1. Introduction

A line of research that has received a strong impulse from recent empirical work is the so-called cartographic program, which aims to provide a map of the functional projections in the structure of the clause. In the framework of this project so far, a highly articulated functional structure has been drawn, where specialized positions appear to have the same respective order across languages. Some of the results of this research can be found in Cinque (2002), Rizzi (2004), and Belletti (2004). In this chapter, I present some descriptive generalizations based on medieval Romance as a contribution to the outline first proposed by Rizzi (1997) on the “fine structure of CP.” I will try to show that these languages allow us to draw a more precise picture of the functional structure of the CP area and provide further evidence in favor of the proposals I made in Benincà (2001).

The general assumptions and the procedure I adopt are inspired by Cinque’s (1996, 1999) extensive investigation of IP functional structure: no variation is assumed to be allowed by Universal Grammar in the number and type of functional projections and their relative order in natural languages; determining the hypothetical hierarchy is a matter of empirical investigation, based on observed order restrictions between the occupants of the functional projections (heads and/or specifiers).1

I will use data from medieval Romance varieties, including medieval dialects of Italy, dating from the twelfth to the early fourteenth century.2 Some of the phenomena are well known to Romance philologists, some are even part of the knowledge of nineteenth-century Romanists. Syntactic theory gives us a way to see in all of them some new and interesting regularities, which confirm or add further precision to the conclusions reached so far on CP structure.

I will argue that the whole of medieval Romance languages share important features of sentence structure and properties of the lexical constituents and functional elements, so that they can be considered a set of variants of an abstract Medieval Romance. On the basis of these common characteristics, we can at least try to exploit what is clear and evident in one variety in order to enlighten what is more obscure or elusive in another. I first briefly summarize the general framework sketched in Rizzi’s (1997) work on the left periphery, together with the revisions that have been
suggested in Benincà (2001) and further developed in Benincà and Poletto (2004b), mainly on the basis of modern Italian and Italian dialects (section 2). In section 3, I present the main properties of medieval Romance languages, which lead us to consider them a homogeneous linguistic group in this respect, that is, a set of dialects sharing syntactic features relevant to our investigation. I will also point out the peculiar characteristics that distinguish subareas of this linguistic family and present the first generalizations. In section 4, I concentrate on the rich articulation of the left periphery that appears in the medieval Romance varieties spoken in Italy. The fact that CP is open to more than one constituent in these varieties permits us to observe ordering constraints and make hypotheses on the organization of the functional structure. The generalizations can be formulated adopting the theory of an articulated series of functional projections, thus supporting the structure proposed in Benincà (2001). The focus of the analysis will be the position of complement clitics in main clauses. I will show that it is possible to state a set of generalizations that are valid for all medieval Romance if we make reference not to surface positions or roughly to a CP/IP distinction but to specific functional positions in an articulated CP structure. In particular, I will motivate the following generalizations concerning the position of the clitic with respect to the verb:

1. Enclisis and proclisis are sensitive to verb movement and the content of CP.
2. When the verb moves to C, we have enclisis if and only if the Focus field is empty.

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

It is important to emphasize that I use the labels Topic and Focus to refer to syntactic objects, putting aside their precise pragmatic values. It appears that the relation between syntactic phenomena of the left periphery and their pragmatic interpretation is not obvious. Unfortunately, these phenomena have inherited labels that seem to refer to pragmatics more than to syntax and misleadingly suggest an overlapping of these two levels. Here, I use these labels only as a way of referring to syntactic positions, bearing in mind that their pragmatic and semantic interpretation is in certain respects language specific (or depends on other language-specific characteristics).

The medieval Romance data are meant just to illustrate the phenomena under investigation, since positive evidence is insufficient to prove a generalization and since it is impossible to get grammaticality judgments on dead languages. The generalizations are then necessarily tentative; nevertheless, I will assume that what has not yet been found is ungrammatical.

2. The Fine Structure of CP: Evidence from Modern Italian
Rizzi (1997) proposes a first articulation of CP as shown in (1):

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

Part I: Clausal Architecture
The leftmost projection (ForceP) encodes the force of the sentence; as Rizzi suggests, this projection “looks outside,” connecting the sentence with the context or marking it with respect to the clause type. In contrast, the rightmost projection (FinP) “looks inside,” towards the content of the IP; the choice of the complementizer, for example, has to do with the modality and tense in IP, a sort of agreement between C° and I°, as it has been traditionally seen. TopP in Rizzi’s system can appear in two different positions and is recursive in both cases; it can contain many arguments, without ordering restrictions.

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

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

The recursivity of TopP has also been challenged in Benincà and Poletto (2004b), where it is proposed that these projections stand for fields, that is, sets of projections sharing specific semantic and syntactic characteristics. Data are provided showing that different kinds of topics can appear in the Topic field, in distinct and strictly ordered functional projections, and that the same holds for different kinds of foci in the Focus field.

Reaching a characterization of these projections in terms of their semantic interpretation and pragmatic felicity is beyond the scope of the present research. I will more simply try to identify their exact structural position on the basis of their semantic properties and given a prototypical semantic and pragmatic characterization. The traditional labels can be misleading, and judgments are often elusive and slippery. Even phonological properties like stress or intonation do not strictly determine the nature of preposed constituents; for example, intonational pitch is neither a necessary nor a sufficient feature to determine whether an element is in the Focus field or not. Moreover, when dealing with languages only accessible through written records, it is obviously impossible to get judgments or prosodic evidence, and in spoken languages, judgments can vary depending on local varieties.

Looking for purely syntactic evidence to identify projections and fields, we can start by considering a *wh*-element (or an emphatic Focus) as a Focus par excellence, a typical occupant of the Focus field, and take Italian Hanging Topic (HT) and Clitic Left Dislocation (LD) as typical Topics in the Frame field and in the Top field, respectively. Extending the properties of these prototypical elements, I propose that the Focus field hosts elements with operatorlike properties that undergo movement. Topics of various kinds are, on the contrary, base generated and hosted in fields all located above the Focus field. These properties are connected with different surface phenomena, which can be exploited in order to reconstruct the hierarchy of functional projections.

An argument in CP is in the specifier position (Spec) of a functional projection strictly of the X-bar form (one head, one Spec); a head in the Romance CP can be occupied either by a complementizer or by the verb (depending, first of all, on the nature of the sentence, as a main or a dependent clause). More than one Focus and more
than one Topic can appear, in their respective fields, even if the possibility for them to co-occur is subject to language-specific restrictions, which in some languages can be very strong. The functional projections are strictly ordered, and this is part of Universal Grammar.

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

Some of the elements identified as occupants of precise positions in the fields hosting topics have been identified in modern Italian: they are circumstantial adverbs and HTs in the Frame field, and Listed topics and LD topics in the Top field. As they can more freely co-occur in Italian than in other Romance languages, we are able to provide an order of these functional projections (the order in which I have listed them, going from left to right). In the following sections, I will introduce the properties that permit us to identify, in the appropriate cases, the various kinds of topics in modern Italian and to localize them in CP with respect to other heads and specifiers. We will then explore medieval Romance using—where possible—the same properties to distinguish constructions and identify positions. 7

2.1 A Typology of Italian Topics

Italian has two different types of thematized arguments: HT (Hanging Topics) and LD (Left Dislocated topics). They differ in four respects:

(a) While in the case of LD topics, an entire argument appears on the left (3a), HTs can only be DPs (3b). The two constructions are distinguishable in this way only when a prepositional phrase is involved, as in the following cases:

(3) a. Di Mario/di questo libro, non (ne) parla più nessuno. (LD)
   of Mario/of this book, NEG (of.him) talks anymore nobody
   b. Mario/questo libro, non ne parla più nessuno. (HT)
      Mario/this book, NOT of.him talks anymore nobody
      ‘Nobody talks about Mario/this book any more.’

(b) LD topics require a resumptive pronoun only with direct and partitive objects, while the clitic is optional in the other cases (obviously impossible if that type of argument has no appropriate clitic). If present, the clitic agrees with the LD topic in gender, number, and case (4a). In contrast, HTs necessarily require a resumptive pronoun, which expresses the syntactic relation of the preposed argument
with the sentence; case is only marked on the pronoun, which is not necessarily a clitic (4b, c):

(4) a. Mario, *(lo) vedo domani. (LD)
   Mario, (him) see tomorrow
   ‘Mario, I’ll see him tomorrow.’

   b. MARIO, (*lo) vedo domani. (Focus)
      ‘MARIO, I’ll see tomorrow.’

   c. Mario, nessuno parla più di lui/ ne parla più. (HT)
      Mario, nobody talks anymore of him/of.him talks anymore
      ‘As for Mario, nobody talks about him anymore.’

