*v*-VP adverbs (henceforth marked by bold and underlining), of which our textual sample offers us a handful of examples:

- (16) a. *puis que Sicheus fu mors, mes barons, ne me*
 since Sicheus was died my husband NEG= me=
traist mais mes corages tant a null home
 leads no.longer my courage so.much a no man
 ‘since Sicheus, my husband, died, my heart is no longer greatly
 attracted by any man’ (§601.9)
- b. *ensi estoit adonques la costume*
 thus was then the custom
 ‘thus was the custom at that time’ (§606.10)
- c. *par ces trois teches n’ estoit onques ses cuers*
 by these three stains NEG= was ever his heart
asasiés de faire desloiautés et felonies
 satiated of to.do disloyalties and felonies
 ‘thanks to these three vices his heart was never tired of
 committing disloyal and treacherous acts’ (§594.11)
- d. *Ceste choze ot mout Eneas en sa memoire retenue*
 this thing had much Aeneas in his memory retained
 ‘Aeneas had kept a particularly strong memory of this’ (§611.17)

¹⁸ Of course, in unaccusatives structures the postverbal subject might also occur in its in-situ position V',DP.

- e. *ENCORE n' en estoit mie l' arme partie*
 still NEG= therefrom= was NEG the soul departed
quant Anna i vint
 when Anna there= came
 'Her soul had not yet left her when Anna came to her' (§605.2)

Given cartographic assumptions following Cinque (1999) about the fixed position of adverbs such as *mais* 'no longer', *adonques* 'then', *onques* 'never', *mie* 'not (presuppositional)', *mout* 'much' and *bien* 'well; indeed' which lexicalize distinct specifier positions along the functional spine of the clause above the *v*-VP complex and hence a secure diagnostic for identifying the left edge of the verb phrase, the order (V_{Fin} +) Adverb + Subject in the examples in (16) unequivocally demonstrates that the subject fails to vacate the *v*-VP complex, implying that there is no SpecTP position above the *v*-VP available to the subject. Rather, the subject must lexicalize Spec \bar{v} P in transitive examples such as (16a) as well as in the auxiliary structures in (16d-e) where the subject precedes the participle. By contrast, unaccusative examples with a simplex verb such as (16b-c) are genuinely string-ambiguous, in that the subject may be taken to occur either in its base position (V',DP) or in a derived position (Spec \bar{v} P).

Yet, these observations are contradicted by the evidence of the examples in (17a-c) where the opposite order Aux/V + Subject + Adverb obtains, highlighting how the subject in these cases reaches a position within the T-domain above the *v*-VP complex.

- (17) a. *Por ce le vos di je ore que [...]*
 for this it= you= say I now that
 'For this reason I am now telling you that [...]' (§591.4)
- b. *D' une part doutoit il mout a corocier Dido et [...]*
 of one part doubted he much to to.afflict Dido and
 'On the one hand he hesitated greatly between distressing Dido and [...]' (§604, 3)
- c. *ce poés vos bien croire*
 this can you well to.believe
 'you can indeed believe this' (§604.15)

Significantly, there is, however, a non-trivial difference between the examples in (16) and in (17): whereas the former all involve a lexical DP subject, those in (17) involve a pronominal subject. This distribution reflects a strong cross-linguistic tendency for pronominal and full nominal subjects to

occupy distinct positions (cf. discussion of English in Biberauer & van Kemenade 2011, and late Latin in Ledgeway 2017: 185 n.41) according to a well-documented difference across languages in relation to the surface positions in which the distinct semantic interpretations of pronominal and lexical DPs are licensed (cf. Diesing's 1992 Mapping Hypothesis). The higher position of pronominal subjects is also evidenced by the following impersonal examples in conjunction with the existential predicate HAVE (14a) and copular BE (14b) where, quite exceptionally (cf. §2.2.4), the pronominal expletive *il* 'it' is realized in postverbal position in a V2 linearization. According to standard assumptions, unlike referential nominals first-merged within the lexical domain (*v*-VP) from where they may variously raise to the preverbal T-related subject position in accordance with an EPP requirement, expletives are simple Ds which are first-merged in SpecTP by way of a last resort mechanism to satisfy the EPP. It follows that in examples of Germanic-style inversion such as (18a) the postverbal expletive *il* necessarily lexicalizes SpecTP, a conclusion further confirmed by (18b) where, in addition, the postverbal expletive *il* also occurs to the left of the pre-*v*-VP negative adverb *mie*.

- (18) a. *DEVANT CE QU' ENEAS FUST LA ARIVES ET VENUS,*
 Before this that Aeneas was there arrived and come
 C' EST EN ITALE, i avoit il eu ·v· rois
 this is in Italy there= had it had 5 kings
 'before Aeneas had arrived there, namely in Italy, there had
 been 5 kings' (§611.1)
- b. *Mais ensi ne fu il mie*
 but thus NEG= was it NEG
 'But it was not thus' (§604.6)

The comparative evidence of the examples in (16)-(17) therefore leads us to conclude that the old French of the *HA*, unlike modern French or English, is not a canonical EPP-language in that SpecTP is not a default subject position, at least in root clauses. Rather, as we have seen, subjects, just like all other constituents, are restricted to occurring in their (intermediate) base position within the sentential core (cf. 19a), unless they receive particular pragmatic salience, in which case they are fronted to the left periphery where they variously receive a thematic (old) or rhematic (new, narrow focus) reading, or to one of the various specifier positions within the topic space where they receive a topicalized reading. The exception are pronominal subjects (cf. 19b) which, for independent semantic reasons (cf. Diesing's Mapping Hypothesis), are moved out of the *v*-VP to license their specific interpretation, possibly targeting SpecTP on a par with rare examples of postverbal expletives such

as (18a-b). By contrast, evidence from embedded clauses, where we have seen (cf. Tables 2, 4) that the predominant order is SVO in which the finite verb does not move to C° but lexicalizes a T-related position, highlights that in embedded contexts SpecTP does indeed function as default subject position systematically hosting both pronominal and full nominal subjects (cf. 19c); if this were not the case, we should expect to find, contrary to fact, numerous examples of embedded $V + \text{Subject}_{(\text{Pro})} (+ \text{VP-Adverb})$ and $V + (+ \text{VP-Adverb}) + \text{Subject}_{(\text{Lex})}$ orders.¹⁹

- (19) a. $[_{\text{CP}} \text{Aux}/V_{\text{Fin}} [_{\text{TP}} \text{Aux}/V_{\text{Fin}} [_{v\text{-VP}} [_{\text{Spec}} \text{Subj}_{\text{Lex}}] V_{\text{PtP/Inf}}/V_{\text{Fin}}]]]$
 b. $[_{\text{CP}} \text{Aux}/V_{\text{Fin}} [_{\text{TP}} [_{\text{Spec}} \text{Subj}_{\text{Pro}}] \text{Aux}/V_{\text{Fin}} [_{v\text{-VP}} [_{\text{Spec}} \text{Subj}_{\text{Pro}}] V_{\text{PtP/Inf}}/V_{\text{Fin}}]]]$
 c. $[_{\text{CP}} \text{que} [_{\text{TP}} [_{\text{Spec}} \text{Subj}_{\text{Pro/Lex}}] \text{Aux}/V_{\text{Fin}} [_{v\text{-VP}} [_{\text{Spec}} \text{Subj}_{\text{Pro/Lex}}] V_{\text{PtP/Inf}}/V_{\text{Fin}}]]]$

This is an internally-consistent finding in that it allows us to make a principled generalization about the EPP and the licensing of subject positions in both root and embedded clauses which is entirely in line with the V2 nature of the HA. On a par with non-V2 languages like modern Romance (cf. Cardinaletti 1997; 2004), in non-V2 contexts, namely embedded clauses, the dedicated SpecTP subject position licenses, although not exclusively, both thematic subjects and rhematic subjects in wide focus, whereas in V2 contexts,

¹⁹ Our sample does, however, offer some examples of the embedded V3 order Subject + VP-Adverb + V (cf. i.a-b), but these are examples of embedded V2 (cf. §2.2.6) with focus-fronting of the adverb to the left periphery and base-generation of the topical subject in SpecFrame, as further highlighted by example (i.c) where the finite verb in C° continues to precede all other in-situ pre-VP adverbs (e.g. *bien* ‘well’). Significantly, however, there are no examples in our sample of the opposite order VP-Adverb + Subject + V.

- (i) a. *et si lor dist [...] qu’ il bien savoit que [...]*
 and si to.them= he.said that he well knew that
 ‘and he told them [...] that he indeed knew that [...]’ (§606.10)
 b. *si esguarda par la mer et d’ une part et d’ autre s’ il*
 si he.looked by the sea and of one side and of other if he
ja verroit par aventure null de ses compagnons
 already would.see by chance any of his companions
 ‘he looked out to sea on both sides to see if he could by chance already see
 any of his companions’ (§593.1)
 c. *et si dist a ses compagnons qu’ il ore savoit bien*
 and si he.said to his companions that he now knew well
sans doutance qu’ [...]
 without doubt that
 ‘and he told his companions that he now indeed knew without any doubt
 that [...]’ (§611.18)

namely root clauses, these same pragmatic functions are typically licensed by fronting of the subject to a specifier position within the C-space. It follows that there would be very little motivation for a TP-related subject position in V2 contexts (viz. root clauses), unless specifically driven by the particular semantics of pronominals,²⁰ especially if the EPP feature (whatever that turns out to be) can be satisfied by V-to-T movement (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998).²¹ The EPP therefore shows a mixed setting in the *HA* in accordance with the asymmetric distribution of V2.

Finally, putting to one side the position of the postverbal subject within the sentential core, it is important to note that the incidence of (Germanic-style) verb-subject inversion in the *HA* is hardly negligible, but stands out as a characteristic feature of the text and, by definition, an important indicator of a V2 syntax. Thus, as indicated in Table 5, in root clauses inversion accounts for 25.2% of all root clauses.

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals
V1	–	–	0/1	0/1
V2	57/173 (32.9%)	35/70 (50%)	42/195 (21.5%)	134/438 (30.6%)
V3	0/45	0/25	2/30 (6.7%)	2/100 (2%)
V4	–	–	0/1	0/1
Totals	57/218 (26.2%)	35/95 (36.8%)	44/227 (19.4%)	136/540 (25.2%)

Table 5 Distribution of immediately postverbal subjects in root clauses

By contrast, in embedded contexts (cf. Table 6) the incidence of inversion amounts to just 6.9% of all embedded clauses.

²⁰ For simplicity, we have been assuming that pronominal subjects in root clauses raise to SpecTP, but the evidence considered in (17) simply shows that the subject vacates the *v*-VP. Another possibility is that SpecTP is never projected in root clauses, inasmuch as pronominal subjects undergo movement to a dedicated scrambling position within the T-domain, a possibility to which we return in §2.2.4 below in our discussion of non-referential (viz. expletive) pronominal subjects.

