VERB-INITIAL ORDERS IN OLD ROMANCE: A COMPARATIVE ACCOUNT

SAM WOLFE[1]

Abstract. Against the backdrop of controversy over the correct analysis of Old Romance clausal structure, this article presents a comparative typology of the V1 orders found within seven Old Romance texts. Evidence is presented that all the languages under consideration feature V-to-C_{Fin} movement and are thus types of verb-second (V2) grammar. The languages present a pattern of rich microvariation with regard to V1 phenomena however. The Old Sicilian, Old Occitan and Old Venetian varieties considered are argued to present widespread V1 which is employed as a discourse-marked word order alternative. In the later Old Spanish text presented V1 is attested as a marked word order, but is exceptionally rare. Old Sardinian contrasts with the other varieties is licensing generalised V1, derived via V-to-C_{Fin} movement. Later Old French makes use of the initial particle SI, in cases where the other varieties license V1 orders.

Keywords: Old Romance, V1 order, V2 grammar, V-movement.

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

1.1. V1 and V2 in Old Romance

Since the seminal work of Benincà (1983–1984) the dominant, though not uncontroversial, view in the literature is that the Old Romance languages were characterised by a verb-second (V2) syntax (Benincà 1983–1984, 1995, 2004, 2006, 2013; Vanelli, Renzi and Benincà 1986; Vanelli 1986, 1998; Adams 1987; Salvi 1991, 2004, 2012; Fontana 1993; Roberts 1993; Vance 1993, 1997; Ribeiro 1995; Poletto 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2013, 2014; Ledgeway 2007, 2008, 2009:Ch 21; Vance, Donaldson and Steiner 2009; Wolfe 2015a, b, c, d). This hypothesis sits alongside widespread observations that orders where the finite verb appears superficially first in the linear ordering prevail to a greater or lesser extent across the Old Romance textual record (Vance 1993; Roberts 1993: 150f; Fontana 1993: 100f; Ribeiro 1995: 122; Benincà 1995: 330, 2004: 290, 2006: 69; Labelle 2007: 300; Ledgeway 2007: 122; Salvi 2012: 106; Poletto 2014: 20).

Space constraints prevent a full review of evidence for the V2 status of Old Romance here, but note that the key arguments concern (i) a verbal *prefield* not specialised for subjects, which crucially can host direct objects which are not resumed by a clitic within the clausal core (Benincà 2004: 262, 2013: 71; Lombardi and Middleton 2004: 557;

[1] St John's College, University of Cambridge, sw493@cam.ac.uk.

RRL, **LX**, *2–3*, p. 147–172, Bucureşti, 2015

Ledgeway 2007: 130-131; Fernádez Ordóñez 2009: 17f; Salvesen 2013) (ii) widespread 'inversion' structures where the subject surfaces post-verbally (Roberts 1993: 56; Vance 1995: 177; Lombardi and Middleton 2004: 574; Donaldson 2012; Benincà 2013: 71), (iii) restrictions on the nature of V1 and V3 (Benincà 2004: 290; 2013: 73; Ledgeway 2007: 122; Salvi 2012: 106; Labelle 2007; Poletto 2014: 20f) and (iv) strong matrix/embedded word order asymmetries where a V2 order in matrix clauses gives way to a restricted SVO order in embedded clauses (Vanelli, Renzi and Benincà 1986: §4.1; Vanelli 1986: 175; Adams 1987; Salvi 1993: 189; Benincà 1995: 328, 2004: 265, 2006: 64, 2013: 70; Ledgeway 2007: 139, 2008: 458, 2009: 754; Poletto 2014: 15).

Taken as a whole, this evidence has led many scholars to propose a V2 account of Old Romance word order, where the V2 constraint is not considered a linear ordering rule but rather a purely syntactic constraint that the finite verb raise into the left-periphery (C-domain) of the clause, accompanied by the movement or merger of an additional phrasal constituent in a position structurally higher than the finite verb (Den Besten 1983; Vikner 1995; Biberauer 2002; Cardinaletti and Roberts 2002; Holmberg 2012; Roberts 2012). Following much recent work which shows the left periphery of the clause to be made up of dedicated discourse-related functional projections associated with Frame-Setting and Speaker Deixis, Topic and Focus functions, the preverbal phrasal constituent is taken to lexicalise a functional projection in one of these respective fields (Benincà 2004, 2006; Labelle 2007; Ledgeway 2007; Salvi 2012; Salvesen 2013; Poletto 2014) which precede C_{Fin}, a projection associated with finiteness which we take, in line with Cardinaletti and Roberts (2002), Ledgeway (2008, 2009) and Salvesen (2011, 2013), to be the landing side of the moved verb[2,3]:

(1) [**CP**{$C_{Frame/SpeakerDeixis}$}{C_{Force}}{C_{Topic}}{C_{Focus}}{C_{Fin} V_{Finite}} [**TP**…[***v*P**… ~~V_{Finite}~~]]]

Under such an account, orders where the verb appears superficially in initial position are not ruled out by the V2 grammar as an element which is phonologically null may satisfy the part of the V2 constraint which requires merger of a phrasal element in the left periphery. This has led a number of scholars to postulate the existence of Null Topics in the Old Romance languages (Roberts 1993: 151; Ribeiro 1995: 98; Lemieux and Dupuis 1995: 97; Benincà 2004: 290; Ledgeway 2007: 134, 2008: 448; Salvi 2012: 106; Poletto 2014: 20), whilst Salvi (2012: 106f) posits a number of other null elements which can satisfy the V2 constraint. Thus the superficially V1 Old Italian clause in (2a), would have a structure

[2] We adopt this stance here for ease of exposition. It may however be the case that the Old Romance languages vary both synchronically and diachronically as regards the landing site of the finite verb. This hypothesis is explored in detail in Wolfe (2015d, in press).

[3] The map of the left periphery given in (1) essentially corresponds to that sketched by Benincà and Poletto (2004), themselves building on seminal work by Rizzi (1997). See §4 for further discussion.

as in (2b) where merger of a Null Topic alongside V-to-C_{Fin} movement satisfies the V2 constraint:

(2) a. e quel cotal marito era dopo la parete della camera…
and that same husband be.3SG.PST behind the wall of-the room
Parlò e disse….
speak.3SG.PST and say.3SG.PST
'and that same husband was behind the wallk of the room. He spoke and said…' (Old Italian, *Novellino* XLVII, 231, from Poletto 2014: 21)

b. [**CP**{C_{Frame}}{C_{Force}}{C_{Topic} $Topic_{ø}$}{C_{Focus}}{C_{Fin} *parlò*} [**TP**…[***v*P**… ~~*parlò*~~]]

More detail on the technical implementation of this proposal is given below. The overall view of these authors can be best summarised as one under which V1 structures are readily permitted in a V2 grammar under specific structural conditions.

Such a view, however, contrasts markedly with a body of work which has emerged critiquing the V2 hypothesis for Old Romance. Kaiser (2002) argues against the V2 analysis of Old French previously put forward in Adams (1987), Roberts (1993) and Vance (1997) amongst others, suggesting that Old French was in fact an SVO language. He views the widespread attestation of V1 orders as crucial evidence against a V2 hypothesis. A stance viewing V1 orders as incompatible with a V2 account has been adopted in several subsequent works[4]. Note for example comments by Rinke and Elsig (2010: 2566) that '[a]s regards verb-initial and verb-third orders, they are clearly not a freely available option of verb-second grammars'. A clear contrast thus emerges with the V2 accounts outlined above. For those advocating an SVO account, V1 orders are not a marked word order alternative, but rather the unmarked output of a null subject SVO grammar with V-to-T movement.

1.2. Aims and methods

Given the controversy surrounding the role of V1 orders in Old Romance, this article sets out to critically evaluate the role played by V1 matrix clauses in the medieval period. The data used are drawn from a new comparative corpus of Old Romance texts, representing Sardinian, Sicilian, Venetian, Occitan, French and Spanish. The details of the texts appear in Table 1[5]:

[4] See Kaiser (2009: 140); Fiéis (2003); Rinke (2003: 221, 2007: 53); Bossong (2006: 536); Eide (2006: 170); Rinke and Meisel (2009: 101); Rinke and Elsig (2010: 2563); Sitaridou (2011: 164; 2012: 577).

[5] Note from the outset that the dates of composition vary, with the Old Sardinian texts being considerably older than the others used due to limitations of the textual record. The significance of this for a diachronic account of V1 is discussed in detail in Wolfe (2015a, b, d). For the remainder of the analysis we abstract away from the diachronic details and treat the varieties synchronically.