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

(5) a. *Mario, questo libro, non ne hanno parlato a lui. (*HT-HT)
    Mario, this book, NEG of.it have talked to him

   b. A Gianni, di questo libro, non gliene hanno mai parlato (LD-LD)
      To Gianni, of this book, NEG to.him-of.it have never talked
      ‘To John, about this book, they’ve never talked to him about it.’

(d) HTs can co-occur with LD; the relative order is HT-LD:

(6) a. Giorgio, ai nostri amici, non parlo mai di lui. (HT-LD)
    Giorgio, to our friends, NEG talk never of him
    ‘As for Giorgio, to our friends, I never talk about him.’

   b. *Ai nostri amici, Giorgio, non parlo mai di lui. (LD-HT)
      to our friends, Giorgio, NEG talk never of him

   Having drawn a distinction between HTs and LD topics, let us now examine the relative order of LD topics and focalized elements. In Benincà (2001), I concluded that a syntactic Topic cannot appear below Focus. The following examples show that the order LD-Focus is grammatical, while the opposite order is ungrammatical. For some still unclear reason, the contrast is stronger if the sequence is tested in the left periphery of a dependent clause:

(7) a. Il tuo amico, A MARIA, lo presenterò! (LD-Foc)
    the your friend, TO MARIA, him will-introduce
    ‘Your friend, TO MARIA I’ll introduce him.’

   b. *?A MARIA, il tuo amico, lo presenterò! (*Foc-LD)
      to MARIA, the your friend, him will-introduce

   c. *IL TUO AMICO, a Mario, gli presenterò! (*Foc-LD)
      THE YOUR FRIEND, to Mario, to.him introduce

   d. *Ho deciso che A MARIA, il tuo amico, lo presenterò. (*Foc-LD)
      have decided that TO MARIA, the your friend, him introduce
      ‘I have decided that TO MARIA, your friend, I’ll introduce him.’
Crucially, if the resumptive clitic is missing, (7a) becomes ungrammatical (8a) as expected, because a clitic is obligatory if the LD element is a direct object. If we change the order of Topic and Focus, the omission of the clitic corresponding to the hypothetical topic renders (7b, c) grammatical (8b, c); there is no difference in this case between main and dependent clauses:

(8) a. *Il tuo amico, A MARIA, presenterò!
   b. A MARIA, il tuo amico, presenterò!
   c. Ho deciso che A MARIA, il tuo amico presenterò.

A possible conclusion is that the sequence of elements in CP in (8b, c) is not [Focus LD], as the pragmatic interpretation would suggest, but [Focus Focus], as indicated by their syntactic behavior. This conclusion is a natural one if Focus is not a single projection but a field in which more than one element can be moved, binding a variable. Inside the field, the elements appear to be ordered, since only one can be intonationally focalized, namely the leftmost one: this instantiates the “emphatic focus” position (I Focus).

The hypothesis is, then, that we are locating fields containing several projections: the following scheme shows the fields in braces and the projections in square brackets:

(9) \{Frame . . . [HT] . . .\} \{Topic . . . [LD] . . .\} \{Focus . . . [EmphFocus] . . .\} \{UnmFocus . . .\}

### 2.2 Interrogatives, Relatives, and Complementizers

Further evidence in favor of the ordering of the elements appearing in the left periphery comes from the observation of their relative order in relation to interrogative and relative wh-phrases and with respect to heads located in CP, such as complementizers and verbs. In a main question, a lexicalized wh-element cannot be separated from the verb; an HT or an LD must precede the sequence wh-element–verb:

(10) a. Questo libro, a chi l’hai dato? (LD-wh-V)
    this book, to whom it-have given
    ‘This book, who did you give it to?’
   b. *A chi questo libro, l’hai dato? (*wh-LD-V)
      to whom this book, it-have given

(11) a. Mario, quando gli hai parlato? (HT-wh-V)
    Mario, when to.him have spoken
    ‘Mario, when did you talk to him?’
   b. Questo libro, a Mario, quando gliene hai parlato? (HT-LD-wh-V)
      this book, to Mario, when to.him-of.it have spoken?
      ‘This book, to Mario, when did you talk to him about it?’

(12) *Quando questo libro, ne hai parlato? (*wh-HT)
    when this book of.it have spoken

The resulting sequence is then (13).
As shown in Rizzi (1997), the relative wh-element occupies a section of the functional field that is higher than that of the interrogative wh-element; in the same area we also find the relative complementizer che:

(14) a. Il ragazzo a cui il libro lo porterò domani.
   the boy to whom the book it will.bring tomorrow
   ‘The boy to whom I’ll bring the book tomorrow.’
b. *Il ragazzo il libro a cui lo porterò domani
   the boy the book to whom it will.bring tomorrow
c. Il libro che a Mario non regalerò mai ...
   the book that to Mario NEG will.give never ...
   ‘The book that I’ll never give Mario . . .’
d. *Il libro a Mario che non regalerò mai ...
   the book to Mario that NEG will.give never ...

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

(15) a. Lo chiederò a chi queste cose le sa bene. (rel wh-LD)
   it will.ask to whom these things them knows well
   ‘I will ask this of those who know these things well.’
b. *Lo chiederò queste cose a chi le sa bene. (*LD-rel wh)
   it will.ask these things to whom them knows well
c. *Mi chiedo a chi queste cose le hai dette. (*interr wh-LD)
   SELF wonder to whom these things them have said
d. Mi chiedo queste cose a chi le hai dette. (LD-interr wh)
   SELF wonder these things to whom them have said
   ‘I wonder to whom you said these things.’

This observation will help us understand the behavior of a particular class of interrogatives in medieval Romance (see below, section 5.1). The complementizer introducing a subordinate clause also occupies a head in the higher portion of CP: it precedes LD (see Rizzi 1997) and can be preceded by an HT: 10

(16) a. *Sono certa di questo libro che non (ne) ha mai
   am certain of this book that NEG (of.it) has never
   parlato nessuno. (LD-che)
   spoken nobody
b. Sono certa questo libro che non ne ha mai parlato nessuno.
   ‘I am certain that nobody ever talked about this book.’

    (HT-che)

c. Sono certa che di questo libro non ne ha mai parlato nessuno.
   ‘I am certain that nobody ever talked about this book.’

    (che-LD)

The co-occurrence of interrogative-*wh* and Focus is highly restricted in Italian (as in many languages); I will not try to determine whether they share the same position or not, but it is possible to conclude that the *wh*-projection is the lowest one in CP. The evidence (which will be dealt with below) is the fact that in dependent interrogatives in all Romance languages, any access to the CP system is blocked. If we hypothesize that the *wh*-head is the lowest one, its involvement in dependent interrogatives blocks all the higher projections. The *wh*-head appears overtly in those Romance dialects (Northern Italian in particular) that require a lexical complementizer to introduce dependent interrogatives (see Benincà and Poletto 2004a).

2.3 The Recursivity in TopP Is Only Apparent

In the previous section, the apparent recursivity of TopP* assumed by Rizzi (1997) was scaled down. There is a syntactic difference between HT and LD that allows us to isolate two distinct and ordered projections; HT is probably in a field (call it Frame) where scene-setting adverbs (ScSett) also find their location (ordered above HT; [17a]). However, with respect to LD, recursion does not appear to be completely reduced. In Benincà and Poletto (2004b), we pointed out some semantic-pragmatic differences among LD arguments that appear together, identified a particular kind of topic with List Interpretation (LI), and showed that its position is below the ordinary LD (17b, c). The resumptive clitic has the same distribution with both the LD and the LI topic, which leads us to locate them in the same Topic field.

(17) a. [ScSett In quel momento [LD Gianni [IP non lo vedevo.]]]
   in that moment Gianni NEG him saw
   ‘At that moment, Gianni, I couldn’t see him.’

b. [LD Agli amici, [LI la prima [IP gliela vendiamo, (la seconda gliela regaliamo).]]]
   to-the friends, the former him-it sell, (the latter him-it give)
   ‘To friends, the former we sell, the latter we give for free.’
The pragmatic differences between the various categories of topics are in most cases hard to detect but can be brought out in particular contexts. This suggests that recursion could be completely eliminated once observation and grammatical description lead us to a fuller understanding of this part of grammar.