²¹ The correlation between V2 syntax and the lack of a T-related subject position is also independently maintained for other V2 languages, including medieval Romance (cf. Ledgeway 2007: §2.2.6, 2008: 452f.; though see Benincà 1996: 326; Lemieux & Dupuis 1995: 90), late Latin (Ledgeway 2017: 186–88), and the OV Germanic languages (cf. Haider 1993; Roberts & Roussou 2002: 145; Biberauer 2003; 2004; Biberauer & Roberts 2005).

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals
V1	1/1 (100%)	0/5	1/3 (33.3%)	2/9 (22.2%)
V2	9/119 (7.6%)	7/65 (10.8%)	12/213 (5.6%)	28/397 (7.1%)
V3	1/28 (3.6%)	1/9 (11.1%)	0/17	2/54 (3.4%)
V4	0/1	–	–	0/1
Totals	11/149 (7.4%)	8/79 (10.1%)	13/233 (5.6%)	32/461 (6.9%)

Table 6 Distribution of immediately postverbal subjects in embedded clauses

Overall, then, we witness a substantial number of immediately postverbal subjects in root clauses, crucially not limited to unaccusative structures,²² which can only be interpreted as the surface output of a V2 syntax which requires the finite verb to raise to the C-domain. This is an important finding since subject-inversion is standardly considered to be one of the most salient and robust acquisitional cues in the instantiation of a V2 grammar (cf. [Lightfoot 1999; 2006](#)). By the same token, the notable asymmetry in the distribution of subject inversion in root and embedded clauses lends direct support to our proposed asymmetric V2 analysis of the grammar of the *HA*, inasmuch as V2 and hence also verb-subject inversion prove much more restricted in embedded contexts.

2.2.3 Distribution of referential pronominal subjects

We turn now to the licensing of referential pronominal subjects, the distribution of which has traditionally been argued in early Gallo-Romance to provide a robust cue for a V2 syntax ([Adams 1987; Hirschbühler & Junker 1988; Dufter 2010](#)). Beginning with root clauses, these readily license null subjects in conjunction with topical referents, typically those already mentioned in the preceding discourse ([20 a-c](#)).

²² The greater proportion of immediately postverbal subjects with unaccusatives than with transitive and athematic predicates naturally follows from standard assumptions ([Perlmutter 1978; Burzio 1986](#)) that unaccusative subjects are generated underlyingly in the postverbal complement position. Objectors to a V2 analysis might therefore claim that such unaccusative examples are ambiguous (though not in the case of Germanic-style inversion where the subject precedes the non-finite verb). Clearly, they would be ambiguous if they were the only structures acquirers were presented with but, combined with the other unambiguous V2 cues, acquirers will surely be biased towards the V2 possibility.

- (20) a. *Adonc lor_i reconta Eneas_j coment il_j estoit la*
 then to.them= recounted Aeneas how he was there
venus et [...]. Lors parlerent [Ø_{i+j}] ensamble
 come and then spoke [Ø_{i+j}] together
 'Then Aeneas told them how he had arrived there and [...].
 They spoke with each other' (§598.11-12)
- b. *Quant Dido_i fu esveillee, ele_i crei bien la vision*
 when Dido_i was awoken she_i believed well the vision
qu' ele_i ot veue. Tantost quist [Ø_i] et assembla
 that she_i had seen at.once sought [Ø_i] and assembled
grans avoires d' or et d' argent
 great possessions of gold and of silver
 'When Dido had awoken, she indeed believed the vision that
 she had seen. At once she sought and gathered great riches of
 gold and silver' (§594.14-15)
- c. *ele_i fu essolee de Anna sa seror et de tote*
 she_i was separated from Anna her sister and from all
sa maisnee. Et lors vint [Ø_i] en sa chambre
 her household and then came [Ø_i] in her room
 'she was separated from Anna her sister and from all her
 household. And then she came into her room' (§604.16)

On the other hand, overt pronominal subjects only occur to signal a change of topic (21 a-b) or to establish a contrast with another topical referent in the discourse (21 c).

- (21) a. *Entretant, fait Eneas, fu la nuis alee et estoit*
 in.meantime does Aeneas was the night gone and was
ja venue la jornee. Et nos esguardames de
 already come the day and we watched from
la o nos estions
 there where we were
 'In the meantime, Aeneas said, the night had passed and day
 had already dawned. And we watched from where we were'
 (§600.7)
- b. *ele_i les_j mist fors de prison et il_j entrerent en*
 she_i them_j= put out of prison and they_j entered in
une nef
 a ship
 'she released them from prison and they boarded a ship'
 (§609.5)

- c. *por ce te proions nos, dame, que tu defendes a*
 for this you= beg we lady that you defend to
tes gens
 your people
 ‘for this reason we beg of you, our lady, that you defend your
 people’ (§597.2)

Embedded clauses, by contrast, behave very differently from root clauses in that they invariably display overt pronominal subjects, even when coreferential with the subject of the preceding clause (22 a-c).

- (22) a. *Por ce le vos di je_i ore que je_i voill que vos*
 for this it= you= say I_i now that I_i want that you
sachés que de Japheth et des Troiens orent li
 know that from Japheth and from.the Trojans had the
Fransois totes ores comensance
 French all hours beginning
 ‘For this reason I am telling you now that I want you to know
 that the French descended nevertheless from Japheth and the
 Trojans’ (§591.4)
- b. *Por ce qu’ ele_i estoit tostans en doute qu’ ele_i*
 for this that she_i was always in doubt that she_i
ne perdist ce qu’ ele_i trop amoit
 NEG= lost this that she_i too loved
 ‘Because she was always in doubt that she would lose what she
 so dearly loved’ (§604.7)
- c. *il_i dist qu’ il_i iroit cercher et veir s’ il_i*
 he_i said that he_i would.go to.search and to.see if he_i
troveroit null home ne nulle feme par aventure qui
 would.find any man nor any woman by chance who
le_i desist en quel terre li vent l’_i avoient
 to.him_i= said in which land the winds him_i= had
amené
 brought
 ‘he said that he would go to seek and see if he could find by
 chance any man or woman who would tell him in which land
 the winds had taken him’ (§594.4)

The *HA* thus exhibits a robust asymmetry in the licensing of null and overt subject pronouns in accordance with the root vs embedded opposition, as summarized in Table 7. In particular, we observe that in root clauses 38% of

all pronominal subjects are null, in contrast to embedded clauses where only 3% of all pronominal subjects are null.

	Root Clauses			Embedded Clauses		
	Lexical S	Overt pro S	Null pro S	Lexical S	Overt pro S	Null pro S
V1	–	–	1	2	–	2 (cf. 23 a-b)
V2	195	103	98	156	205	6 (cf. 24 a-f)
V3	32	62	2	5	49	–
V4	1	–	–	–	1	–
Totals	228 (46.2%)	165 (33.4%)	101 (20.4%)	163 (38.3%)	255 (59.8%)	8 (1.9%)
		62% vs 38%			97% vs 3%	

Table 7 Distribution of null and overt referential pronominal subjects

Ultimately, this asymmetry can be interpreted as a reflex of the asymmetric V2 syntax of the *HA* and the functional head able to license pro-drop: when the finite verb raises in root clauses to the vacant C position, null subjects are freely licensed (20 a-c), whereas in embedded clauses, where the finite verb lexicalizes T° within the sentential core, pronominal subjects must be phonologically expressed (22 a-c), although not necessarily interpreted as emphatic or contrastively-focused. This asymmetrical distribution leads us to conclude that null subjects in the *HA* (and in medieval Gallo-Romance in general) were not licensed exclusively, if at all, by rich verb inflexion for person and number, but, by a feature which the finite verb can only check by raising to the vacant C position, presumably the locus of finiteness in medieval Romance.

What then of the 8 apparent examples of null pronominal subjects in embedded clauses highlighted in Table 7? These apparently fall into two categories as illustrated in (23 a-b) and (24 a-f), although ultimately, as we shall see, they form a single coherent set of examples of embedded V2.

- (23) a. *quant se fu par li soule desmentee*
 when self she.was by the own tormented
 ‘after she had tortured herself’ (§604.16)
- b. *quant la vit en son sanc toellier et estandre*
 when her= she.saw in her blood to.soil and to.lie
 ‘when she saw her lying and soiled in her own blood’ (§605.2)

- (24) a. *Ele baisoit l' enfant plus et plus por l' amor*
 she kissed the child more and more for the love
*au pere, et que PLUS le **baisoit** plus*
 to.the father and that more him= she.kissed more
s' enbatoit en la folie et en la rage
 self= plunged in the folly and in the rage
 'She kissed the child more and more out of her love for his father, and the more she kissed him the more she was taken by folly and rage' (§599.5)
- b. *Et de Gomer issirent un pueple qui Galathe*
 and from Gomer descended a people who Galatea
furent apelé por ce qu' il erent blanc et BLONDES
 were called for this that they were white and blond
*CHEVELEURES **avoient***
 hair they.had
 'And from Gomer is descended a people who were called Galatians because they were white and had blond hair' (§591.2)
- c. *Tantost com ele sot o eles furent et que ·vii·*
 soon as she knew where they were and that 7
*NÉS i **avoit** chargees*
 ships there= he.had loaded
 'As soon as she found out where they were and that he had 7 ships fully laden there' (§598.8)
- d. *si chai en l' aigue et la fu il noiés c'*
 si he.fell in the water and there was he drowned that
*ONQUES ne **fu** rescous ne n' i ot*
 never NEG= he.was rescued nor NEG= there= he.had
aïe
 help
 'he fell in the water and there he was drowned for he was never rescued nor did he receive any aid' (§608.2)
- e. *Et por ce que MOLT **estoit** lassés de regarder*
 and for this that much he.was weary of to.watch
es estoiles
 in.the stars
 'And because he was very weary of looking at the stars' (§608.2)
- f. *si les mirent a force fors des palus et*
 si them= they.put to force out of.the swamps and
chacerent et desconfirent, si c' ONQUES PUIS
 they.pursued and they.destroyed so that never since

n' oserent vers Rome nulle rien mesprendre
 NEG= they.dared towards Rome no thing to.violate
 'they removed them from the swamps pursuing and destroying
 them, such that never again did they dare commit any crime
 against Rome' (§591.11)

The examples in (23 a-b) have already been discussed at some length in footnote 16, where it was argued that the reflexive and feminine accusative singular pronominals *se* and *la* instantiate in these particular examples weak, rather than clitic, pronouns which, as phrasal constituents, can satisfy the linear V2 requirement. As such, we interpret these two examples as embedded V2 structures (cf. §2.2.6) rather than surface V1 sequences as provisionally indicated in Table 7, a conclusion which immediately explains the distribution of null pronominal subjects in these examples since pro-drop is licensed in V2 contexts, irrespective of the root vs embedded distinction.

An analogous explanation applies to the 6 examples in (24 a-f) where we see that in all cases the finite verb in the embedded clause is immediately preceded by a focalized constituent (adverb, direct object), a clear indication of an embedded V2 structure. As a consequence, the licensing of a null subject in each of these examples is to be fully expected in accordance with their (embedded) V2 status.