Table 1

Textual Corpus

Variety	Text	Date of Composition
Sicilian	*Libru de lu dialagu di sanctu Gregoriu*	1301-1350
Venetian	*I momnumenti del dialetto di Lio Mazor*	1312-1314
Spanish	*Libro de los ejemplos del conde Lucanor y de Patronio*	1335
Occitan	*La Vie de Sainte Douceline*	1200s
French	*La Quête du Saint Graal*	1215-1230
Sardinian	*Il Condaghe di San Nicola di Trullas*	1115-1200
	Il Condaghe di Santa Maria di Bonarcado	1120-1146

In the analysis that follows we assume an articulated set of left-peripheral projections (Rizzi 1997; Benincà 2001; Benincà and Poletto 2004 *inter alios*) as set out in (1). Following Roberts (2010) Head Movement is assumed to be part of Narrow Syntax. Finally, note the working assumption that functional heads can be endowed with movement diacritics which trigger phrasal movement to their specifier position (akin to the EPP-feature of Chomsky 2000).

The aim of this article is, however, principally empirical, in seeking to describe the distribution of V1 in the texts studied from a comparative perspective and evaluate whether the V1 clauses are the output of a V2 or SVO grammar. It will be clearly demonstrated that there is greater variation between the Old Romance languages in this regard than has previously been acknowledged but all of the languages under consideration show evidence for verb movement into the C-domain.

2. EVIDENCE FOR A V2 GRAMMAR?

2.1. V-to-C Movement in Old Romance

Prior to a detailed consideration of the role of V1 structures in Section 2, we seek to establish here that there is in fact compelling independent evidence for positing a form of V2 system in all of the languages consideration.

Although as cautioned by Fontana (1993: 100), Ledgeway (2008: 439) and Wolfe (2015b: 25) the V2 property should not be reduced to a superficial linear ordering constraint, it is nevertheless observable that in uncontroversially V2 Raeto-Romance and Germanic languages linear verb-second can be viewed as the unmarked word order.[6] It is

[6] See amongst others Haiman and Benincà (1992: 150); Vikner (1995: 41); Holmberg and Platzack (1995: 71); Poletto (2002: 229); Craenenbroeck and Haegeman (2007: 167); Haider (2010: 1) and Holmberg (2012: 1) amongst others.

therefore significant that in all but one of the languages considered second position is the most frequent for the finite verb. Although there is clear variation between all texts with regard to finite verb placement, Old Sardinian is the significant outlier in this regard where V1 order is dominant, a point we return to in §3.6[7]:

Table 2

Finite Verb Placement in Matrix Clauses

Variety	**V1**		**V2**		**V3***		**Total**	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Sicilian	51	8.10%	317	50.32%	262	41.59%	630	100%
Venetian	154	24.33%	371	58.61%	108	17.06%	633	100%
Spanish	6	1.26%	437	91.81%	33	6.93%	476	100%
Occitan	47	7.56%	328	52.73%	247	39.71%	622	100%
French	0	0.00%	475	75.16%	157	24.84%	632	100%
Sardinian	198	52.24%	163	43.01%	18	4.75%	379	100%

A second piece of evidence in favour of a V2 analysis comes from the nature of the verbal prefield. It has long been noted that the preverbal field in Germanic V2 languages is not a specialised subject position as in most SVO languages (Pollock 1989; Guasti and Rizzi 2002) but is rather made up of left-peripheral projections with a range of discourse-pragmatic functions which can host constituents belonging to a variety of different grammatical categories (Diesing 1990:44; Müller 2004:§2; Frey 2004:3; Thráinsson 2007:17; Westergaard 2008:1843; Haider 2010:1). Significantly, all the texts under consideration show clear evidence that the prefield is not a specialised subject position, with a wide range of constituents readily attested immediately before the finite verb:

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

[7] For the sake of completeness the V3* orders found within the corpus are shown in Table 2, but are not discussed further here. In line with Benincà (2004: 275, 2006: §4, 2013: 73-74), Poletto (2006a: 263, 2006b: 13, 2014: 16) and Ledgeway (2007: 132) we analyse these orders as resulting from the co-occurrence of multiple constituents structurally higher than the moved verb in C_{Fin}. Crucially as shown in Wolfe (2015a, c) all cases of V3* across the corpus involve initial constituents which are plausibly first-merged in the C-layer, in line with Holmberg's (2012) observation that V2 languages permit V3*, but only where only one constituent is *moved* to the C-layer. This may arise as a result of 'bottleneck' effects in Spec-C_{Fin}P discussed by Haegeman (1996: 143, 2012: 108).