On the basis of the arguments briefly outlined here and discussed in more detail in Benincà (2001) and Benincà and Poletto (2004b), we can sketch the following structure of the left periphery: braces include fields, square brackets include single projections; a slash separates arguments whose relative order is unclear; C° indicates any head in the CP system (I have only marked the C°s for which we have some evidence, even if all Specs are supposed to be accompanied by a C°):

\[
(18) \begin{array}{c}
\text{[Force C°][Relwh C°]} \{/\text{Frame[ScSett][HT] C°}\} \{\text{TOPIC[LD] [LI] C°}\} \\
\{\text{Focus[I Focus][II Focus]}/[\text{Interrwh} C°]\} [\text{Fin C°}] 
\end{array}
\]

3. Medieval Romance: Common Syntactic Features

As shown by syntactic research on these languages, all the varieties of Romance languages in the Middle Ages (until the beginning of the fourteenth century at least) present characteristics in their syntax that have been explained hypothesizing that they share Verb Second (V2) syntax. Note that by V2, I refer to the obligatory activation of CP in all main clauses and not simply to the verb being in second position. By virtue of sharing a V2 syntax, these languages exhibit subject-verb inversion in main clauses when a constituent different from the subject appears in first position (see section 3.1). But since all of them are pro-drop languages (some have an asymmetric pro-drop, licensed by V-movement: see section 3.2), this surface sign of V2 syntax is not always immediately visible. In what follows, some aspects of Romance V2 syntax are illustrated with examples from some medieval Romance languages.

3.1 V2 Syntax: Subject-V Inversion in Main Clauses

In a V2 main clause, an object, an adverb, or a filler in first position is immediately followed by the verb. In this context, the subject can be omitted (see below); otherwise, it appears immediately after the inflected verb. We analyze this structure as resulting from movement of the verb to a head in CP; any constituent (including the subject) can appear in (one of) the specifiers of CP. In the following examples, the inflected V is in small capitals while the inverted subject is italicized (clitics and negation are not to be taken into account in this respect):

(19) a. Autre chose NE POT li roi trouver.
other thing NEG could the king find

‘The king couldn’t find anything else.’ (OFr.; Artu, 101)
b. Un pou après eure de prime fu Mador venuz a cort.
   ‘Mador arrived to court a little after the hour of first hour (i.e., 6:00 a.m.).’
   (Artu, 103)

(20) a. Mal cosselh DONET Pilat
   bad advice gave.3SG Pilatus
   ‘Pilatus gave bad advice.’
   (OProv.; Venjansa, 106)

b. Si sai eu la meillor razon.
   so know I the best reason
   ‘So I know the best reason.’
   (OProv.; Gaucelm Faidit, 47)

(21) Este logar MOSTRO dios a Abraam.
   this place showed God to Abraham
   ‘God showed Abraham this place.’
   (OSp.; Fontana 1993, 64)

(22) Con tanta paceença SOFRIA ela esta enfermidade.
   with so.much patience suffered she this disease
   ‘She suffered this disease so patiently.’
   (OPort.; Ribeiro 1995, 114)

(23) a. Bon vin FA l’uga negra.
   good wine makes the-grape black (SUBJ)
   ‘Black grapes make good wine.’
   (OMil.; Bonvesin, 96)

b. Et così LO MIS e’ ço
   and so it-put down
   ‘And so I put it down.’
   (OVen.; Lio Mazor, 31)

c. Ciò TENNE il re a grande maraviglia
   this held the king to great marvel
   ‘The king was astonished at that.’
   (OFlor.; Novellino, Tale 2)

The examples above represent the clearest cases. Sometimes the verb is in first, third, or fourth position. We will come back to this variation, which is typical of medieval varieties spoken in Italy; we will see that it leads us to discover other interesting syntactic properties and restrictions.

3.2 V2 Syntax: The Asymmetric Pro-Drop of Northern Italian and French

Another type of evidence for V2 syntax in Romance is provided by those Romance varieties (distributed in a continuous area going from France to Northern Italy) that exhibit what I will call asymmetric pro-drop: main clauses allow pro-drop, whereas in dependent clauses, the subject has to be expressed (Vanelli, Renzi, and Benincà 1985). The following sample of sentences shows the asymmetry. In the main clause, the subject is expressed only if semantically necessary; in the dependent clause, a subject pronoun is inserted even when it is coreferential with the subject of the main clause and is not required for semantic reasons:
(24) a. Or poez __ veoir a terre un des freres del chastel d’ Escalot
now can.2PL see on ground one of-the brothers of-the castle of-Escalot
‘Now you can see on the ground one of the brothers of the castle of
Escalot.’ (OFr.; Artu, 14)

b. Ceste merveille poés __ veoir
this marvel can.2PL see
‘You can see this marvel.’ (Artu, 186)

(25) a. Si errerent __ tant en tele maniere qu’il vindrent en la praerie
so wandered so.much in such way that-they came in the prairie
de Winchester
of Winchester
‘They wandered so much in such a way that they arrived in the prairie
of Winchester.’ (OFr.; Artu, 13)

b. Or avoit __ tant les doiz gresliz Qu’il s’ en issi
now had so the fingers frozen that-he cl-cl went
‘He had the fingers so frozen that he left.’ (OFr., Béroul, 63)

(26) Quand tu veniss al mondo, se tu voliss pensar, negota
when you came to-the world, if you wanted to.think, nothing
ge portassi __ , negota n poi __ portar
there brought.2SG, nothing from there can.2SG to.take
‘When you came into the world, if you think about it, you didn’t bring
anything, and nothing can you take away.’ (OMil.; Bonvesin, 179)

(27) et levà __ lo rem et de-me __ sulo col et menà-me __ ço per
and raised.3SG the oar and hit.3SG-me on-the neck and struck.3SG-me down
lo braço, si ch’el me lo scaveçà
the arm, so that he to.me-it broke.3SG
‘And he raised the oar and hit me on the neck, and struck my arm so that
he broke it.’ (OVen.; Lio Mazor, 18)

(28) E così ne provò __ de’ più cari ch’elli avea.
and so of.it tested.3SG of the most dear that-he had
‘So he tested some of the best friends he had.’ (OFlor.; Testi fiorentini, 74)

This asymmetry can be taken as evidence for V-movement to C° in main clauses
by making the following hypothesis. When the inflected verb moves to C° (as it does
in main clauses), it locally governs the subject position, so it transmits its features to
pro and licenses it as a subject. But when the verb doesn’t raise to C° (as is typically
the case in subordinate clauses), it cannot license pro as a subject. This hypothesis
accounts for the asymmetry of pro-drop, as V-movement to C° is primarily a root
phenomenon.

This description is an idealization, because in a number of cases the subject is
dropped in dependent clauses as well. The theory of an articulated structure of CP
makes possible a more complex hypothesis which accounts for the apparent counter-
examples in an interesting way. V-movement to C° is not obligatory in dependent
clauses, but it is possible provided that the lowest head is not occupied; the only case
in which V-movement is prohibited is in a dependent interrogative.14 In dependent
clauses involving portions of the structure higher than the locus of wh-movement, the
verb is allowed to move at least to the FocusP head, licensing a pro in subject posi-
tion. In medieval Romance languages that do not show the asymmetry of pro-drop, a
pro subject is always licensed in Spec, IP.

As movement to the CP system (in both main and dependent clauses) is much
freer in Old Italian varieties than in other medieval Romance languages, data from
medieval Italy will be used in sections 4 and 5 to test the consequences of this hy-
pothesis on a wider database.

3.3 V2 Syntax: Preverbal Elements

In this subsection, I will focus on two classes of elements that appear in preverbal po-
sition and adjacent to the verb in medieval Romance varieties: high-frequency words
like so and then, and preposed objects. I make the hypothesis that all these elements
occupy the Spec of FocusP, or better, a Spec in the Focus field, as sentential opera-
tors or moved arguments.