2.2.4 Distribution of expletive pronominal subjects

We begin by observing that there are at least 2 subtypes of non-referential pronominal subject. This can be observed, for example, in modern French which distinguishes both formally and syntactically between true expletives (with impersonal predicates; cf. 25 a-d) and quasi-arguments (with weather predicates and idioms; cf. 26 a-d). Formally, the former are lexicalized by *il* 'it' (m.sg) and the latter (cf. 26 a-d) by *il* or, in lower registers of spoken French, also by *ça* 'that' (n.sg). Significantly, though, *ça* cannot replace *il* in its uses as a true expletive. In terms of their syntax, they also show an important difference: whereas the true expletive *il* can frequently remain unpronounced in lower registers of spoken French, this is not true of quasi-argumental *il* or its colloquial variant *ça* which must always be pronounced. These facts are illustrated in (25)-(26).

- (25) a. (II) *faut que j' y aille tout de suite*
 it is.necessary that I there= go at.once
 (*Ça faut que...)

'I must go there at once'

- b. *De toute façon, (il) paraît qu' on a été invités*
 of any way it seems that we have been invited
 (...**ça paraît qu'on...*)²³
 'In any case it seems that we've been invited'
- c. *(Il) y en a qui disent que [...]*
 it there= thereof= has who say that
 (**Ça y en a qui...*)
 'There are those who say that [...]'
- d. *(Il) suffit de parler à voix haute!*
 it suffices of to.speak at voice loud
 (**Ça suffit de parler à voix haute!*)
 'You just have to speak up!'

- (26) a. **(Il/Ça) pleut/ flotte/ fait beau...*
 It/that rains rains makes nice
 'It's raining / nice weather'
- b. **(Il/Ça) fait nuit/ jour plus tard*
 it/that makes night day more late
 'It gets dark / light later'
- c. **(Ça) va chier des bulles/ barder ! (*Il va...)*
 that goes to.shit some bubbles to.load
 'The shit's going to hit the fan / That's going to kick off!'
- d. **(Ça) caille!/ (Ça) pue le fauve ici !*
 that curdles that stinks the wild.animal here
 (**Il caille/pue...*)
 'It's freezing! / It bloody stinks in here!'

23 As correctly pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, *ça paraît (que)* does indeed occur in modern French. However, in this usage (cf. i.a-b) *ça* has full anaphoric reference and is never a non-referential expletive:

- (i) a. *On aime notre boulot et ça paraît.*
 one loves our job and that seems
 'We love our job and it/that shows.'
- b. *Tu donnes toujours ton 400% et ça paraît que c' est ta passion.*
 you give always your 400% and that seems that it is your passion
 'You always give 400% and that shows that it's your passion.'

A not too dissimilar distinction in the typology of non-referential pronominal subjects is also found in the *HA*. Formally, the true expletive is lexicalized by *il* ‘it’ or *ce* ‘this’ (cf. 27 a-b), whereas the quasi-argument is always *il*, never *ce* (cf. 27 c).

- (27) a. *il sambloit que tuit li maistre ·iiii· vent ventassent*
 it seemed that all the principal 4 winds blew
 ‘it seemed that all four cardinal winds were blowing’ (§590.7)
- b. *ce li sambloit que c’ estoit terre mout sauvage*
 this to.him= seemed that it was land very wild
 ‘it seemed to him that it was a very wild country’ (§594.4)
- c. *Mes il comensa a plovoir si tres durement*
 but it began to to.rain so very hard
 ‘But it began to rain so very hard’ (§607.3)

In terms of their syntax, both subtypes of non-referential pronominal function as place-holders in root clauses, inasmuch as they only surface as a last resort strategy when required to satisfy the V2 constraint. Consequently, in the respective examples of true and quasi-argument expletives in (28) and (29) the pronominal functions as an overt phonological XP first-merged in a C-related specifier position simply as a means to satisfy the V2 requirement. By contrast, in the examples in (30)-(31) where the preverbal position is already filled by a fronted constituent and hence the V2 requirement is already satisfied, the expletive fails to surface, as expected (relevant finite verbs highlighted in bold).

- (28) a. ***Il** n’ est nulle doutance que [...]*
 it NEG= is no doubt that
 ‘There is no doubt that [...]’ (§591.2)
- b. ***il** les en conviendrait aller querre la terre*
 it them= thereof. would.suit to.go to.seek the land
que li deu lor avoit promise
 that the gods to.them= had promised
 ‘it would be to their advantage to go and seek the land which the gods had promised them’ (§604.4)
- c. ***il** lor avint une grans mescheance*
 it to.them= happened a great misfortune
 ‘a great misfortune befell them’ (§608.2)

- d. *il li tornoit mout a grant grevance de sa*
 it to.him= turned much to great grievance of his
gent qu' il cuidoit avoir perdue
 people that he believed to.have lost
 'he was greatly aggrieved for his people that he believed to have lost' (§594.3)
- (29) a. *Mes il comensa a plovoir si tres durement*
 but it began to to.rain so very hard
 'But it began to rain so very hard' (§607.3)
- b. *Il plut tant et a si grant habundance*
 it rained so.much and to so great abundance
 'It rained so much and in such great abundance' (§923.4, Rome II Section)²⁴
- (30) a. *et après sa mort li sambla qu' [...]*
 and after his death to.him= it.seemed that
 'and after his death it seemed to him that [...]' (§610.2)
- b. *PETIT s' en failloit qu' il en l'*
 little self= thereof= it.was.necessary that they in the
aigue ne sailloient
 water NEG= jump
 'they almost jumped into the water' (§608.1)
- c. *et asses i a qui ne le sevent mie*
 and enough there= it.has who NEG= it= know NEG
 'and there are many who do not know' (§608.7)
- d. *VOIRS fu ou commencement que Minos fu rois de*
 true it.was at.the beginning that Minos was king of
Crete
 Crete
 'It was true in the beginning that Minos was king of Crete'
 (§608.8)
- (31) a. *et adonc anuita*
 and then it.became.night
 'and then night fell' (§590.7)

²⁴ The number of examples of quasi-argument expletives in our textual sample (and in the text more generally) is very limited, hence we also draw on examples taken from outside the sample.

- b. *Après comensa a plovoir a si tres grans fuisons*
 after it.began to to.rain to so very big floods
 ‘Afterwards it began to rain very profusely’ (§603.7)
- c. *adonc comensa a toner et a esclistrer*
 then it.began to to.thunder and to to.lighten
 ‘then it began to thunder and lighten’ (§590.8)

By the same token, in embedded clauses where we have seen that V2 typically fails to obtain yielding SVO with obligatory realization of pronominal subjects, we expect both expletive subtypes to be realized to satisfy the EPP edge feature on T°. Indeed, this expectation is borne out, witness examples (32) and (33).

- (32) a. *quant il lor leva si tres orible tempeste et*
 when it to.them= raised so very terrible storm and
si grande
 so great
 ‘when a very big and frightening and storm took them’ (§590.7)
- b. *Mais quant il vit [...] qu’ il ne li convenist*
 but when he saw that it NEG= to.him= suited
estre desous autrui segnorie
 to.be under of.others power
 ‘But when he realized [...] that it was not in his interest to be under the authority of someone else’ (§589.1)
- c. *tant estoit bele la roine Dido qu’ il n’*
 so.much was beautiful the queen Dido that it NEG=
estavoit veir ne querre en forme de feme
 was.necessary to.see nor to.seek in form of woman
nulle plus bele creature
 no more beautiful creature
 ‘queen Dido was so beautiful that you could not see or seek a more beautiful woman than her’ (§596.7)
- d. *mais en la fin vit il que ce ne pooit ester*
 but in the end saw he that this NEG= could to.be
 ‘but in the end he realized that it could not be’ (§604.12)
- (33) *si tost com il ajorna*
 so soon as it became.day
 ‘as soon as day broke’ (§594.4)

The expected exceptions here are examples of embedded V2 such as (34) and (35) where the V2 constraint is already met by a fronted constituent, hence the absence of the expletive since it is neither needed to satisfy the computation of V2 as a place-holder in CP nor to satisfy the EPP as an expletive in SpecTP.

- (34) a. *Parmi ces .ii. gries fais se porpensa il en la*
among these 2 difficult facts self= thought he in the
fin que MEAUS li viendrait qu' il corousast
end that better to.him= it.would.come that he vexed
la roine Dido
the queen Dido
'Given these two difficult facts he thought in the end that it
would be better for him to distress queen Dido' (§604.3)
- b. *et por ce que FAIRE li convenoit ce que li*
and for this that to.do to.him= it.suited this that the
deu li comandoient
gods to.him= commanded
'and because it was to his advantage to do what the gods had
ordered him to' (§604.12)
- c. *si com adonc en estoit costume*
so as then of.it= it.was custom
'as it was then the custom' (§605.4)
- d. *si s' en tornast si coient de la contree*
si self= of.it= returned so softly from the region
qu' A SON FRERE n' en fust percevance
that to her brother NEG= of.it= it.was knowledge
'she left the region so secretly that her brother did not notice'
(§594.13)
- (35) *tantost com BONS VENS seroit, vendrait il apareillies*
at.once as good wind it.would.be would.come he prepared
'as soon as there were good winds, he would come prepared'
(§604.5)

In sum, irrespective of the formal distinction between true and quasi-argumental expletives (namely, *il/ce* vs *il*), the distributions observed above and summarized in Table 8 highlight how non-referential pronouns fulfil one of two last-resort functions. In root clauses and in some restricted types of embedded clause (i.e. with V2 syntax) they are externally-merged in a C-related specifier as a place-holder in satisfaction of the V2 constraint, whereas in (other)

embedded clauses (i.e. without a V2 syntax) they are externally-merged in SpecTP as an expletive in satisfaction of the EPP. We thus see once again that there is a striking asymmetry between root (V2) and embedded (non-V2) clauses in the distribution of overt expletives which lends further support to the hypothesis that the language of the *HA* is characterized by an asymmetric V2 syntax.

	Root Clauses				Embedded Clauses			
	V	<i>il/ce</i> V	XV__	XV <i>il</i>	V	<i>il</i> V	XV__	XV <i>il</i>
V1	1	–	–	–	5	–	–	–
V2	–	18	19	3	–	18	10	2
V3	–	1	3	–	–	–	–	–
V4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Totals	1 (2.2%)	19 (42.2%)	22 (48.9%)	3 (6.7%)	5 (14.3%)	18 (51.4%)	10 (28.6%)	2 (5.7%)

Table 8 Distribution of null and overt expletive pronominal subjects

Despite the otherwise robust generalizations about the distribution of non-referential pronominal subjects, Table 8 also highlights some notable exceptions in conjunction with true, but not quasi-argumental, expletives. In particular, our textual sample offers two sets of exceptions, the first of which, constituted by just 6 examples, are set out in (36).