b. Questo avrò=e'
this have.1SG.FUT=I
'I will have this' (Old Venetian, *Lio Mazor* 45)

c. et eso mismo fizo a las arcas
and that same do.3SG.PST to the chests
'and he did the same to the chests' (Old Spanish, *Lucanor* 204)

(4) a. Et issara mi=torrait iudice su cantu mi=levaban
and thus me=gave.back.3SG.PST iudice that what me=took.3PL.PST
'And the Iudice then gave be back the equivalent of what they took (Old Sardinian *SNDT* 46)

b. Adoncs dis le lectors mot consolatz que…
then say.3SG.PST the clerk very comfortingly that
'The clerk then said, very comfortingly, that…' (Old Occitan, *Douceline* 150)

c. E così fosemo=no denter
and thus go.1PL.PST=we inside
'And we then went inside' (Old Venetian, *Lio Mazor* 44)

(5) a. Et por ce vos=pre je…
and for that you=ask.1SG I
'And because of this, I ask you…' (Old French, *Quête* 152)

b. Et desque nascieron, dixo el Mal al Bien…
and after born.3PL.PST say.3SG.PST the Bad to the Good
'and after they were born, the Bad said to the Good…' (Old Spanish, *Lucanor* 189)

c. Vinendu lu tempu di la morti di kistu Stephanu, vinniru multi
come.PROG the time of the death of this Stephanu come.3PL.PST many
pirsuni a visitari=lu…
people to visit.INF=him
'As the time of Stephanu's death was coming, many people came to visit him' (Old Sicilian, *Gregoriu* 261–262)

Many scholars have viewed $XP_{Non\text{-}Subject}$—V_{Fin} clauses as having a particularly significant status as a crucial trigger for the acquisition of a V2 grammar (Poeppel and Wexler 1993:14; Lightfoot 1995:40, 1999:152; Yang 2000:113; Lightfoot and Westergaard 2007:409; Van Kampen 2010:273), leading some to suggest that a certain proportion of matrix clauses must show an initial-non-subject before the finite-verb for the system to be acquired. Lightfoot's (1995: 153) Dutch and German data lead him to posit a figure of 30%, whilst Westergaard (2009: 67) finds that her corpus of child-directed Norwegian includes a lower figure of 13.6%. Yang (2000: 114) features a figure between both of these, at 23% for his sample of Modern Dutch. We avoid positing exact parallels between child-directed spoken language and formal written texts here, but note from Table 3 that $XP_{Non\text{-}Subject}$-V_{Fin}

clauses are far from unusual in the texts examined and in fact occur at a rate above both Westergaard and Yang's figure in all of the texts studied:

Table 3

Preverbal Constituents in Matrix V2 Clauses

	Old French		Old Occitan		Old Sicilian		Old Venetian		Old Sardinian		Old Spanish	
$XP_{NonSubject}$-V_{Fin}-S	255	53.68%	250	76.22%	197	56.61%	112	29.87%	60	37.74%	282	64.68%
S-V_{Fin}-(O)	220	46.32%	78	23.78%	151	43.39%	263	70.13%	99	62.26%	154	35.32%
Total	475	100%	328	100%	348	100%	375	100%	159	100%	436	100%

A third piece of evidence in favour of a V2 analysis comes from the distribution of postverbal subjects. As has been noted by many authors, verb-subject 'inversion' abounds in the Old Romance textual record (Adams 1987: 9; Benincà 1983–1984: 190, 1995: 326, 2004: 278; Roberts 1993: 56; Ribeiro 1995: 133; Hulk and van Kemenade 1995: 235f; Vance 1995: 177; Labelle and Hirschbühler 2005: 8; Ledgeway 2007: 440; Salvesen 2013: 136). Note for example the postverbal subjects in (3a, b, 4, 5). As pointed out by Rinke (2009: 324), however, these postverbal subjects could be located within the *v*-VP complex with finite verb-movement only as high as T. Crucial evidence against this hypothesis comes from cases of 'Germanic inversion' (Roberts 1993: 56, Vance 1995: 177, Poletto 2014: 4f) like the following where a postverbal subject occurs between the finite verb and elements demarcating the left edge of the *v*-VP-complex. These are flatly ungrammatical in the modern counterparts of the languages examined (Hulk and Pollock 2001: 3; Sheehan 2009: §3.4; Poletto 2014: 5) and clearly indicate V-to-C movement with the subject occupying Spec-TP[8]:

(6) a. e così er'=e' rivà a casa de Macho de Robin
and so be.1SG.PST=I arrive.PTCP at house of Macho de Robin
'and I thus arrived at the house of Macho de Robin' (Old Venetian, *Lio Mazor* 22)

b. Non era eu prisente per spiritu
NEG be.1SG.PST I present for spirit
'I wasn't present in spirit' (Old Sicilian *DSG* 60)

c. et en faciendo estos seguramientos, ha él ya
and in make.PROG these assurances have.3SG.PST he already
pensado
think.PTCP
'And in making these assurances, he has already thought…' (Old Spanish, *Lucanor* 141)

[8] Due to the limited nature of the Old Sardinian textual record and the rarity in the texts that do exist of compound verb constructions, there are no cases of Germanic inversion in Old Sardinian. Independent evidence still supports a V-to-C analysis (Wolfe 2015a, b, c).

d. Son cors ne poï je veoir..
his body NEG can.1SG I see.INF
'I cannot see his body' (Old French, *Quête* 122)

e. Acostumat avia li sancta de pagar a Dieu las horas
accustom.PTCP have.3SG.PST the saint to pay.INF to God the hours
'The Saint had become used to reciting her hours to God' (Old Occitan, *Douceline* 159)

Fourth, note that fronted direct objects in the texts considered do not require a resumptive clitic within the clausal core (3, 6d), as would be required in the modern languages in all but very formal registers (Fontana 1993: Ch5; Belletti and Shlonsky 1995, Zubizarreta 1998: 103–105, Vanelli 1998: 230). This once again shows clear parallels between the Old Romance varieties considered on the one hand and the Germanic V2 languages on the other (Vikner 1995: 39; Westergaard 2009: 36; Haider 2010: 3; Haegeman 2012: 108).

Fifth and finally, note that all the varieties considered show sharp matrix/embedded asymmetries in word order, as is typical of many V2 languages (Koster 1975; Den Besten 1983: 56f; Vikner 1995: 65f; Holmberg and Platzack 1995: 76f; Biberauer 2002: 46; Bentzen 2005, 2009, 2011; Julien 2007; Bentzen, Hrafnbjargarson, Hróarsdóttir and Wiklund 2007; Haider 2010: 4; Haegeman 2012: 108). In Sardinian the embedded word order is VSO as discussed in §3.6, in all other varieties considered it is SVO in the unmarked case (7):

(7) a. eu ti=comandu … ky tu prindi kystu pani…
I you=command.1SG that you take.2SG this bread
'I command you … to take this bread' (Old Sicilian, *Gregoriu* 88)

b. que bien sabia que el non era tan rica que…
that well know.3SG.PST that he NEG be.3SG.PST so rich that
'that he indeed knew that he wasn't so rich that…' (Old Spanish, *Lucanor* 155)

c. Le paires volia qu'illi servis los paures
the father want.3SG.PST that-she serve.3SG the poor
'Her father wanted her to serve the poor…' (Old Occitan, *Douceline* 45)

To summarise, a wide variety of syntactic characteristics suggest that the varieties instantiated in the texts are forms of V2 system[9].

2.2. V1 as Evidence against V-to-C?

Despite the wide body of evidence amassed above that the languages under consideration are V2, the mere existence of V1 orders has been used extensively to motivate an SVO analysis by a number of scholars writing within the last fifteen years

[9] I do not discuss here the extensive diachronic evidence attested in the Classical and late Latin textual record which also supports a V2 analysis. See Salvi (2000, 2004), Ledgeway (2012: Ch3) and Wolfe (2015a, b, d) for discussion.