A few high-frequency lexical elements, when preverbal in a main clause, always
appear strictly adjacent to the inflected verb (and its clitics)—for example, Venetian
an, French (ainsi) ‘so’, lors ‘then’, and ainz ‘on the contrary.’15 Complement clitics,
if present, are always proclitic in this context. Occurrences are innumerable, with no
exceptions (clitic elements are in italics):

(29) a. Ainz n’en osastes __ armes prendre
    ‘On the contrary you didn’t dare to take up arms.’ (OFr.; Béroul, 94)

(30) a. Si se conseillierent __ entr’ex comment il feroient
    ‘They consulted each other on what to do.’ (OFr.; Artu, 253)

b. An’ me credev- eo servirte.
    ‘I rather thought I was your servant.’ (OVen.; Rainaldo, 172)

c. an lo dies tu ben!
    ‘On the contrary, you said it well!’ (OVen.; Lio Mazor, 18)
‘The queen was very upset about that.’ (OFr.; Artu, 166)

d. et enaysi, senher, fo tot lo tezaur de Iherusalem maniatz e and so, sir, was all the treasure of Jerusalem touched and gastats par las gens. spoiled by the people
‘And in that way, sir, was all the treasure of Jerusalem touched and spoiled by the people.’ (OProv.; Venjansa, 117)

e. et così cors-e’ là e si g’ entremeçaj _.
and so run-I there and so them pulled.apart
‘And I rushed there and pulled them apart.’ (OVen.; Lio Mazor, 30)

There is also another class of elements that always appear adjacent to the main verb: preposed direct objects without a clitic copy. Pragmatically, these objects can have various interpretations: they can represent an emphatic or an unmarked focus, a “relevant” theme, or an anaphoric theme. They do not seem pragmatically marked, as in modern Italian and other modern Romance languages. In the following examples, the preposed object is italicized, and the Romance verb (with clitics, if present) is in small capitals (some examples given above are repeated here):

(31) a. La traison LI A CONTÉ que li vasals a apresté.
the treason him has told that the vassal has prepared
‘He told him about the treason that was planned by the vassal.’
(OFr.; Enéas, 23–24)

b. Mes Lancelot ne CONNUT il mie, car trop estoit enbrons but Lancelot NEG recognized he NEG, because too.much was sullen
‘But he didn’t recognize Lancelot, as he was too sullen.’
(OFr.; Artu, 11, 3)

(32) Mal cosselh DONET Pilat.
bad advice gave Pilatus
‘Pilatus gave bad advice.’ (OProv.; Venjansa de la mort de Nostre Senhor)

(33) Este logar MOSTRO dios a Abraam.
this place showed God to Abraam
‘God showed Abraham this place.’ (OSp.; Fontana 1993, 64)

(34) Tal serviço LHE PODE fazer hûn homen pequenho.
such service to.him can do a man short
‘A short man can do this service for him.’ (OPort.; Huber 1933)

(35) una fertra FEI lo reis Salomon . . . Las colones FEI d’argent a sedan.chair made the king Solomon . . . The columns made of-silver e l’apoail and the-support
made of gold the steps through which man there mounted covered of purple
‘King Solomon made a sedan chair. He made the columns of silver and the support of gold; he covered the steps on which one climbed up with purple.’ (OPied.; Sermoni, 232)

(36) *Questa obedientia de morire* REGUIRIVA lo Padre a lo Fiolo
this obedience of to.die demanded the Father to the Son
‘The Father exacted this submission to die from the Son.’ (OMil.; Elucidiario, 123)

(37) et *lo pan ch’ e aveva en man DÉ* per la bocha a Madalena.
and the bread that I had in hand slammed on the mouth to Madalena
‘And I slammed the bread that I had in my hand on Madalena’s mouth.’ (OVen.; Lio Mazor, 27)

(38) *L’uscio MI LASCERAI aperto istanotte*
the-door to.me will.leave.2SG open tonight
‘You will leave the door open for me tonight.’ (OFlor.; Novellino, 38)

(39) *Guiderdone ASPETTO avere da voi.*
guerdon expect.1 SG to.have from you
‘I expect compensation from you.’ (OSic.; Scremin 1984–1985)

The pattern that emerges from the examples above has some apparent counter-examples: cases can be found in which the preposed object, even if adjacent to the verb, has a clitic copy, which is always enclitic. In the following sentences, the preposed object is in square brackets and the copy is italicized:

(40) a. *[Lo primo modo] chiamo lo estato temoruso*
the first mode call.1SG-it state timorous
‘I call the first type (of love) timorous state.’ (OUmbr., Jacopone)

b. A voi [le mie poche parole ch’avete intese] holle dette
to you the my few words that-have.2PL heard have.them said
con grande fede
with great faith
‘The few words that you heard from me I pronounced with great faith.’ (OFlor.; testi fiorentini, 282)

c. e [a los otros] acomendo-los adios.
and to the others commended.3SG-them to god
‘And he commended the others to God.’ (OSp.; Fontana 1993, 153)

The generalization based on surface order is the following:
Generalization on Preverbal Objects (Part 1):

In a main clause, an object can precede the verb and lack a clitic copy only if no lexical material intervenes between the object and the verb (except for clitics and the negative marker).

If, as anticipated above, we make a formal hypothesis on the structural position an object occupies when it is preposed without a clitic copy, we can formulate an absolute generalization as follows. Let us hypothesize that when a direct object moves leaving a trace, it can only move to the Spec of one of the projections in the Focus field. More precisely, let us assume that it can move only to the specifier immediately preceding the head to which the verb moves in a main clause. This hypothesis predicts that we should never find a preverbal object connected to a trace if some other XP intervenes between it and the verb. This is because the intervening XP would be in the specifier of the FocP headed by the verb, and thus the object would be in the Topic field. If the object is in the Topic field, it is not connected to a trace, but rather to a clitic copy in the clause.

When no XP intervenes between the preposed object and the verb, the structure is ambiguous, and the pragmatics determines where the object is located in the structure. We assume that the syntactic correlate of the pragmatic choice is the presence or absence of the clitic copy. One piece of syntactic evidence for disambiguating between the two possible structures—one with the preposed object in the Focus field and one with the preposed object in the Topic field—comes from the position of the clitic copy. This will be discussed in the following section.

3.4 The Position of Clitics (Tobler-Mussafia Law)

The law formulated in the nineteenth century by Adolf Tobler and Adolfo Mussafia (see Tobler 1875/1912; Mussafia 1886/1983) states that complement clitics cannot appear in first position in a sentence in medieval Romance languages. Since they must be adjacent to the verb, when the V is in first position they become enclitic. Enclisis is also found sentence internally; it is then supposed to be an option, obligatorily adopted to avoid clitics in first position. This corresponds to a first approximation of an accurate description of clitic syntax in medieval Romance. We will see that the description can reach a more detailed and interesting level. The Tobler-Mussafia law is based on data like the following (the verb is in small capitals, enclitics are italicized):

(41) REMANBRE li de la reine.
    occurred to.him of the queen
    ‘He remembered the queen.’ (OFr.; Chrétien, Erec et Enide, 28)

(42) RESPONDIO les el que lo non farie.
    answered them he that it neg would-do
    ‘He answered that he wouldn’t do it.’ (Osp.; Fontana 1993, 110)
Torné-s-en, si ané a l’autre so ami (. . .), si li ai went3SG-back.clit.clit, so went to the-other his friend, so to-him has coità so desasi. told his trouble

‘He went back and went to the other friend and told him his troubles.’ (OPied.; Sermoni Subalpini, 238)

et he li tras la fosina de man et branchai-lo and I to-him snatched the harpoon from hand and seized.him per li caveli et tras-lo en la sentin a . . . by the hair and pulled.him down into the bilge

‘And I snatched the harpoon from his hands and caught him by his hair and pulled him down into the bilge.’ (OVen.; Lio Mazor, 18)

levòssí questa femmina e aiutollo raised.herself this woman and helped.him

‘The woman stood up and helped him.’ (OFlor.; Novellino, 38)

Gravame forte lo balestire. burdens.me heavily the arbalester

‘The arbalester burdens me heavily.’ (OUmbr.; Jacopone)

Purriami laudari d’Amori bonamenti. could1SG.myself praise of-love kindly

‘I could praise Love.’ (OSic.; Scremin, 44; Stefano Protonotaro)

The distribution appears very regular: if something precedes the verb, clitics are generally proclitic; if the verb is initial, clitics are enclitic. If we try to push the generalization further, we face an asymmetrical situation: with no exception, in all the written Romance texts until at least the fourteenth century, if the verb is initial in a main assertive clause, there is enclisis.17 However, enclisis cannot completely depend on the impossibility for clitics to appear in first position, because we find cases of sentence-internal enclisis. Even if the latter case is quite rare outside Italy, it is found in all Romance languages of the Middle Ages:

a. [Quelgli il quale andasse per Firenze in die di lavorare], he the which would-go through Florence in day of working, debbìalglì essere soddisfatto . . . must.to-him to-be paid

‘Who happens to go through Florence in a working day must be paid . . .’ (OFlor.; Testi fiorentini, 54)

b. E [despues] mando-lo fazer a sus discipulos and afterwards gave.it to-do to his disciples

‘And afterwards he asked his disciples to do it.’ (OSp.; Fontana 1993, 53)
Using as a diagnostic test the properties of topics established on the basis of modern Italian, and anticipating in part what is to come, the examples in (48) are to be analyzed as follows. In (48a), the constituent preceding the verb is an HT, as there is no Case-matching between it (a bare DP) and the clitic that resumes it (a dative). In (48b) as well, the constituent in first position (followed by a V with an enclitic pronoun) is an HT, as it is one of the few elements (a circumstantial adverb) that allows V3 in Old Spanish. At a more abstract level, we can reach the following conclusion:

Generalization on Enclisis (Part 1):

Enclisis is found when the verb has moved to C°, and the XP which immediately precedes it is not in the Focus field, but rather in the Topic field or in the Frame field.