- (36) a. *E puet bien estre qu' adonques en celui tans i*
and can well to.be that then in that time there=
ariverent et vindrent et des uns et des autres
arrived and came and of.the ones and of.the others
'And it may be that at that time both came there' (§589.8)
- b. *E quant vint au chief de .x. ans*
and when it.came to.the head of 10 years
'And when 10 years had passed' (§591.13; cf. Acre mss.
...q[ua]nt **uint**... (D 109ra, B 145ra/rb, P3 134vb, Pa 134ra), and
L5 ms. ...q(ua)nt **uint**... (93rb))
- c. *Quant vint a la matinee*
when it.came to the morning
'When morning came' (§594.4; cf. Acre mss. Q[ua]nt **uint**... (D
109vb, B 146rb, Pa 135rb), L5 ms. Q[ua]nt **uint**... (95vb), but P3
Quant **il uint**... (136rb))
- d. *E quant vint a la jornee*
and when it.came to the day

‘And when daylight broke’ (§601.6; cf. Acre mss. *q[an]t uint...* (D 112va, B 149vb, P3 140rb, Pa 138vb), L5 ms. *Qu[an]t uint...* (95vb))

- e. *Quant vint a lendemain*
when it.came to following.day
‘When the following day came’ (§606.10; cf. Acre mss. *Quant uint...* (D 114rb, B 152ra, Pa 141ra), but P3 *Quant uint | ce uint...* (142vb))
- f. *mais quant vint pres de dimie nuit*
but when it.came near of mid night
‘but when it was almost midnight’ (§608.2; cf. Acre mss. *quant ce uint...* (P3 143va, D 114vb, B 152vb))

All six examples involve root V1 linearizations and hence stand out in our sample since they constitute genuine violations of an otherwise robust asymmetric V2 rule, although amounting to just 0.6% of all root and embedded clauses in our sample. The exceptional and albeit inexplicable nature of the first example has already been discussed in §2.2.1.2 (cf. examples 12a-b). However, the five remaining examples, although genuine exceptions to the V2 rule, do seem to form a coherent group, both lexically and structurally. In particular, they all involve the unaccusative verb *venir* ‘come’ introduced by the temporal conjunction *quant* ‘when’ and are constructed with a postverbal temporal argument; if the verbs involved in such exceptions were lexically diverse and involved a different range of arguments other than temporal ones, then it might be plausible to interpret such examples as productive and meaningful violations. Given the evidence, however, it seems more plausible to conclude that we are dealing with some kind of lexicalized and obsolescent idiom which solely survives as an archaism in these temporal expressions, a conclusion in line with Wolfe’s (2018a) findings about the greater availability of V1 structures in earlier stages of French when the language still had a V-in-Fin V2 grammar.²⁵

25 Note that a comparison with other later manuscripts based on the first redaction – provided in brackets in (36b-f) above – shows in most cases the maintenance of this lexicalized archaism in the same examples, though in a few cases in some of the manuscripts (especially P3) the expletive has been introduced, presumably in accordance with the contemporary rules of the scribes’ V2 syntax (I thank S. Ventura for providing these examples). The Acre manuscripts are: i) Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MS 10175 (= B); ii) Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 562 (= D); iii) Paris, BnF, MS f. fr. 168 (= P3); and iv) Paris, BnF, MS f. fr. 9682 (= Pa). Alongside these we have also compared one manuscript of the ‘short version’ of the first redaction of the HA, namely London, BL, Add. MS 19669 (= L5). As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the lexicalized nature of the examples is further confirmed by the

The second set of exceptions involves the following 5 examples in which the expletive unexpectedly undergoes verb-subject inversion as a result of a root (37 a-c) or embedded (38 a-b) V2 structure.

- (37) a. *Mais ensi ne fu il mie*
 but thus NEG= was it NEG
 ‘But it was not thus’ (§604.6)
- b. *POR L’ AMOR QUE JE AI A TOI ne m’ en*
 for the love that I have to you NEG= me= of.it=
chaut il
 matters it
 ‘it does not matter to me because of the love that I have for you’
 (§604.9)
- c. *Segnor, devant ce qu’ Eneas fust la arivés et*
 lord before this that Aeneas was there arrived and
venus, c’ est en Itale, i avoit il eu .v. rois
 come it is in Italy there= had it had 5 kings
 ‘My Lord, before Aeneas had arrived there, namely in Italy,
 there had been 5 kings’ (§611.1)
- (38) a. *il me dist [...] que AUTRAMENT ne porroit il ester*
 he me= told that otherwise NEG= could it to.be
 ‘he told me [...] that it could not be otherwise’ (§600.8)
- b. *si devint si crueus et si malaventurous de totes*
 si he.became so cruel and so unlucky of all
creatures qu’ A PAINES est il nus qui le
 creatures that hardly is it nobody who it= you=
vos seust conter ne descrire
 knows to.say nor to.describe
 ‘he became the most cruel and miserable of all men that there is
 barely anyone who can tell or describe him to you’ (§594.10)

Again the number of exceptions are so small – just 0.6% of all root clauses and 0.4% of all embedded clauses, and 0.5% of the overall sample – that they do not undermine our general conclusions about the asymmetric V2 grammar of the language used in the *HA*. However, what these examples do possibly show are the first signs of a progressive extension of an originally asymmetric EPP feature on T° (originally restricted to non-V2 embedded contexts)

fact that the construction *quant vint* + temporal argument continues at least into the early 16th century and probably beyond.

to V2 contexts and, by implication, to root clauses in particular, which will gradually take hold in the language at the same time as the V2 constraint progressively weakens.

2.2.5 V3 Orders

In §2.1 it was noted that the distribution of V3 orders was considerably less frequent than V2 orders in both root and embedded clauses. The relevant distributional contrasts, taking into account our revisions regarding some apparent cases of V1 and V2 originally included in Tables 1 and 2, are presented in Table 9.

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals
Root Clauses				
V2	173 (32%)	70 (13%)	195 (36.1%)	438 (81.1%)
V3	45 (8.3%)	25 (4.6%)	30 (5.6%)	100 (18.5%)
Embedded Clauses				
V2	119 (26.4%)	65 (14.4%)	213 (47.2%)	397 (88%)
V3	28 (6.2%)	9 (2%)	17 (3.8%)	54 (12%)

Table 9 Distribution of V2 and V3 orders in root and embedded clauses

Although the difference in frequencies of V3 in root vs embedded clauses is actually quite minimal, namely 18.5% vs 12%, this conceals a significant qualitative difference in the types of V3 structure respectively licensed in root and embedded clauses, which can be summarized by way of (39) and (40).

- (39) a. Root V3: X + S + V... (S = 89/100 = 89%)
 b. Embedded V3: S + X + V... (S = 48/54 = 88.9%)
- (40) a. Root V3: X + S + V... (X = Circ. adv (80) > S (10), Adv (8) > O (2))
 b. Embedded V3: S + X + V... (X = O (30), Adv (19), S (4), circ. adv. (1))

As these schemata make clear, in root V3 clauses (cf. 39 a) the immediately preverbal constituent is typically the subject (89% of cases; cf. 41 a-d), whereas in embedded V3 clauses (cf. 40 b) the immediately preverbal constituent is rarely the subject (just 7.4% of cases; cf. 42 e-f). Conversely, the outermost constituent in embedded V3 contexts (cf. 39 b) predominantly corresponds to the subject (88.9% of cases; cf. 42 a-d), whereas in root V3 contexts (cf. 40 a)

this outermost position rarely hosts the subject (10% of cases; cf. 41 e-f), but is typically lexicalized by a circumstantial adverb (80% of cases; cf. 41 a-d).

- (41) a. [Quant devant Dido furent tuit venu,] [il] l'
 when before Dido were all come they to.her=
enclinerent et saluerent
 bowed and greeted
 'When all had come before Dido, they bowed to her and greeted her' (§597.1)
- b. Et [s' il ce pooit trover,] [il] le renonceroit
 and if he this could to.find he it= would.announce
volentiers a ses compagnons
 willingly to his companions
 'And if he could find this, he would willingly tell his companions' (§594.4)
- c. [E tantost com il furent en port entré,] [le rois
 and as.soon as they were in port entered the king
Acestes] les receu a grant joie
 Aceste them= received to great joy
 'And as soon as they had entered port, King Aceste welcomed them with great joy' (§609.9)
- d. E [quant il orent tant coru qu' il furent en
 and when they had so.much run that they were in
haute mer] [...] [UNS FORS TANS] lor vint
 high sea a strong weather to.them= came
 'And when they had travelled so much that they were on the open sea [...] they were met by very hostile weather' (§603.3)
- e. et [il] [TANTOST] le voudroit tot mangier
 and he at.once it= would.like all to.eat
 'and he would like to eat it all at once' (§608.20)
- f. [meismes li rois Acestes qui au port estoit et
 even the king Aceste who at.the port was and
tote sa gente] [DOLANT] en estoint
 all his people sorrowful there.of= were
 'even king Aceste who was in the port and all his men were saddened by it' (§608.1)
- (42) a. Et si me dist que [je] [MOUT] avroie de
 and si me= he.said that I much would.have of
paines par mer et par terre
 difficulties by sea and by land

‘And he told me that I would encounter many difficulties by sea and land’ (§600.4)

- b. *et si lor comanda qu’ [il] [SOR LES]*
and si to.them= he.ordered that they on the
FRANSOIS] alassent
French went
‘and he ordered them to attack the French’ (§591.16)
- c. *il cuida qu’ [ele] [NULL HOME] ne vousist avoir*
he thought that she no man NEG= wanted to.have
por la grant amor de son baron
for the great love of her husband
‘he thought that she did not want any man on account of her great love for her husband’ (§602.7)
- d. *Et s’ [il] [ce] pooit trover*
and if he this could to.find
‘And if he could find this’ (§594.4)
- e. *si li dist que [se il l’ en]*
si to.him= she.said that if he her= therefrom=
voloit avec lui porter en sa contree,] [ele] le
wanted with him to.take in his region she him=
delivreroit de la mort et de la prison son
would.deliver from the death and from the prison her
pere
father
‘she told him that, if he wanted to take her with him to his land, she would free him from death and her father’s prison’ (§608.18)
- f. *il vit [...] coment [en la fin] [la cités] fu*
he saw how in the end the city was
destruite
destroyed
‘he saw [...] how in the end the city was destroyed’ (§595.12)

We thus see that V3 sequences are not random linearizations but, rather, follow specific structural templates which, in turn, indirectly tell us something about the type of V2 grammar instantiated by the language of the *HA*. In particular, we need to consider the distinction between V-in-Fin and V-in-Force V2 grammars introduced briefly in §2.1 following Roberts (2012; 2015) and Wolfe (2015d; 2018a). According to this typology, V2 grammars differ in terms of whether the finite verb targets a low position (viz. Fin) or a high

position (viz. Force) within the C-domain, as represented in the respective structural sketches in (43 a-b).