(Kaiser 2002: 134, 2009: 140; Bossong 2006: 536; Eide 2006: 170; Rinke and Meisel 2009: 101; Rinke and Elsig 2010: 2563; Sitaridou 2011: 164; 2012: 577). Since Table 1 shows V1 to be a productive word order type in all but the Old French variety, should a V2 analysis for all the other varieties be dismissed outright from the outset? On empirical and theoretical grounds we suggest not.

There is in fact a wealth of empirical evidence that V1 orders can exist as a marked word order alternative in otherwise uncontroversial V2 systems. Thus in the case of the Modern Germanic languages, V1 structures which are standardly analysed as involving a null operator-like element in the C-domain are well attested synchronically, although there is clear variation between the languages in this regard (Huang 1984; Santorini 1989: 60; Sigurdsson 1990; Önnerfors 1997: 1; Axel 2007: 115; Thráinsson 2007: 502). Many scholars have also noted that V1 orders are even more widespread in earlier stages of Germanic in varieties (Sigurdsson 1993: 252; Axel 2007: 165; Petrova and Solf 2008: 334; Hinterhölzl and Petrova 2010; Walkden 2014: §3), which are also standardly analysed as V2 (Axel 2007; Ferraresi 2005; Walkden 2014, 2015). On the basis of data from one well-known V2 language family alone, we can conclude that a V2 language showing no V1 at all would be the exception, not the rule.

From a purely conceptual point of view such an empirical finding is unsurprising. There is a long tradition within the V2 literature of drawing parallels between the properties of finite T in SVO languages and the C-head in V2 languages (Den Besten 1983; Tomaselli 1990; Roberts 1993; Hulk and van Kemenade; Platzack 1995; Holmberg and Platzack 1995; Cardinaletti and Roberts 2002). Assuming that some kind of null phonological element can satisfy a movement diacritic on a T-head is a very standard assumption (Rizzi 1986; Frascarelli 2007; Roberts 2009; Biberauer 2010). Proposing that a movement diacritic on a C-head can be satisfied by a null element is a natural extension of this proposal[10].

3. V1 IN OLD ROMANCE

3.1. V1 in Old Sicilian

Although V1 clauses make up a relatively small proportion of Old Sicilian matrix clauses numerically (8.1%), they show the most varied distribution of the languages where V1 constitutes a marked order and fall into three broad classes.

The first class of V1 found within the Old Sicilian text can be termed *Topic Continuity V1*. These feature a Null Topic which is always co-referent with a preceding nominal expression and correspond to a structure widespread elsewhere cross-linguistically (Huang 1984: 546; Van Kemenade 1987: 44–45; Hjartardóttir 1987; Sigurdsson 1989: 139, 1993: 251, 2011: §4; Kiparsky 1995: 163). In keeping with their pragmatic characteristic of discourse continuity and continuing topicality these never occur discourse-initially and are always found within a paragraph of text, again mirroring similar constructions in Germanic

[10] Note however this should not be interpreted as suggesting that the same kind of null elements can satisfy movement-triggering diacritics on different heads. The relationship between the featural matrix of both the Probe and the Goal is relevant. See Roberts (2009, 2010) for extensive discussion.

(Hjartardóttir 1987: 81; Santorini 1989: 55; Sigurdsson 1990: 62; Sigurdsson 1993: 253; Koeneman 2002: 195):

(8) a. Tornau al monisterio
return.3SG.PST to-the monastery
'He returned to the monastery' (Old Sicilian, DSG 86)
b. Mecti, adunca, unu exemplu a provari lu primu modu
make.3SG.PST thus an example to try.inf the first way
'He made an example to try out the first method…' (Old Sicilian, DSG 268)
c. schifava=si di killa comu di una sua inimica
avoid.3SG.PST of her like of one his enemy
'He avoided her like one of his enemies' (Old Sicilian, DSG 248)

The second class of V1 clauses found within Old Sicilian can be termed *Rhematic V1*. The whole sentence in each of the examples is informationally new and serves 'to introduce not-yet activated referents into a discourse' (Lambrecht 1994: 143). Parallel structures where rhematic clauses are verb-initial are especially common in the earlier stages of the Germanic languages (Lenerz 1984: 131; Axel 2007: 120f, 2009: 26f; Petrova and Solf 2008: 331; Hinterhölzl and Petrova 2010; Petrova 2011: 213). Consider the following examples in this regard:

(9) a. Passau lu sicundu e lu terzu iornu
pass.3SG.PST the second and the third day
'The second and third day went by' (Old Sicilian, DSG 256)
b. Mandau Deu unu liuni da unu voschu
send.3SG.PST God a lion from a forest
'God sent a lion out from the forest' (Old Sicilian, DSG 265)

As already noted, there is a long tradition of viewing V1 clauses in V2 languages as featuring a form of null element (Katz and Postal 1964; Huang 1984; Cardinaletti 1990; Sigurdsson 1993; Zwart 1997; Faarlund 2007) and this view has frequently been adopted for Old Romance by Benincà (1995, 2004: 290, 2006: 69), Salvi (2000, 2012: 106–107), Poletto (2006a: §2, 2014: 21–23) and Ledgeway (2007: 134–146, 2008: 442, 2009: 752) amongst others. Benincà (2004: 290) hypothesises that in Old Romance a Null Topic can be merged in the C-layer as a form of last-resort mechanism. This hypothesis is further refined by Poletto (2014: 21) who suggests that it is indeed a Null Topic that is present in V1 structures and that this corresponds to a 'Shift Topic' in the terms of Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007: 88).

A version of this hypothesis is appropriate for both the constructions in (8) and (9). In the case of Topic Continuity V1, the Null Topic is concerned with both 'what the sentence is about' (Givón 1983:8), so a Shift Topic in the terms of Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl (2007: 88) yet is always D-linked and 'given' or 'accessible' in the terms of Chafe (1987) or Lambrecht (1994) and thus a Familiar Topic in Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl's (2007: 88) account. Either a single Null Topic can be postulated, with the exact interpretation left to the interfaces or to maintain a tight mapping between syntax and

semantics it could be proposed that this Topic enters the derivation with the featural specification [+Fam, +Shift], with the features thus valued by corresponding probing heads within the Topic field of the left periphery. Adopting the latter variant of the proposal, we can suggest in line with Poletto (2014: 21) that Topic Continuity V1 involves a variant of *pro,* which moves into the C-layer due to its unvalued Topic-related features. Thus (8a) would have the structure in (10)[11]:

(10) [**CP**{C_{Frame}}{C_{Force}}{C_{Topic}*pro*$_{Top}$ }{C_{Focus}}{C_{Fin}~~*pro*~~$_{Top}$*tornau*}
[**TP**~~*pro*~~$_{Top}$[**vP**… ~~*tornau*~~ *al monisterio*]]

The cases of *Rhematic V1* in (9) may also feature a Null Topic, but this may be more featurally impoverished than the Null Topic involved in *Topic Continuity V1*. By definition there is no D-linked 'familiar' constituent in rhematic clauses and as such any kind of [+Fam] feature is entirely unmotivated. The Null Topic in these cases is thus a 'pure' Shift Topic as postulated by Poletto (2014: 21) which serves to satisfy C_{Fin}'s movement diacritic so as to keep all verbal arguments postverbal and thus unambiguously interpreted as informationally new.

We tentatively suggest however that there is a third class of V1 in Old Sicilian which warrants a partially-distinct analysis. We term these clauses *Narrative V1*, as much like in certain Germanic varieties they occur exclusively with *verba dicendi* (Sigurdsson 1990: 46; Önnerfors 1997; Axel 2007: 215; Thráinsson 2007: 29) and are always discourse-initial (Koeneman 2002: 195; Petrova 2011: 212):

(11) a. Dichi, adunca, sanctu Gregoriu ki…
say.3SG.PST then Saint Gregory that
'Saint Gregory said again that…' (Old Sicilian, DSG 254)
b. Ricunta ancora de zo sanctu Gregoriu
tell.3SG.PST again of that Saint Gregory
'Saint Gregory spoke again of this…' (Old Sicilian, DSG 96)

Following seminal work by Reis (1995, 2000a, b) on similar constructions in Germanic, the proposal is that this class of V1 is restricted to a particular class of predicates which 'express/recount a proposition that is true' rather than explicitly asserting its truth value (Reis 2000a: 97). Since features concerning clause-typing and illocutionary force are at stake here and these are standardly assumed to be associated with the upper portion of the C-layer (Rivero 1993; Diesing 1997: 373; Han 2000: 53; Allan 2006), we propose that V1 clauses such as those in (11) feature a null discourse-operator akin to that proposed for Modern Dutch Narrative Inversion by Zwart (1997: 220), which occupies Spec-C_{Force}P due to its bearing on the illocutionary force of the utterance.