The examples in (48) are cases of sentence-internal enclisis in which a V is in second position but the Focus field is empty. With this formulation, which will be illustrated below for other cases, the generalization has no exception.

4. Medieval Romance of Italy: The Multiple Accessibility of CP

The V2 syntax of Romance varieties spoken in Italy appears less rigid than that of other Romance languages: V1, V3, and V4 are very common in all the languages of medieval Italy. These options are not totally impossible in other Romance languages but are governed by stronger textual and pragmatic requirements.18

The multiple accessibility of CP in Italian Romance is illustrated by the following examples:

(49) a. [L’altre ami] [si] est la moiller.
   the-other friend so is the wife
   ‘The other friend is the wife.’ (OPied.; Serm. Sub., 238)

b. [A le] [per tug li tempi] me rend e me consegno
   to her for all the times me surrender and me-deliver
   ‘I surrender and submit myself to her forever.’ (OMil.; Bonvesin, 163)

c. E [Pero Capel] [en la fiata] branchà uno uiger de pes
   and Pero Capel immediately seized a hamper of fish
   ‘And Pero Capel immediately seized a hamper of fish.’
   (OVen.; Lio Mazor, 35)

d. [Allora] [questi] andò e ricombatté.
   then this went and fought-again
   ‘Then he went there and began to fight again.’ (OFlor.; Novellino, 37)

e. [Ad ogni matto] [i savi] paiono matti, [si come] [ai savi]
   to each madman the sane.men seem mad, so as to the sane-men
   [i matti] paiono veramente matti.
   the madmen seem truly mad
‘To each madman the sane men seem crazy, just as the madmen seem truly crazy to the sane men.’

(OFlor.; Novellino, 40)

f. Et [chi facesse contra] [la prima volta] gli sia imposta and who should-act contrarily, the first time to-him be imposed penitença, et la seconda sia cacciato penance, and the second be expelled

‘And to anyone who may act contrarily, the first time he should be fined, the second time he should be expelled.’

(OFlor.; Testi fiorentini, 46)

g. [La speranza che avia de lo tuo gran perdonare] [a peccar] the hope that had.1sg of the your great forgiving to sin me conduca.

‘The hope that I had of your great forgiveness led me to sin.’

(OUmbr.; Jacopone)

h. [La figura piacente] [lo coro] mi diranca.

the figure pleasant the heart to-me wrenches

‘The pleasant figure tears my heart.’

(OSic.; Scremin, 34, Jacopo da Lentini)

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

(50) Sao ko [kelle terre per kelle fini que ki contene], [trenta anni]

I know that those lands for those boundaries that here contains, thirty years

le possette parte Santi Benedicti.

them-owned party of Saint Benedict

‘I know that the party of Saint Benedict owned for thirty years those lands between the boundaries that are here contained.’

Two constituents precede the inflected verb in a dependent complement clause. Since the complementizer ko is in a very high position in CP (see above, section 2), access to the lower projections is open for moved and base-generated constituents.19

This freedom of Italian allows us to refine our understanding of the properties of the elements in the left periphery. We can conclude that, even if the verb can frequently be initial and more than one constituent can precede it in main (and even dependent) clauses, the syntax continues to be what we call V2 syntax. That is, it is characterized by obligatory movement of the verb to a head position within the CP.

5. The Structure of CP in Medieval Romance

5.1 The Accessibility of CP in Main and Dependent Clauses

We can map the sentence of the Placitum into the structure that was proposed in (18) on the basis of modern Italian:20
Italian varieties, if viewed (with all possible caution) as a coherent subgroup of Romance, show us with greater clarity what in other varieties appears harder to detect. I will express it with the following generalization (see below for discussion of a systemic exception):

**Generalization on Verb Movement:**

In Romance, the CP is blocked for V-movement only in dependent interrogatives.

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

In the varieties of Romance spoken in Italy, we can find two noun phrases preceding the verb; if neither has a clitic copy, the leftmost one is the subject, and the object is adjacent to the verb:

(52) [La mia cattivanza] [l’alma] ha menata.

\[\text{the } \text{my wickedness } \text{the-soul has led} \]

‘My wickedness led my soul.’ (OUmbr., Jacopone)

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

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

(53) a. Sire, ge sai bien [qui ceste demoisele fu.]

\[\text{Sir, I know well who this damsel was} \]

‘Sir, I know well who this damsel was.’ (OFr.; *Artu*, 89)

b. Et sez tu [de quel part Booz et Lionnaix et Estors se son mis?]

\[\text{and know you in what part Booz and Lionnaix and Estors SELF are put} \]

‘And do you know where Booz and Lionnaix and Estors went?’

(OFr.; *Artu*, 12)

c. Domandà lo ditoPero [que eli deveva far del pes]

\[\text{asked the aforementioned Pero what they should do of-the fish} \]
‘The aforementioned Pero asked what they should do with the fish.’

(OVen.; Lio Mazor, 37)

In dependent complement clauses governed by bridge verbs, and even in dependent relatives, the accessibility of CP appears more restricted than in main clauses. But this restriction applies only to quantity, not to quality: the structures are allowed, even if they are not very frequent. We could informally conclude that the accessibility of CP in noninterrogative dependent clauses is the same in all Romance languages as in Italian, and the differences are governed only by pragmatics.

Some examples follow; the ones in (54) are complement subordinate clauses, those in (55) are relatives:

(54) a. v’aven noi scritto che [’l fornimento che vi bisongniasse]
to.you-have we written that [the supply that to.you was.necessary]
traeste di Bari e dell’altre fiere.
should.get2PL._ from Bari and from other fairs
‘We have written you that the supply you needed you should get from Bari and other fairs.’ (OFlor.; Lettera, 1)

b. mes ge croi qu’[encor] le fera il mieuz en la fin.
but I think that even it will-do he better in the end
‘But I think that in the end he will do it even better.’ (OFr.; Artu, 16)

(55) a. . . . cil qui [meint grant cop] avoit doné.
he who numerous big strokes had given
‘He who had given many strokes.’ (OFr.; Artu, 255)

b. . . . li chevalier qui [a la guerre] devoient aler.
the knights who to the war had-to go
‘The knights who had to go to war.’ (ibid., 138)

A class of apparent exceptions to the generalization above (which states that V-movement is blocked in a dependent interrogative) involves dependent interrogatives introduced by come ‘how’:21

(56) a. Vedi tu ( . . . ) come [per le dette vie] fa Avarizia/le sue
see you how through the said ways makes Greed its
operazioni ( . . . )?
operations?
‘Can you see how Greed in the aforesaid ways makes its operations?’

(OFlor.; Bono Giamboni, Trattato, 46)

b. Pregoti che mi dichi come [queste cose] tu le sai.
pray1SG.you that to-me tell how these things you them know
‘I pray you that you tell me how you know these things.’

(OFlor.; Novellino, 2)\textsuperscript{22}

The object *queste cose* ‘these things’ in (56b) is in TopP, as is revealed by the presence of the resumptive clitic; the subject is in the Focus field. In (56a), the subject follows the inflected V, which has moved to C°. I assume, without strong motivation, that the preposed PP in (56a) is in Focus (the adjective *dette* ‘(afore)said’ suggests this possibility, in analogy with modern Italian Anaphoric Anteposition; see Benincà 2001); nothing changes if one prefers to consider it a Topic.

There are reasons to hypothesize that these interrogatives have in fact the structure of a headless relative. The structure of (56a, b) would be as in (57a, b), respectively:

\begin{equation}
(57) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{[Rel } w \text{ come C°] \{} \text{Frame} \{} \text{TOPIC} \{} \text{Foc per le dette vie C° fa } \}\{ \text{IP } Avarizia tV le sue operazioni i } \\
\text{b. } & \text{[Rel } w \text{ come C°] \{} \text{Frame} \{} \text{TOPIC queste cose} \} \{ \text{Foc tu C° le sai } \} \{ \text{IP } tV t i} 
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

With respect to modern Italian, the structural location of the *wh*-pronoun in headless relatives was briefly illustrated above; in particular, it occurs in the same position as the *wh*-element of a regular relative clause (i.e., in a very high projection in CP).\textsuperscript{23}

5.2 Arguments in CP and Their Clitic Copies

From the analysis of Italian varieties we concluded that an object can be in CP and separated from the verb by another constituent; in this case it is obligatorily doubled by a clitic:

\begin{equation}
(58) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{[La mia gran pena e lo gravoso affanno c’ho} \\
\text{the my great sorrow and the grievous pain that-have1sg} \\
\text{lunghiamente per amor} \\
\text{long for love} \\
\text{patuto], [madonna] lo m’ha in gioia ritornato} \\
\text{suffered, my-lady it to-me-has into joy turned} \\
\text{‘The great sorrow and grievous pain I have suffered for a long time, my Lady turned into joy for me.’ (OSic.; Scremin, 89, Guido delle Colonne)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{[Madonna per cui stava tuttavia in allegranza], [or] no } \text{la} \\
\text{my.lady for whom was.1SG always in happiness now NEG her} \\
\text{veggio né notte né dia.} \\
\text{see.1SG neither night nor day} \\
\text{‘My Lady, who always used to make me happy, I see her now neither day nor night.’ (ibid., 88, Giacomo Pugliese)} \\
\text{c. } & \text{[La vertude ch’ill’ave d’auciderme e guarire], [a lingua dir} \\
\text{the virtue that-he-has of-kill-me and heal, to tongue to-say} \\
\text{non l’auso.} \\
\text{NEG it.dare.1SG}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}
‘I don’t dare to tell the virtue he has to kill me and heal me.’