- (43) a. $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text{FrameP} [\text{Spec}] [\text{ForceP} [\text{Spec}] [*_{\text{TopP}} [\text{Spec}] [\text{FocP} [\text{Spec}] [\text{FinP} \text{V}_{\text{Fin}} \\ \text{TP} \text{V}_{\text{Fin}} \dots]]]]]] \end{array} \right]$
 b. $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text{FrameP} [\text{Spec}] [\text{ForceP} [\text{Spec}] \text{V}_{\text{Fin}} [*_{\text{TopP}} [\text{FocP} [\text{FinP} [\text{TP} \\ \text{V}_{\text{Fin}} \dots]]]]]] \end{array} \right]$

Note that the two structures in (43) make some precise and testable predictions about the types of structures that can be generated in each of the V2 grammars. In a V-in-Fin V2 grammar (cf. 43a) the verb sits in the lowest head position Fin° from which it can be preceded, potentially simultaneously, by a focus (SpecFocP), one or more topics ($*_{\text{SpecTopP}}$) and a frame element (SpecFrameP).²⁶ In a V-in-Force grammar (cf. 43b), by contrast, the possibilities are greatly reduced since the verb targets the higher Force head, from where it can only be preceded by a fronted focalized or topicalized constituent in SpecForce ($> \text{V2}$) and additionally by a frame-element in SpecFrameP ($> \text{V3}$). Grammars of the former type have been argued to characterize, among others, medieval southern Italo-Romance varieties (cf. Ledgeway 2007; 2008) as well as late Latin (Ledgeway 2017), where we witness V-to-Fin raising with optional fronting of one or more constituents to the left periphery ($> \text{SpecFocP}$, $*_{\text{SpecTopP}}$, SpecFrameP). Consequently, we correctly predict that in these V2 varieties, alongside frequent linear V2 orders, V1 and V3* orders are not only possible but also not insignificant. On the other hand, V2 grammars of the latter V-in-Force type have been argued to characterize medieval Gallo-Romance (cf. Wolfe 2018a), where V-to-Force movement is accompanied by obligatory fronting to SpecForceP, be that of a focus or a topic. This correctly predicts a much stricter surface V2 linearization where V1 and V4 orders are extremely rare, if not entirely absent/impossible, and where V3 orders are attested, but are qualitatively constrained since the only position above SpecForceP is SpecFrameP such that V3 orders necessarily instantiate Frame+Topic/Focus sequences.

Returning now then to the HA, we have seen in root clauses that the only productive orders are V2, the predominant order, and V3, whereas V1 and V4 orders are near inexistent with just 1 example of each in our entire sample. This suggests, as already hinted above (cf. §2.1), that the HA displays a V-in-Force V2 grammar which, in turn, predicts that in root V3 sequences

26 As documented in the literature (cf. Benincà & Poletto 2004; Ledgeway 2010), frame elements sit outside the clause proper above ForceP and introduce a dislocated topical constituent, typically represented either by a (hanging) topic or by a scene-setting/circumstantial adverb(ial) that spells out the spatial-temporal coordinates of the utterance.

the outermost constituent should be a frame element (cf. 44). Indeed, this is precisely what we saw in (40 a) and was exemplified in (41 a-d) where the initial constituent is typically a circumstantial adverb or, less frequently, a topical subject (cf. 41 e-f). Although the immediately preverbal constituent lexicalizing SpecForceP is most frequently a topical subject, this position is not a specialized subject position nor a specialized topic position, but simply functions as a general ‘V2’ position which may also host focalized constituents bearing other grammatical relations, witness the foci in (41 e-f).

$$(44) \dots [\text{FrameP} [\text{Spec}] [\text{ForceP} [\text{Spec}] \text{V}_{\text{Fin}} [\text{*TopP} [\text{FocP} \dots [\text{FinP} [\text{IP} \text{V}_{\text{Fin}} \dots]]]]]]]$$

What then of embedded V3? Given the strict SVO order generally encountered in embedded contexts where the finite verb remains under T° (cf. §2.2.2, §2.2.6), we must assume that when V3 order obtains it is always the output of an embedded V2 syntax in which the finite verb *HAs* raised to the C-domain accompanied by fronting of two constituents to the left periphery, thereby effacing underlying SVO order.²⁷ However, given that in embedded contexts the Force head is already lexicalized by the complementizer/subordinator, the embedded finite verb cannot raise to Force° , but is forced to raise instead to the lower head Fin° , thereby producing a V-in-Fin V2 grammar (cf. 45). It follows that, unlike in root V3 clauses, there is no expectation – indeed no possibility – for the outermost constituent in an embedded V3 clause to be a frame element. Our only prediction is that embedded V3 sequences will involve either a Topic (SpecTopP) + Focus (SpecFocP) sequence as in (42 a-c), where the topic is most frequently, though not necessarily, represented by the subject (cf. 39 b), or a recursive topic sequence (*SpecTopP) as in (42 d-f).²⁸

27 Note that if we assumed that embedded V3 sequences did not involve embedded V2, but simply some form of base-generation of a topic or focus in the embedded left periphery above the usual non-V2 embedded SV(O) order (for which, see the discussion of recomplementation in footnote 29), then we should expect a high incidence of the order XP + SV(O). However, as already noted in (39 b) and (40 b), XP + SV(O) orders are very rare in embedded V3 sequences (just 4 examples, viz. 7.4%), where the typical placement of the overt subject (88.9% of cases) is in the outermost position, viz. S+XP + V(O).

28 Our sole example of an embedded V4 sequence illustrated in (i), where we find the sequence Topic + (contrastive) Focus + Topic, can also be explained by (45) if we assume, following Rizzi (1997), that there is an additional TopP sandwiched between FocP and FinP.

(i) *mais ne troverent mie a lor consell qu’ il plus as*
 but NEG= they.found NEG to their counsel that they more to.the
Romains se combattissent
 Romans self= fought
 ‘but they did not agree to continue to fight the Romans’ (§591.17)

- (45) ...[_{FrameP} [_{ForceP} *que* [_{*TopP} [_{*Spec}] [_{FocP} [_{Spec}] [_{FinP} **V_{Fin}** [_{IP} **V_{Fin}** ...]]]]]]

In conclusion, qualitative differences in the examples from V3 sequences provide direct support once again for the V2 nature of the language of the *HA*, and at the same time also reveal a significant asymmetry in the type of V2 grammars that obtain in root (V-in-Force) and embedded (V-in-Fin) contexts.

2.2.6 Embedded V2

Finally, we turn briefly to a topic which we have already touched upon on more than one occasion above in relation to our discussions of subjects and V3 orders, namely embedded V2. Above it has been argued that V2 follows largely an asymmetric distribution in the *HA*, such that in root clauses the finite verb raises to C-Force yielding the surface order XP V (S) ..., whereas in embedded clauses V-raising to C-Force is blocked, causing the finite verb to surface in T° yielding a fixed SVO order in 89.2% of surface V2 linearizations (cf. Table 4), with concomitant overt realization of pronominal subjects (cf. §§2.2.3-4). Less frequently, we find in our sample examples of embedded V2 (cf. Salvi 2004: ch.1; Benincà 2006: 24), in which the finite verb exceptionally raises to C-Fin with concomitant fronting of one (> V2; cf. 46) or two (> V3; cf. 47) constituents to the left periphery. Such cases can be unambiguously identified in that they deviate from the otherwise predominant embedded SVO pattern, displaying an immediately preverbal constituent other than the subject (cf. Salvesen & Walkden 2017), and the subject, if overtly realized and not fronted in V3 sequences (cf. 47 a-d), is found immediately after the finite verb as a reflex of the regular inversion structure (cf. 46 a-e, 47 e).

- (46) a. *je voill que vos sachés que DE JAPHETH ET DES*
 I want that you know that from Japheth and from.the
TROIENS orent li Fransois totes ores comensance
 Trojans had the French all hours beginning
 ‘I want you to know that the French descended nevertheless
 from Japheth and the Trojans’ (§591.4)
- b. *Quant ce vit Eneas, il dist [...]*
 when this saw Aeneas he said
 ‘When Aeneas saw this, he said [...]’ (§595.8)
- c. *Et si sachés que A MOI MEISMES sunt*
 and thus you.may.know that to my self are
maintes averses chozes avenues
 many hostile things happened

'And thus take heed that I myself have been adversely affected by many events' (§597.7)

- d. *on li ot bien dit et conté que DAME*
 one to.him= had well said and recounted that lady
ET ROINE en estoit Dido
 and queen of.it= was Dido

'and he had been told that Dido was the mistress and queen of the city' (§595.10)

- e. *Et si sachés bien que A GRANT PAINÉ*
 and thus you.may.know well that to great difficulty
sui je eschapés de la mer d' Aufrique
 am I escaped from the sea of Africa

'And thus take heed that I escaped from the sea of Africa with great difficulty' (§598.1)

- (47) a. *et si lor en feist sacrefices qu'*
 and si to.them= of.it= she.should.make sacrifices that
il A ENEAS EN donassent volenté et corage
 they to Aeneas of.it= give willingness and courage

'and she should make sacrifices to them so that they should grant Aeneas the will and the courage necessary' (§603.1)

- b. *Eneas comanda a ses maroniers qu' il A CELE*
 Aeneas commanded to his mariners that they to that
PART adresassent lor nés au plus droit qu'
 part direct their ships to.the more straight that
il pooient
 they could

'Aeneas ordered his mariners to steer their ships as directly as possible in that direction' (§610.4)

- c. *Mais ansois qu' il EN LOR NES entrassent*
 but before that they in their ships entered

'But before they boarded their ships' (§588.1)

- d. *Et si envoieai je cers messages [...] por*
 and thus will.send I certain messengers for
savoir s' il EN FOREST fust ja arivés
 to.know if he in forest was already arrived

'And I shall thus send some messengers [...] to find out if he had already arrived in the forest' (§597.12)

- e. *adonc comensa a toner et a esclistrer si fort*
 then it.began to to.thunder and to to.lighten so strong
 [...] *c' onques PLUS FORT TANS ne vit nulle*
 that never more strong weather NEG= saw no
creature
 creature
 'then it began to thunder and lighten so intensely [...] that such
 a powerful storm had never been seen before' (§590, 8)

We thus take all embedded V3 sequences like those in (47 a-d) to instantiate a V2 syntax (viz. V-in-Fin), since they deviate from the fixed SVO order (viz. V-in-T) which otherwise obtains in embedded clauses.²⁹ The markedness of these structures is evidenced by the fact that they only constitute a small proportion of all embedded clauses, namely 11.7% (54/461). Similarly marked is the distribution of embedded V2 linearizations displaying a V2 syntax (viz. V-in-Fin), which constitute only 10.6% (42/397) of all embedded linear V2 sequences and 9.1% (42/461) of all embedded clauses in our sample.

We note finally that alongside cases of embedded V2 we also find examples of so-called recomplementation,³⁰ albeit just 4 of them exemplified in (48 a-d).