(ibid., 88, Re Enzo)

In the structure we have hypothesized, an object that precedes the verb can either be in the Focus field (via movement) or be base generated in the Topic or Frame field, even if nothing intervenes between the object and the verb. In the former case it behaves like a wh-element and there is no resumptive clitic; in the latter case, it is a base-generated Topic, and so it must be doubled by a clitic.

On the basis of data from all Romance languages (examples are scarce in some languages, but there is virtually no exception), the following generalization holds:

Generalization on Preverbal Objects (Part 2):

A direct object that immediately precedes the verb and is doubled by a clitic requires enclisis.

This completes the generalization on preposed objects given in section 3.3 (some of the examples are repeated here for convenience):

(59) a. [Lo primo modo] chiamo lo estato temoruso, [lo seconno] pareme lo amor medecaruso, [lo terzo amore] pareme viatico amoruso, ‘I call the first type (of love) timorous state, the second seems.me love medicamentous, the third love seems.me viaticum amorous.

b. A voi le mie poche parole ch’avete intese holle dette con grande fede, ‘The few words that you heard from me I pronounced with great faith.’

c. e a los otros acomendo-los a dios. ‘And he commended the others to God.’

In these examples, we find enclisis of the clitic to a verb that is not in first position. The element in first position is one of those that permit V3; that is, in our view, one of those that can be inserted in the Frame field. This means that, though the verb is not first, it is still the case that the Focus field is empty. This configuration triggers enclisis.

5.3 Reformulating the Tobler-Mussafia Generalization

In the light of a theory that hypothesizes an articulated functional structure of CP, we can formulate several descriptive generalizations mapping surface phenomena to an abstract sequence of positions in CP.
Generalization on Enclisis (Part 2):

When the verb is in C° and an XP is in a Spec of the Focus field, enclisis is impossible.

The XPs in a specifier of the Focus field can be preverbal si, così, ainsi, assì, and so on; ‘so’; preverbal objects without a clitic copy (general Romance); or (OFr.); and an (OVen.). After these elements, clitics, if present, are always proclitic:

(60) a. et  
cosi lo mis e’ ço.
and so it put down
‘And so I put it down.’

b. An’  
me credev-eo servirte.
on-the-contrary myself thought-I to-serve-you
‘I rather thought I was your servant.’

(61) a. tutto ciò che m’hai chiesto t’ho dato.
all which that to-me-have.2SG asked to-you-have.1SG given. The
signoria di Roma t’ho data. Signore t’ho
domination of Rome to-you-have.1SG given. Master you-have.1SG
fatto di molte dilizie
made of many delights
‘I gave you everything you asked me. I gave you the domination of Rome. I made you the master of many delights.’

b. Tal servíço lhe pode fazer hûn homen pequenho.
such service to-him can do a man small
‘A short man can do this service to him.’

Generalization on Enclisis (Part 3):

If a verb is preceded by an XP in a Spec higher than the Focus field, and this verb has clitics, they are obligatorily enclitic.
Elements that have to be higher than Focus are HTs and preposed objects with a clitic copy:

(62) [Quelgli il quale andasse per Firenze in die di lavorare],
he the which would-go through Florence in day of working,

debbialgli essere soddisfatto . . .
must.to-him be paid

‘Who happens to go through Florence in a working day must be paid . . .’
(OFlor.; Testi fiorentini, 54)

The constituent preceding the verb is an HT, which can only be base generated in the Frame field; as no lexical material intervenes between it and the verb, there is enclisis.

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

(63) E despues MANDO-LO fazer a sus discipulos
and afterwards gave.it to.do to his disciples

‘And afterwards he asked his disciples to do it.’ (OSp.; Fontana 1993, 53)

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

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

(64) a. ed essendo poveramente in arnese, misesi ad andare ad Alessandro
and being poorly in condition, set.himself to go to Alessandro

‘And being in poor condition, he set out to go see Alessandro.’
(OFlor.; Novellino, 4)

b. la famiglia volendoli bene, l'insegnaro a campare
the family wanting.him good, him.taught.3PL to get-by

‘As the family loved him, they taught him how to get by.’ (ibid.)

The following structure, the same that we have proposed in (18) for modern Italian, accounts for the subtle facts we have pointed out in medieval Romance:

(65) [Force C°[Relwh C°]/{Frame [ScSett][HT] C°}{TOPIC[LD] [LI] C°}
{Focus[I Focus][II Focus]/[Interrwh] C°}[Fin C°]
There is a particular fact that deserves some reflection here:

Generalization on Enclisis (Part 4):

Enclisis is never found in dependent clauses with overt complementizers.\(^{25}\)

This is not an immediate consequence of what we have argued so far; since V2 is possible in dependent clauses (apart from interrogatives) and enclisis is triggered by an empty focus, enclisis should in principle be possible in dependent clauses, too. Interestingly, the absence of enclisis in all dependent clauses can instead be linked to the fact that V-movement to C\(^{0}\) in dependent clauses is in fact possible but not obligatory; the requirement is that the complementizer be in a head higher than that of the interrogative. In main clauses, enclisis is triggered by an empty Focus. My hypothesis is that, while enclisis is fed by V-movement to C\(^{0}\), it is the effect of a further movement that is required in main clauses, but rendered unnecessary—in fact, impossible—if a C\(^{0}\) head (and a Spec) is realized higher in CP. I will briefly elaborate on this idea in the following, concluding section.

5.4 Some Consequences and Speculations

The descriptive generalizations on medieval Romance pointed out in this chapter are accounted for if we assume that the lowest field in CP—the Focus field—is reserved to constituents that move there leaving a trace. In contrast, the higher fields host elements that are base generated (or moved with a different kind of movement, see note 5) and resumed by a clitic. The requirements for clitic doubling in medieval Romance are identical to those of modern Italian (see above, section 2): only direct objects in Topic or Frame are obligatorily doubled; HTs are distinguished from LD by the lack of Case-matching. Direct objects in Focus are moved and cannot be clitic doubled.

In the light of an articulated structure of CP, we have obtained a unitary description of enclisis of complement clitics in Romance, which accounts for enclisis and proclisis on purely syntactic grounds. Enclisis is a phenomenon—still to be understood as a morphosyntactic process—triggered by a V in C\(^{0}\) and an empty Focus. It seems reasonable to suppose that it is the result of a further movement of the V to the left, to reach the head in whose Spec a Topic (LD or HT) is base generated.

In dependent clauses, enclisis is not attested;\(^{26}\) as such, we conclude that this further movement is not required (and thus not possible). If we think of the empty topic as a pro, this context recalls various cases in Romance of pro-licensing via government; in dependent clauses, a null topic can be licensed via government by a higher head with features. A sentence beginning with a V is not, in fact, a sentence without a Topic but a sentence whose Topic is interpreted by default. When nothing precedes a V, an argument is necessarily supplied in a Spec in the CP system (possibly to satisfy some version of EPP). While a “null topic” can be inserted and interpreted on the basis of the linguistic context or general knowledge, a “null Focus” seems impossible on various grounds: being a moved element, it must not be inserted as a last resort; being relevant information, it cannot be interpreted by default. An inflected verb in a
main clause is then supposed to obligatorily create a Spec-Head configuration with a constituent in Spec, CP, which can either be overt (in the Focus or Topic field) or a null element; a null element can only be in the Topic field. Even if more than one element (overt or null) can coexist in the various CP specifiers, the requirement is satisfied with the lowest one. As a set of V2 languages, Old Romance shows that V2 requirements can be fulfilled at different functional levels in CP. In the framework of this hypothesis, a V-initial sentence is then a sentence that has a Topic (superficially empty) and has nothing in the Focus field, and as such the position of the clitics—if present—conforms to the generalization: they must be enclitic. In Benincà (1989), enclisis was described as the result of a further movement of the V to the Spec of Top; with an articulated structure, the verb can be thought of as moving to a higher head, thus preserving head movement in its classical version. The enclitic position of complement clitics that results from this further movement of the V suggests the existence of a position for clitics in CP; this completes the map of clitics that are being identified in (the functional structure of) IP and VP.

Let me try to sketch a very rough typology of the three layers of clitics I am proposing. In the VP functional area, we find clitics for complements and, in very few cases, clitics for subjects; in the IP area we find the complete series, complements and subjects; only clitics corresponding to subjects have been located in CP for modern Romance (namely, northern Italian dialects). It should not be surprising to find that complement clitics also used to be realized in CP in medieval Romance, in particular cases; this characteristic was lost together with other features of the old syntax.

In a restrictive theory of parameters (see Chomsky 1995, 160; Kayne 2005), parameters are seen as properties of functional elements. If we compare medieval Romance languages with their modern descendants, it seems to be the case that the V2 phenomena we have been dealing with—shared by all varieties and simultaneously lost or modified by all of them—are to be accounted for by a change in parameter setting. Two sorts of phenomena can be recognized that may depend on parametric features: the first is V-movement to C° when the lowest C° is free, and the second is V-movement to higher C° heads in CP. Both phenomena appear to be a consequence of properties of verbal inflection, which in the medieval stage of Romance could be assumed to be endowed with features to be discharged in CP and with features able to licence an argument in its Spec. The relative independence of these two types of features appears reflected in the varieties of Romance that still preserve some residue of the older syntax. These are the Rhaeto-Romance varieties, which are still V2 but have no residue of the medieval clitic syntax, and Portuguese, which maintains the medieval clitic syntax but has a limited V2 phenomenology (no inversion after Focus, etc.). The higher frequency of V-initial word order in the medieval languages of Italy corresponds to a wider range of “dropped” Topics that the V is able to legitimize in the corresponding Spec in this set of languages, that is, to a “stronger” V-inflection.

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

1. This position can be integrated in the Minimalist Program as outlined in Cinque (1999, sec. 6.3): the full structure is itself part of the numeration; an element is merged (or “base generated”) via feature checking; empty functional heads receive a default interpretation (see Cinque, 1999, sec. 6.1). Cinque (2003) discusses in detail the idea that the order of functional projections cannot be accounted for in terms of semantic scope, even if in some particular instances this could seem to be the case (for example, the relative order of Tense and Aspect projections). The order of functional projections is a construct of the computational system, as is the choice of particular modalities and functions among all those that could be linguistically encoded in the system.

2. It is not possible to include Rumanian in the set of languages considered because in its first written texts, which are from the sixteenth century, there is no trace of the phenomena that characterize Old Romance. It was probably too late, as by then all other Romance languages had already undergone a change in this part of the grammar. It is interesting to underline, in relation to this, that the Romance languages seem to change at the same pace in this part of syntax. The only partial exceptions are some Rhaeto-Romance dialects, which are still V2 today, and European Portuguese (with Galician and dialects belonging to that area), which preserve till today, though simplified, the general pattern of the relation between the syntax of clitics and V2 (see a brief discussion in Benincà 1995; more details and theoretical proposals can be found in Costa 2000, in particular the articles by Barbosa, Duarte and Matos, and Raposo).

3. The theory concerning the location of “clause typing” has been recently developed by Nicola Munaro, Hans Obenauer, Cecilia Poletto, Jean-Yves Pollock, Paul Portner, and Raffaella Zanutlini, in various papers on Romance languages and dialects, showing that clause typing markers seem to appear in different positions in the CP system, not just in the leftmost field. It could be the case that the explicit markers are secondary offspring of an abstract primary marking, located in ForceP. More work is needed to further explore this topic.

4. See Benincà (2001) for the case of syntactic topics (LD) that are intonationally focalized. An interesting, more restrictive, analysis of focalized topics as syntactic focuses is discussed in Bocci (forthcoming). Lonzi (2005) presents a very detailed and insightful discussion of the various pragmatic values a syntactic focus can have in spoken Italian.

5. I am oversimplifying the difference between all kinds of Topics on the one hand, and Focus on the other, in terms of base generation for the former versus movement for the latter. Cinque (1990) has proposed an analysis of LD in terms of base generation; the problem remains as to how to account, even in descriptive terms, for the syntactic differences between the two classes of Topics, namely HT and LD (which will be discussed in section 2.1 below). It seems straightforward to analyze a HT as base generated, as the sentence to which it belongs is always a closed sentence, whereas LD is connected to a sentence that in certain cases can be an open sentence, with gaps corresponding to, for example, LD PPs. Even if we were to adopt a movement analysis for LD (as proposed by Cecchetto 1999), we would have to hypothesize a type of movement different from Focus/wh-movement. It could be the case, for example, that LD involves a kind of movement that leaves behind functional material, which is either realized as a clitic or remains silent depending on the grammatical relation the element entertains with the sentence (see also, for similar properties of resumptive clitics in Celtic relative clauses, the solution proposed by Rouveret 2002). This problem is however not directly relevant to the issues examined in this paper. I maintain that different kinds of elements
occupy specific fields within CP, and only those elements that are legitimately moved as operators leaving a trace occupy the lower field. The others, which for the sake of simplicity are all claimed to be base generated, occupy higher fields.

6. Rizzi (2002) has approached some restrictions on sequences of arguments in CP as consequences of Relativized Minimality, blocking movements of operators in particular cases. It would be very interesting to do a detailed comparison of his theory and the one adopted in this paper. The ordering of base-generated elements seems, however, to remain outside of its explanatory scope.

7. One interesting aspect of Romance comparative syntax is that having identified the distinctive properties on the basis of modern Italian, we can use them in the analysis of Old Romance and obtain consistent results.

8. In Benincà (2001), evidence is given to identify a position in IP for certain kinds of (apparently topologized) adverbs, as in the following example:

   (i) [CP La casa [IP Gianni domani la compra]
       the house Gianni tomorrow it buys
       ‘The house, tomorrow Gianni will buy it.’

   A consequence is that a subject appearing on the left of adverbs of this kind is not necessarily in CP (TopP or FocP) but can be in subject position in IP.

9. More evidence comes from cases in which weak crossover effects can be observed, showing that the alleged Topic appearing on the right of Focus has the properties of a moved element, not of a base-generated topic. See Benincà (2001), section 1.2.1.2, and Benincà and Poletto (2004b), section 2. Recent works present interesting results that are consistent with ours. Krapova (2002) analyzes Bulgarian phenomena that provide very clear evidence against the idea that proper topics (base-generated themes) can also appear below Focus. Interesting data from Russian (Jacopo Garzonio, pers. comm.) show that elements that cannot be topics but only focus in CP (indefinite operators such as some, some kind of) can appear to the right of an emphatic Focus ([ia] through [ic]). The same can be observed with respect to Italian nessuno ‘nobody’ ([iia] through [iic]):

   (i) a. *kakujuto knigu IVAN kupil  (some book IVAN bought)
       b. KAKUJUTO KNIGU Ivan kupil    (SOME BOOK Ivan bought)
       c. IVAN kakujuto knigu kupil     (IVAN some book bought)
   (ii) a. *A nessuno Mario parlava  (to nobody Mario spoke)
        b. A NESSUNO parlava             (TO NOBODY he-spoke)
        c. MARIO a nessuno parlava      (MARIO to nobody spoke)

   In a different framework, Dryer (2003) argues for the existence of double Focus preposing in English, which is consistent with the proposal that some apparent cases of Focus followed by a Topic pointed out by Rizzi are double Focus cases, individuating a Focus field where moved elements appear. Some of the examples of Dryer (2003) are in fact to be interpreted as emphatic topics in the light of Italian (our List Interpretation). In Italian, the distinctive feature of this construction is the obligatoriness of the clitic, a piece of evidence not available in English. Even leaving these cases aside, the evidence provided by Dryer remains sufficient and convincing.

10. HTs are not taken into account in Rizzi (1997; see also Rizzi 2001). The example of LD Rizzi uses, where the LD element is a direct object, cannot be distinguished from an HT; this probably explains, at an abstract level, the apparent disagreement between my data and his, for example, with respect to a sentence like the following, which is for me colloquial but grammatical:

   (i) Maria dice il tuo libro che lo leggerà domani.
       Maria says the your book that it will-read tomorrow
       ‘Maria says that, your book, she’ll read it tomorrow.’