- (48) a. *dist que se les estoiles qu' il maintes fois avoit*
 he.said that if the stars that he many times had
veues et coneues ne le decevoient, qu' il li
 seen and known NEG= him= deceived that it to.him=
sambloit que [...]
 seemed that
 '[Palinurus] said that, if the stars that he seen and known many
 times did not mislead him, then it seemed to him that [...]'
 (§606.5)

29 Even if we were to exclude embedded XP+S+V(O)... sequences on the assumption that they involve non-V2 SVO with some form of non-V2-related fronting of a single constituent, for which there is no evidence, this would not change our overall findings since of the 54 examples of linear embedded V3 only 4 examples (2 transitives, 2 athematics, viz. 7.4%) present the order XP+S+V(O). Indeed, such cases of non-V2 XP+S+V(O) order are attested, but they all involve recomplementation (cf. 48a-d).

30 Cf. Salvesen (2014: §§3.1.2–4) for old French; Dagnac (2012) for Picard; Uriagereka (1995) for Galician; Rodríguez-Ramalle (2003), Demonte and Fernández-Soriano (2005; 2009), Villa-García (2012a, 2012b; 2015), González i Planas, Francesc (2013) for Spanish; Mascarenhas (2007), Ribeiro & Torres Morais (2012) for Portuguese; Paoli (2003; 2007) for Ligurian and Turinese; Ledgeway (2004; 2005), Manzini & Savoia (2005), Vincent (2006), D'Alessandro & Ledgeway (2010), Dardano (2012: 147f.) for central-southern Italo-Romance; and Ledgeway (2012: ch. 4; 2016b: 1019f.) for an overview of Romance.

- b. *Et si avint que quant ele se delivra de sa*
 and so happened that when she self= delivered of her
porteur qu' ele ot ·ii· enfans
 pregnancy that she had 2 children
 'And thus it came to pass that when she gave birth she had two
 children' (§609.5)
- c. *et si li dist que se il pooit eschaper en*
 and so to.him= said that if he could to.escape in
nulle maniere qu' il n' i perdist la vie
 some way that he NEG= therein= lost the life
 'and he told him that, if he could escape in some way, he should
 not lose his life in so doing' (§608.16)
- d. *E puis si dist que quant il ne le pot*
 and then si he.said that when he NEG= her= could
trover, qu' il la comensa a hucher
 to.find that he her= began to to.shout
 'And then he said that, when he could not find him, he began to
 shout at her' (§600.2)

As these examples clearly demonstrate, recomplementation represents an alternative to embedded V2, only differing from the latter in that the Fin position is lexicalized not by the raised verb, but by the complementizer *que* 'that' which, in turn, introduces a canonical non-V2 embedded SV(O) structure. The relevant distinction thus lies in the differential lexicalization of the lower C-head Fin° which can be realized through the internal-merge option (⇒ embedded V2) or the external-merge option (⇒ recomplementation).

3 CONCLUSION

Our examination of the language of the *HA* through a detailed analysis of its sentential word order has shown that, despite the text's non-canonical nature on account of its probable composition in foreign lands, a *texte d'outre-mer*, it nonetheless constitutes a well-behaved example of old French – and of medieval Romance more generally – in all relevant respects. In particular, the *HA* displays an unmistakable asymmetric V2 syntax, as manifested in the conspicuous contrast between root X+V+S and embedded S+V+X word orders which we have interpreted in terms of V-in-Force and V-in-T, respectively, with concomitant fronting of a pragmatically salient constituent to SpecForceP in satisfaction of the V2 constraint in the former case and of the subject to SpecTP in satisfaction of the EPP in the latter case. In turn, this difference

explains a number of other related asymmetries observable in other areas of the V2 grammar of the *HA*, not least the differential setting of the EPP. In root clauses, and V2 contexts more generally, there is no dedicated subject position in the T-domain, with subjects either occurring *in situ* within *v*-VP or in the left periphery when pragmatically salient, whereas in (non-V2) embedded contexts T° both probes the finite verb and is endowed with an EPP edge feature which probes the subject yielding the observed SV(X) order. Consequently, unlike modern Romance varieties where the effects of the EPP on T° are uniformly observed in both root and embedded contexts, the setting of the EPP displays a striking root-embedded asymmetry in the *HA*. At the same time, this asymmetrical setting of the EPP also explains the distributional contrast in verb-subject inversion, a by-product of V-to-Force raising, which proves relatively common in root clauses (25.2%), but is correctly predicted to be absent from embedded clauses where subject and finite verb lexicalize the specifier and head positions of TP, except in the less frequent cases of embedded V2 where V-to-Fin raising may naturally produce verb-subject inversion (namely, in just 6.9% of all embedded clauses).³¹

These same structural differences between root and embedded clauses also explain another major difference between root and embedded contexts. As in other medieval Gallo-Romance varieties, we have observed a strong asymmetry in the distribution of overt and null pronominal subjects, inasmuch as, save a very small handful of exceptions, pronominal subjects are obligatorily overt in embedded contexts where V2 typically fails to obtain, but are either overt or null in root clauses, where V2 is licensed, in accordance with the usual interpretive differences familiar from modern Romance pro-drop varieties. Superficially, this asymmetrical distribution might lead us to hypothesise that the functional head responsible for the licensing of pro-drop in the *HA* is Force° , since null subjects occur in root V2 contexts where the finite verb targets Force° , but not in embedded contexts where the verb only raises to T° and its associated EPP feature can only be satisfied by an overt pronominal. However, the observation that null subjects are also possible in cases of embedded V2 involving V-in-Fin forces us to identify the licensing of pro-drop with Fin° , through which the finite verb passes *en route* to Force° in root V2 contexts, since if the relevant head were Force° , then this would incorrectly predict the ungrammaticality of null subjects in embedded V2. This is a natural conclusion given the strong traditional association of Fin(iteness) with inflexional reflexes of number and person which presumably license and

³¹ Of course, the actual frequency of embedded inversion is higher when considered in relation to just those embedded clauses that show embedded V2, namely 32 cases out of 97 examples of embedded V2 (viz. 33%).

spell-out the relevant phi-feature specification of the null subject.

The behaviour of expletives also shows a strong root-embedded contrast in accordance with the asymmetric distribution of V2 in the *HA*. In root clauses the expletive functions as a mere overt place-holder that only surfaces in SpecCP to satisfy V2 (viz. the edge feature on Force°) when no other constituent is available for fronting, hence is invariably absent when the surface linear requirement is already otherwise met. In embedded clauses where V2 fails to obtain yielding SV(X), the expletive functions again as a mere overt place-holder but is now obligatory, surfacing in SpecTP to satisfy the EPP edge feature on T°. This therefore correctly predicts that in neither case can the expletive appear in postverbal position.

Finally, we have seen that the difference between root and embedded V2 in terms of V-to-Force and V-to-Fin explains a number of observed qualitative differences between root and embedded V3 sequences. Raising of the finite verb to Force° in root clauses necessarily implies that the only positions available before the verb are SpecFrame and SpecForce, whereas in embedded V3 sequences the finite verb can only raise as high as Fin° from where it is preceded by *SpecTopP and SpecFocP. In our sample these positional differences are directly reflected in the typical differential linearizations of root V3 clauses (\Rightarrow circumstantial adverbial (SpecFrameP) + topical (pronominal) subject (SpecForceP)) and embedded V3 clauses (\Rightarrow topical (pronominal) subject (SpecTopP) + focused constituent (SpecFocP)).

We conclude with some very brief observations about the distribution of clauses introduced by *si* (< sic ‘so, thus’; cf. Marchello–Nizia 1985) which were excluded from our examination of V2. Our sample includes 180 examples, of which 165 involve (asyndetic) coordination where *si* signals the continuity of a topical subject in line with a usage widely reported in the philological and theoretical literature on medieval Romance.³² Of these 165 examples just 8 (viz. 4.4%) occur in embedded clauses, a distribution which once again suggests a strong root-embedded asymmetry related to the text’s V2 grammar (cf. Ledgeway 2008). Indeed, in the 157 examples of root clauses the presence of *si* in the (asyndetically) coordinated clause signals (and presumably licenses) a coreferential null subject in line with the typical V2 syntax of root clauses. It follows that in our sample we do not find root structures such as (49b) in which topic continuity is marked by an overt pronominal, inasmuch as *si* and coreferential overt pronominal subjects are in complementary distribution. Conversely, in (non-V2) embedded clauses, as we have already seen (§§2.2.3–4), the positive setting of the EPP requires overt realization of

32 Cf. Fleischman (1991; 1992), van Reenen and Schøsler (1992; 2000), Bocchi (2004), Ledgeway (2008), Wolfe (2018a, 2018b).

the (pronominal) subject, such that in cases of topical subject continuity between matrix and embedded clauses the embedded pronominal subject is obligatorily realized (50 a). Once again it follows that the distribution of overt pronominals and *si* are in complementary distribution, hence the ungrammaticality of embedded structures such as (50 b). We clearly see then that the distribution of *si* signals a V2 syntax – and indeed in Ledgeway (2008) is argued to represent an alternative external-merge option to the internal-merge option of finite verb raising (cf. also discussion of recomplementation in §2.2.6) – such that it is correctly predicted to be absent from embedded contexts.

- (49) a. *Il_i vint (et) si Ø_i dist...*
 he_i came and si Ø_i said
- b. **Il_i vint et il_i dist...*
 he_i came and he_i said
 ‘He came and said...’
- (50) a. *Il_i dist qu’ il_{i/j} vint...*
 he_i said that he_{i/j} came
- b. **Il_i dist que si Ø_i vint...*
 he_i said that si Ø_i came
 ‘He said that he came...’

Returning then to root clauses, we find examples of topic continuity marked by *si* where the clause is variously coordinated asyndetically (51 a) or explicitly (51 b). In cases of multiple clause coordination, we find again both asyndetic (*si* Ø) and explicit (*et si* Ø) coordination (51 c), as well as cases of explicit coordination in which *si* is not necessarily repeated (*et (si) Ø*) as in (51 d-e).