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

   (ii) Maria crede, il tuo libro, che non ne parlerà nessuno.
       Mary believes the your book, that NEG of-it will-talk nobody
       ‘Mary believes that, your book nobody will talk about it.’

   (iii) *Maria crede, del tuo libro, che non ne parlerà nessuno.
        Mary believes of-the your book that NEG of-it will-talk nobody
11. This means that German-type V2 is just a special case of V2 syntax, which entails the requirement of having one and only one overtly filled Spec.


13. I will not consider the cases of subjects (DP only) in final position, which have to be considered instances of lexical subjects linked to an expletive pro subject licensed by the V in C°: the issue is tangential to the present concerns. A sentence like (20a) is in fact ambiguous as for the position of the subject, while the sentences in (20b; 21a, b), where the subject precedes the object, are more transparent. Sentences with tensed auxiliaries would be even more explicit in this respect, but given the tense system of these languages, we have a relative scarcity of compound tenses.

14. This conclusion is consistent with generalizations on V2 in Germanic languages: the last case in which a Germanic language extends V2 in subordinate clauses is in a dependent interrogative (see Vikner 1995). If a language presents embedded V2 in an interrogative, it will present V2 in any other type of dependent clauses. An apparent exception in Old Romance will be briefly dealt with below, in section 5.1.1.

15. These elements are also used as nominal or adverbial modifiers; in such cases, they obviously have a different distribution. Moreover, in the manuscripts, si is written without the accent, which makes it a homograph of the reflexive clitic and the complementizer ‘if.’ This must be kept in mind because the form of the edited texts depends on the decisions of the editors (and in some edited texts all types of si are written without the accent).

16. It is necessary to set aside cases of interpolation, that is, the occurrence of lexical material between the clitic and the inflected verb. Interpolation is found in Old Spanish and Old Portuguese and—in my view—the phenomenon occurs in CP. It is interesting to observe (see Raposo 2000, 279) that the lexical material is inserted only if the clitic is on the left of the verb. Interpolation is also found in ancient varieties of Italian and modern Romance languages—including modern Spanish and Portuguese; this type is limited to a very restricted class of adverbs and occurs in IP. For interpolation in Old Portuguese, see Rivero (1986), Martins (1994), Raposo (2000, 277); for the type found in modern Italian dialects (which corresponds to what is found in Old Italian and modern Portuguese) see Ledgeway and Lombardi (2002). More reflection is needed on this interesting topic, which can be kept separate from other aspects of clitic syntax.

17. This specification is necessary, as some medieval Romance languages (Old Venetian, Old French, etc.) systematically show proclisis in initial position in yes-no questions. Moreover, some varieties treat differently the first position of coordinate sentences: Old Florentine, Old Venetian, and all the medieval varieties of southern Italy behave like Old Spanish and Old Portuguese and have obligatory enclisis if the verb appears immediately after a coordinating conjunction (irrespectively of the syntactic nature of the clause to which they are coordinated, whether a main or a dependent clause). Old French, Old Piedmontese, and Old Lombard do not have obligatory enclisis in this context. I will not further comment here on this difference, which involves the syntax of coordinated structures. I will not examine these particular cases (even if they can easily be accounted for in the proposed framework), as they do not directly bear on the object of our investigation.

18. See, for example, Fontana (1993, sec. 3.4.2) for V1, who points out that V1 appears to be a means of getting a strong textual cohesion, as in the Germanic V2 languages that admit it. This can be related to the hypothesis I will make that V-initial sentences have a null topic; Fontana (1993, sec. 3.4.3) shows that V3 sentences in Old Spanish and Old French admit only a certain type of elements in first position (see below).

19. Given the early date of this text, we cannot be sure that ko has already developed into a complementizer head; it is possible that it still retains its original nature of a neuter pronoun, occupying a Spec and marking the associated complementizer head (complementizers introducing complement clauses developed from pronouns in all Indo-European languages).

20. The constituent in TopP is probably an HT, as often is the case in other examples with a DP or PP containing a relative clause (or other material) that renders it “heavy.” If so, the presence of an HT after a complementizer in this early text is notable. We cannot be sure of the exact categorial status.
of the complementizer at this stage of the development of Romance languages: an element such as *ko* (in contrast with the following *que*) could still have pronominal features; it could have the function of a pro-sentence and structurally be a sister of the entire clause.

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

22. It is interesting that in a different version of the *Novellino* the order appears as “normal”: *come tue sai queste cose*.

23. In support of this hypothesis, we can consider cases of relative clauses introduced by *come* ‘how’ in other Old Romance languages, in which we observe that the subject appears in postverbal position. This means that we have *V* in *C*° in a dependent clause; so, even if the *wh*-element belongs to the interrogative paradigm, its position is very high, and access to *CP* is open to the *V*:

(i) a. *de si lointeingnes terres comme sont les parties de Jerusalem*
   from so far lands how are the parts of Jerusalem
   ‘From lands as far as the parts of Jerusalem.’
   (OFr.; *Artu*, 1)

   b. *asii com es amors so as is love*
   (OProv.; Bertran Carbonel, 54)

The idea that interrogatives can be structurally ambiguous is confirmed by the fact that we find dependent interrogatives using an indefinite relative pronoun or being coordinated with nonambiguous (indefinite) relatives, as exemplified by sentences like the following:

(ii) a. *vedutala così crucciata, la dimandò, quello ch’ella avesse.*
   seeing-her so upset, her asked.3sc that that-she had
   ‘Seeing her so upset he asked her what she had.’
   (OTusc.; Fr. Da Barberino)

   b. *egli è talora difficile e grave veder ciò ch’ave alchuno e chi è quello, a che e come a ragion si move ello.*
   it is sometimes difficult and grave to-see that that-has somebody and who is that, to what and how following reason self moves he
   ‘It is sometimes difficult and grave to see what somebody has and who he is, why and how reasonably he operates.’
   (OTusc.; Fr. Da Barberino)

24. The sentence appears to be a sequence of List Interpretation Topics (see above, section 2.3); the topic of the first clause is an object, the following ones are subjects, and the clitics are always enclitic.

25. This conclusion was already reached by Schiaffini (1954, 68), who asserted that in Old Italian enclisis is never observed after a *che*.

26. Apart, that is, from the case of coordination of subordinate clauses, where the second member is treated, in some varieties only, as a main assertive clause (if the verb is initial, clitics are enclitic; see note 19).

27. A natural consequence is that there cannot be any prosodic reason for the position of clitics with respect to an inflected verb, that is, for the choice between enclisis and proclisis. The generalizations we have seen render this kind of explanation even weaker than it already appeared to the contemporaries of A. Mussafia, who cast some doubts on it (see the discussion in Mussafia [1886/1983, 298]). If enclisis were a way to avoid clitics in sentence-initial position, we would not expect enclitic pronouns in sentence-internal position. This is instead possible, as pointed out here, but only in specific syntactic contexts, when what precedes the verb is not in FocusP.

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

29. I am referring to phenomena reported and analysed by Tortora (2002), for the Piedmontese variety of Borgomanero, and Shlonsky (2002) for some Franco-Provençal dialects, which seem to suggest the existence of a layer for clitics in the functional area of VP in addition to the clitic area in IP. Cinque (2001) also makes this hypothesis on the basis of Standard Italian data. A location for clitics in CP has been proposed for some northern Italian dialects by Poletto (2000), for the so-called vocalic
subject clitics, and by Munaro, Poletto, and Pollock (2001) and Penello (2003) for enclitic subjects in questions. It seems a natural possibility to have a functional structure of a pronominal nature in the three main layers of the structure of the clause.

30. Kayne (1984, 221–22), commenting on the syntactic status of subject clitics in northern Italian dialects (which, in contrast with French, are part of agreement), suggested that “this would appear to be related to Italian being a ‘pro-drop’ language.” At the time, it seemed to me that this idea did not make any sense, as the dialects of Italy each have their own history, independent and parallel to Italian. Today, it still does not make much sense, but seems to be supported by the common characteristics of medieval Italian varieties.

**TEXTS AND SOURCES**

Old Florentine (OFlor.):

Old Italian data also come from the database of the *Opera del Vocabolario Italiano* (OVI) (Florence-Chicago) http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/.

Old French (OFr.):

Old French data also come from the database of the *Laboratoire de français ancien*, Université d’Ottawa-Chicago, http://www.lib.uchicago.edu.

Old Milanese (OMil.):

Old Piedmontese (OPied.):

Old Portuguese (OPort.):

Old Provençal (OProv.):
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Old Sicilian (O Sic.):


Old Spanish (O Sp.):


Old Tuscan (O Tusc.):


Old Umbrian (O Umbr.):


Old Venetian (O Ven.):
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