- (51) a. *il_i entra en sa nef, si Ø_i comanda les ancres*
 he_i entered in his ship, si Ø_i commanded the anchors
 lever de terre
 to.raise from land
 ‘he boarded his ship, ordered the anchors to be raised’ (§590.6)
- b. *li maroner_i arracherent les ancres de terre et si*
 the mariners_i removed the anchors from land and si
 Ø_i desvoloperent les voiles au vent
 Ø_i unfurled the sails to.the wind
 ‘the mariners raised the anchors and unfurled the sails into the
 wind’ (§604.13)

- c. *ele_i se leva, si Ø_i apela sa seror et si Ø_i*
 she_i self= raised si Ø_i called her sister and si Ø_i
li dist
 to.her= said
 ‘she got up, called her sister and said to her’ (§601.5)
- d. *il_i apareillerent lor viandes de lor cers et d’*
 they_i prepared their meats of their deer and of
autres choses, si Ø_i mangerent assés et Ø_i burent
 other things si Ø_i ate a.lot and Ø_i drank
 ‘they prepared their deer meats and other things, ate a lot and drank’ (§594.1)
- e. *E lors mistrent_i fors des nés les fromens qui*
 and then they.put_i out of.the ships the wheat.PL which
moillié estoient et lor armes et lor dras, si
 wet were and their weapons and their materials si
Ø_i resecherent tot et Ø_i rapareillerent, et si Ø_i
 Ø_i dried all and Ø_i readjusted and si Ø_i
mangerent
 ate
 ‘And then they removed from the ships the wheat which was wet and their weapons and their materials, dried and repaired everything, and ate’ (§592.12)

Topic continuity in embedded coordinated clauses typically involves, as just observed, the obligatory overt realization of the pronominal subject (52a). However, as noted, there are also 8 examples of embedded *si* in our textual sample which occur in contexts such as (52b-d). In particular, they all involve coordination with an initial embedded clause introduced by the complementizer *que* + overt pronominal where coordination can be explicit (52b) or asyndetic (52c) or, in cases of multiple coordination, both explicit and asyndetic (52d). Given the overwhelming restriction of *si* to V2 root clauses with a null pronominal subject, it is tempting to interpret the small number of instances of embedded *si* in examples such as (52b-d) as cases of embedded V2 since *si* is incompatible with *que* ‘that’ and licenses a null subject, which we have seen is a hallmark of a V2 syntax in the HA.

- (52) a. *il_j cuida certainement qu’ il_i i fust mors et*
 he_j thought certainly that he_i there= was died and
qu’ il_i ne revenist mie
 that he_i NEG= returned NEG

'he certainly thought that he had died there and that he would not return' (§609.1)

- b. *et si lor_i comanda qu' il_i sor les*
 and *si* to.them_i= he.commanded that they_i on the
Fransois alassent et si Ø_i les destruissent et tote
 French went and *si* Ø_i them= destroy and all
lor cité
 their city
 'and he ordered that they should attack the French and destroy their entire city' (§591.16)
- c. *si dist_j a sa seror qu' il_i en estoit alés*
si he.said_j to his sister that he_i therefrom= was gone
en Sire, si Ø_i reviendrait
 in Syria *si* Ø_i would.come.back
 'he told his sister that he had gone to Syria, he would return' (§594.12)
- d. *Et si lor_i dist qu' il_i as nés alassent*
 and *si* to.them_i= he.said that they_i to.the ships went
et si Ø_i les rapareillassent et Ø_i guarnissent de
 and *si* Ø_i them= repair and Ø_i protect from
tot ce que mestier
 all this that need
 'And he told them that should go to the ships and repair them and protect them from all that is necessary' (§592.12)

REFERENCES

- Adams, Marianne. 1987. *Old French, Null Subjects, and Verb Second Phenomena*: University of California Los Angeles dissertation.
- Alexiadou, Artemis & Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word order, verb-movement and EPP-checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16. 491–539.
- Bech, Kristin & Christine Salvesen. 2014. Preverbal word order in Old English and Old French. In Kristin Bech & Kristine Gunn Eide (eds.), *Information Structure and Syntactic Change in Germanic and Romance Languages*, 233–269. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*, 16–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Belletti, Adriana. 2005. Extended doubling and the VP periphery. *Probus* 17. 1–35.

- Benincà, Paola. 1995. Complement clitics in medieval Romance: The Tobler-Mussafia Law. In Adrian Battye & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 325–344. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benincà, Paola. 1996. *Piccola storia ragionata della dialettologia italiana*. Padua: Unipress.
- Benincà, Paola. 2006. A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance. In Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herberger & Paul H. Portner (eds.), *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*, 53–86. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Benincà, Paola. 2013. Caratteristiche del V2 romanzo. Lingue romanze antiche, ladino dolomitico e portoghese. In Federica Cognola & Ermenegildo Bidese (eds.), *Introduzione alla linguistica del mòcheno*, 65–84. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Benincà, Paola & Cecilia Poletto. 2004. Topic, focus and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 2*, 52–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bentley, Delia. 2007. Relazioni grammaticali e ruoli pragmatici: siciliano e italiano a confronto. In Delia Bentley & Adam Ledgeway (eds.), *Sui dialetti italo-romanzi. Saggi in onore di Nigel B. Vincent*, 48–62. Norfolk: Biddles.
- Biberauer, Theresa. 2003. *Verb Second (V2) in Afrikaans: A Minimalist Investigation of Word Order Variation*: University of Cambridge dissertation.
- Biberauer, Theresa. 2004. Reconsidering the EPP and Spec-TP in Germanic. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 1. 15–40.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Ans van Kemenade. 2011. Subject positions and information-structural diversification in the history of English. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 10. 17–69.
- Biberauer, Theresa & Ian Roberts. 2005. Changing EPP-parameters in the history of English: Accounting for variation and change. *English Language and Linguistics* 9. 5–46.
- Bocchi, Andrea. 2004. «Si» nel «Livero de l'abbecho». In Michelangelo Zaccarello & Lorenzo Tomasin (eds.), *Storia della lingua e filologia*, 121–158. Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni del Galluzzo.
- Bougy, Catherine. 2005. La langue improbable de l'Ystoire de li Normant (Italie du sud, XIV^e siècle), traduction en français de l'Historia Normannorum d'Aimé du Mont Cassin. *Annales de Normandie* 55. 77–85.
- Buridant, Claude. 2000. *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français*. Paris: SEDES.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government-binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 1997. Subjects and clause structure. In Liliane Haegeman

- (ed.), *A New Comparative Syntax*, 33–63. London: Longman.
- Cardinaletti, Anna. 2004. Toward a cartography of subject positions. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 2*, 115–165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cardinaletti, Anna & Michal Starke. 1994. The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 4(2). 41–109.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cognola, Frederica. 2013. Scrambling as verum focus: German scrambling meets Romance anaphoric anteposition. Unpublished manuscript, University of Trento.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2006. Informational focus in Sicilian and the left periphery. In Mara Frascarelli (ed.), *Phases of Interpretations*, 363–386. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related Features and Functional Projections*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio. 2016. Information and discourse structure. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 596–608. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cruschina, Silvio & Adam Ledgeway. 2016. Structure of the clause. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 556–574. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dadan, Marcin. 2019. *Head Labeling Preference and Language Change*: University of Connecticut – Storrs dissertation.
- Dagnac, Anne. 2012. How do you double your C? Evidence from an Oil dialect. In Christopher Piñón (ed.), *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 9, 77–94. Paris: CSSP. (<http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss9/>).
- Dardano, Maurizio. 2012. La subordinazione completiva. In Maurizio Dardano (ed.), *Sintassi dell'italiano antico. La prosa del Duecento e del Trecento*, 120–195. Rome: Carocci.
- Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2005. Features in Comp and syntactic variation: The case of “(de)queísmo” in Spanish. *Lingua* 115. 1063–1082.
- Demonte, Violeta & Olga Fernández-Soriano. 2009. Force and Finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system. *Probus* 21. 23–50.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dragomirescu, Adina & Alexandru Nicolae. 2015. Old Romanian inversion as a residual V2 grammar. Paper presented at Romance Syntax. Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives, Al 15-lea Colocviu Internațional al

- Departamentului de Lingvistică: Perspective Comparative și Diacronice asupra Limbii Române, Facultatea de Litere, University of Bucharest, 26-28/11/15.
- Dufter, Andreas. 2010. Subordination et expression du sujet en ancien français. In Maria Iliescu, Heidi Siller-Runggaldier & Paul Danler (eds.), *Actes du XXV^e Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes, Innsbruck, 3 – 8 septembre 2007, Bd. 2*, 443–458. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- D'Alessandro, Roberta & Adam Ledgeway. 2010. At the C-T Boundary: Investigating Abruzzese complementation. *Lingua* 120. 2040–2060.
- Eide, Kristin. 2006. *Word Order Structures and Unaccusative Verbs in Classical and Modern Portuguese*: University of Oslo dissertation.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1991. Discourse pragmatics and the grammar of old French: A functional reinterpretation of *si* and the personal pronouns. *Romance Philology* 44. 251–283.
- Fleischman, Suzanne. 1992. Discourse and diachrony: The rise and fall of old french *SI*. In Marinel Gerritsen & Dieter Stein (eds.), *Internal and External Factors in Syntactic Change*, 433–473. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Fontana, Josep M. 1993. *Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish*: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- Fontana, Josep M. 1997. On the integration of second position phenomena. In Ans van Kemenade & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, 207–249. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frey, Werner. 2006. Contrast and movement to the German prefield. In Valeria Molnár & Susanne Winkler (eds.), *The Architecture of Focus. Studies in Generative Grammar* 82, 235–264. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Gaunt, Simon. 2015. French literature abroad: Towards an alternative history of French literature. *Interfaces* 1. 25–61.
- Gaunt, Simon. In press. Texte et/ou manuscrit? A propos de l'Histoire ancienne jusqu'à César. In Sylvie Lefèvre & Fabio Zinelli (eds.), *En Français hors de France, Revue de Linguistique Romane*, Paris: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.
- Glikman, Julie. 2008. Les subordonnés asyndétiques en ancien français. In Daniel Roulland (ed.), *Travaux linguistiques du Cerlico*, 23–37. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- González i Planas, Francesc. 2013. On quotative recomplementation: Between pragmatics and morphosyntax. Universitat de Girona: Ms. <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/001620>.
- Haider, Hubert. 1993. *Deutsche Syntax Generativ*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Haider, Hubert. 2010. *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- sity Press.
- Haider, Hubert. 2013. *Symmetry Breaking in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Herman, József. 1990. *Du Latin aux langues romanes: Études de linguistique historique*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Hirschbühler, Paul & Marie-Odile Junker. 1988. Remarques sur les sujets nuls en subordonnée en ancien et en moyen français. *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée* 7. 63–84.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2015. Verb-second. In Tibor Kiss & Artemis Alexiadou (eds.), *Syntax – theory and analysis: an international handbook*, 342–382. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Ingham, Richard. 2014. Old French negation, the Tobler-Mussafia law, and V2. *Lingua* 147. 25–39.
- Jones, Michael. 1990. *Sardinian Syntax*. London: Routledge.
- Kaiser, Georg. 1999. A ordem das palavras e a posição do verbo finito no português antigo. In Ferenc Pál (ed.), *Actas do congresso internacional por motivo dos vinte anos do português no ensino superior*, 248–261. Budapest: Departamento de língua e literatura portuguesas da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Eötvös Loránd de Budapeste 1.
- Kaiser, Georg. 2002. *Verbstellung und Verbstellungswandel in den romanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Kaiser, Georg. 2002–3. Die Verb-Zweit-Stellung im Rätoromanischen. Ein typologischer Vergleich. *Ladinia* 26–27. 313–334.
- Labelle, Marie. 2007. Clausal architecture in early old French. *Lingua* 117. 289–316.
- Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2004. Il sistema completivo dei dialetti meridionali: La doppia serie di complementatori. *Rivista italiana di dialettologia* 27. 89–147.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: The dual complementiser system in the dialects of southern Italy. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103. 336–396.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2007. Old Neapolitan word order: Some initial observations. In Anna Laura Lepschy & Arturo Tosi (eds.), *Histories and Dictionaries of the Languages of Italy*, 121–149. Ravenna: Longo.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2008. Satisfying V2: *Sì* clauses in old Neapolitan. *Journal of Linguistics* 44. 437–440.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2010. The clausal domain: CP structure and the left periphery. In Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds.),

- Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, 38–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: morphosyntactic typology and change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2014. Parametrul poziției centrului și efectele sale pragmatice în trecerea de la latină la limbile romance. In Rodica Zafiu, Adina Dragomirescu & Alexandru Nicolae (eds.), *Diacronie și sincronie în studiul limbii române*, 11–26. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016a. The dialects of southern Italy. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 246–269. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016b. Complementation. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 1013–1028. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2017. Late latin verb second: The sentential word order of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 16. 163–216.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2018. On the decline of edge-fronting from Latin to Romance. In Ana Maria Martins & Adriana Cardoso (eds.), *Word Order Change*, 264–278. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam & Simone Ventura. In prep. Sentential negation and old French as a V2 language: evidence from the textual tradition of the *Histoire ancienne jusqu'à César*. Ms., University of Cambridge.
- Lemieux, Monique & Fernande Dupuis. 1995. The locus of verb-movement in non-asymmetric verb-second languages: the case of Middle French. In Adrian Battye & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 80–109. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lightfoot, David. 1999. *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change and Evolution*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lightfoot, David. 2006. *How New Languages Emerge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lombardi, Alessandra & Roberta Middleton. 2004. Alcune osservazioni sull'ordine delle parole negli antichi volgari italiani. In Maurizio Dardano & Gianluca Frenguelli (eds.), *SintAnt. La sintassi dell'italiano antico. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi*, 553–582. Rome: Aracne.
- Manzini, Maria Rita & Leonardo Maria Savoia. 2005. *I dialetti italiani e romanci. Morfosintassi generativa (3 vols)*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- Marchello-Nizia, Christiane. 1985. *Dire le vrai: l'adverbe «si» en français médiéval. Essai de linguistique historique*. Geneva: Droz.
- Martineau, France & Raymond Mougeon. 2003. A sociolinguistic study of the origins of ne deletion in European and Quebec French. *Language* 79.

- 118–152.
- Martins, Ana Maria. 1994. *Clíticos na história do português*: University of Lisbon dissertation.
- Martins, Ana Maria. 2002. The loss of IP-scrambling in Portuguese: Clause structure, word order variation and change. In David Lightfoot (ed.), *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, 232–248. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mascarenhas, Salvador. 2007. Complementizer doubling in European Portuguese. Institute for Logic, Language and Computation, Amsterdam: Ms.
- Mensching, Guido & Eva-Maria Remberger. 2010. Focus fronting and the left periphery in Sardinian. In Roberta D'Alessandro, Adam Ledgeway & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, 261–276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nicolae, Alexandru. 2015. *Ordinea constituenților în limba română: O perspectivă diacronică. Structura propoziției și deplasarea verbului*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Nicolae, Alexandru & Dana Niculescu. 2015. Pronominal clitics in old Romanian: The Tobler-Mussafia Law. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 60. 223–242.
- Paoli, Sandra. 2003. *COMP and the Left-Periphery: Comparative Evidence from Romance*: University of Manchester dissertation.
- Paoli, Sandra. 2007. The fine structure of the left periphery: COMPs and subjects. Evidence from Romance. *Lingua* 117. 1057–1079.
- Perlmutter, David. 1978. Impersonal passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 157–189. Berkeley: University of California.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2014. *Word Order in Old Italian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Price, Glanville. 1971. *The French Language Present and Past*. London: Arnold.
- Radwan, Sonja. 2011. *L'ordre des mots en ancien français. La syntaxe et la structure informationnelle de la zone préverbale*. University of Oslo MA thesis.
- van Reenen, Pieter & Lene Schøsler. 1992. Ancien et moyen français: Si “thématique”, analyse exhaustive d’une série de textes. *Vox Romanica* 51. 101–127.
- van Reenen, Pieter & Lene Schøsler. 2000. The pragmatic functions of the old French particles *ainz*, *apres*, *donc*, *lors*, *or*, *pluis*, and *si*. In Rosanna Sornicola, Erich Poppe & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds.), *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, 59–105. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ribeiro, Ilza. 1995. Evidence for a verb-second phase in old Portuguese. In Adrian Battye & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*,

- 110–139. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ribeiro, Ilza & Maria Aparecida Torres Morais. 2012. Doubling-que embedded constructions in old Portuguese: A diachronic perspective. In Charlotte Galves, Sonia Cyrino, Ruth Lopes, Filomena Sandalo & Juanito Avelar (eds.), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*, 97–116. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rinke, Esther. 2009. Verb placement in old Portuguese. In Andreas Dufter & Daniel Jacob (eds.), *Focus and Background in the Romance Languages*, 309–332. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rinke, Esther & Martin Elsig. 2010. Quantitative evidence and diachronic syntax. *Lingua* 120. 2557–2568.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, Ian. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax. A Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Roberts, Ian. 2012. Phases, head movement and second-position effects. In Ángel Gallego (ed.), *Phases. Developing the Framework*, 385–440. Berlin: Mouton.
- Roberts, Ian. 2015. Second positions: verb-movement, clitic-movement and the loss of features. Paper presented at Workshop Diachronic Syntax and (Modern) Parametric Theory, 22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics, University of Naples, 27–31 July 2015.
- Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2002. The extended projection principle as a condition on the Tense dependency. In Peter Svenonius (ed.), *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP*, 125–155. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rodríguez-Ramalle, Teresa. 2003. *La gramática de los adverbios en -mente o cómo expresar maneras, opiniones y actitudes a través de la lengua*. Madrid: Ediciones de la Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Salvesen, Christine. 2013. Topics and the left periphery: A comparison of old French and modern Germanic. In Terje Lohndal (ed.), *In Search of Universal Grammar: From Old Norse to Zoque*, 131–172. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Salvesen, Christine. 2014. Le complémentateur que et la périphérie gauche. *Syntaxe et sémantique* 15. 47–80.
- Salvesen, Christine & George Walkden. 2017. Diagnosing embedded V2 in old English and old French. In Eric Mathieu & Robert Truswell (eds.), *Micro-change and Macro-change in Diachronic Syntax*, 168–181. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salvi, Giampaolo. 2004. *La formazione della struttura di frase romanza. ordine delle parole e clitici dal latino alle lingue romanze antiche*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Salvi, Giampaolo. 2011. Morphosyntactic persistence Latin to Romance. In

- Martin Maiden, John Charles Smith & Adam Ledgeway (eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, vol. 1: Structures, 318–381. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salvi, Giampaolo. 2012. On the nature of the V2 system of medieval Romance. In Laura Brugé, Anna Cardinaletti, Giuliana Giusti, Nicola Munaro & Cecilia Poletto (eds.), *Functional Heads. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 7, 103–111. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Salvi, Giampaolo. 2016. Word order. In Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden (eds.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 997–1012. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2012. A comparative study of word order in old Romance. *Folia Linguistica* 46. 553–564.
- Skårup, Povl. 1975. *Les Premières zones de la proposition en ancien français*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 2000. Stability, variation and change in word order: Some evidence from the Romance languages. In Rosanna Sornicola, Erich Poppe & Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds.), *Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns Over Time*, 101–118. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Steiner, B. Devan. 2014. *The Evolution of Information Structure and Verb Second in the History of French*. Indiana University, Bloomington dissertation.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26. 79–123.
- Vance, Barbara. 1995. On the decline of verb movement to Comp in old and middle French. In Adrian Battye & Ian Roberts (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 170–199. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vance, Barbara. 1997. *Syntactic Change in Medieval French. Verb-second and Null Subjects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Vanelli, Laura. 1986. Strutture tematiche in italiano antico. In Harro Stammerjohann (ed.), *Tema-Rema in Italiano*, 248–273. Tübingen: Narr.
- Vanelli, Laura. 1999. Ordine delle parole e articolazione pragmatica nell'italiano antico: La "prominenza" pragmatica della prima posizione nella frase. *Medioevo Romanzo* 23. 229–246.
- Vanelli, Laura, Lorenzo Renzi & Paola Benincà. 1985. Typologie des pronoms sujets dans les langues romanes. In *Actes du XVII^e Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, III, 163–176. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence.
- Ventura, Simone. 2019. Digital editing and linguistic analyses: The first redaction of the *Histoire ancienne jusqu'à César*. *Textual Cultures* 12. 33–56.
- Ventura, Simone. Forthcoming. *Linguistic Variation and Linguistic Change in Medieval French: The Histoire Ancienne Jusqu'à César and its Textual Tradition*

- (12th - 15th c.). Strasbourg: ELiPhi.
- Villa-García, Julio. 2012a. *The Spanish Complementizer System: Consequences for the Syntax of Dislocations and Subjects, Locality of Movement, and Clausal Structure*. Storrs University of Connecticut MA thesis.
- Villa-García, Julio. 2012b. Recomplementation and locality of movement in Spanish. *Probus* 24. 257–314.
- Villa-García, Julio. 2015. *The Syntax of Multiple-Que Sentences in Spanish*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Vincent, Nigel. 2006. Il problema del doppio complementatore nei primi volgari d'Italia. In Alvise Andreose & Nicoletta Penello (eds.), *Laboratorio sulle varietà romanze antiche: Giornata di lavoro sulle varietà romanze antiche*, 27–42. Padua: University of Padua.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2015a. *Microvariation in Medieval Romance Syntax: A Comparative Study*. University of Cambridge dissertation.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2015b. Microvariation in old Italo-Romance syntax: The view from old Sardinian and old Sicilian. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 100. 3–36.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2015c. The nature of Old Spanish verb second reconsidered. *Lingua* 164. 132–155.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2015d. Medieval Romance V2 and the evolution of Romance clausal structure. Paper presented at Workshop Diachronic Syntax and (Modern) Parametric Theory, 22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics, University of Naples, 27–31 July 2015.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2018a. *Verb Second in Medieval Romance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wolfe, Sam. 2018b. Probing the syntax of a problematic particle: old french 'si' revisited. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 116. 332–362.
- Zafiu, Rodica. 2013. Information structure. In Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, 568–575. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zimmermann, Michael. 2014. *Expletive and Referential Subject Pronouns in Medieval French*. (*Linguistische Arbeiten* 556). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Zimmermann, Michael & Georg Kaiser. 2010. Much ado about nothing? On the categorial status of *et* and *ne* in medieval French. *Corpus* 9. 265–290.

V2 beyond borders

Adam Ledgeway
Faculty of Modern and Medieval Languages
and Linguistics
Sidgwick Avenue
University of Cambridge
Cambridge, CB3 9DA
anl21@cam.ac.uk
<https://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/anl21>