Overall Old Sicilian shows three partially-distinct classes of V1: one class involving Topic continuity and another in rhematic clauses, both of which involve a Null Topic which

[11] Lower copies of moved elements are only included when relevant to the present analysis in this and all subsequent examples.

may have partially-distinct featural specifications in each construction. A final class of V1 occurs with *verba dicendi* which involves a null discourse operator within the Force field of the C-layer.

3.2. V1 in Old Occitan

Although there is very little theoretically-informed work on the syntax of medieval Occitan, several recent works have suggested that it may show a greater array of orders where the verb is not second in the linear ordering when compared to Old French (Benincà 1995; Vance, Donaldson and Steiner 2009; Sitaridou 2012: 578)[12]. Such an observation fits with the findings of the present study: in our Old Occitan text *Sainte Douceline,* we note that the distribution of V1 is in fact both quantitatively and qualitatively similar to Old Sicilian. As shown in Table 2, V1 makes up 7.56% of the matrix corpus.

We first find clear cases of what we termed *Topic Continuity V1*, where a Topic co-referent with an accessible nominal expression in the preceding discourse is given a null realisation, which we showed above also occur in Old Sicilian and other Italo-Romance varieties (Benincà 2004: 290; Ledgeway 2008: 442; Poletto 2014: 21):

(12) a. Corregron tantost après per seguir=las
run.3PL.PST soon after to follow.INF=them
'They ran soon after to follow them' (Occitan, *Douceline* 54)

b. Amava e queria luechs solitaris
love.3SG.PST and want.3SG.PST places solitary
'She loved and wanted places where she could be alone…' (Occitan, *Douceline* 107)

The remaining of V1 clauses are all rhematic, which we defined above following Lambrecht (1994:143) as a clause which introduces non-active referents into the discourse. Consider the following examples in this regard:

(13) a. Era oracion en totas cauzas sos refugz
be.3SG.PST prayer in all things her refuge
'Prayer was her refuge in all things' (Occitan, *Douceline* 106)

b. Estavan totas plenas de gauch e de meravilla
be.3PL.PST all full of joy and of marvel
'They were all full of joy and wonderment' (Occitan, *Douceline* 107)

There are no clear examples of *Narrative V1* with *verba dicendi* in *Sainte Douceline.* Overly strong claims should be avoided on the basis of one text alone, but this may suggest that Old Occitan features a Null Topic, pro_{Top} within its lexical inventory but not the null discourse operator present in Old Sicilian.

[12] Though see Jensen (1990, 1994) for an extensive empirical survey of the Old Occitan textual record.

3.3. V1 in Old Venetian

Table 2 above clearly shows that V1 orders are extensively attested in the Old Venetian text, *Lio Mazor*. They account for 154/632 matrix clauses (24.36%). Although this figure is in fact considerably higher than the equivalent figure for the other Italo-Romance language considered, Old Sicilian (8.24%), Old Venetian V1 is qualitatively more homogenous than what was found in *Sanctu Gregoriu*.

Although the proportion of V1 may seem high, the texts under consideration are accounts of legal proceedings and more formulaic in nature than the literary texts considered so far for Occitan and Sicilian. In fact, 142/154 V1 clauses begin with *verba dicendi*that were shown to license V1 in Old Sicilian in a construction termed *Narrative V1* above. As with Old Sicilian, we can draw on earlier intuitions of Önnerfors (1997), Zwart (1997: 220) and Allan (2006) amongst others we suggest that this involves a null discourse operator, which in line with the analysis of Reis (1995, 2000a, b) is associated with predicates that recount rather than assert the truth of a particular utterance. This construction is exemplified in (14):

(14) a. Doman(n)dà s'el vito ch'…
ask.3PL.PST if-he see.3SG.PST that
'They asked if he saw that…' (Venetian, *Lio Mazor* 21)
b. dis che sì
say.3SG.PST that yes
'He said yes' (Venetian, *Lio Mazor* 60)

Secondly, there is a relatively rare instance (5 instances) of V1 which does not involve *verba dicendi* and appears to feature a Null Topic co-referent with a nominal expression in the preceding discourse. Unlike Old Sicilian and Old Occitan, however, this construction is rare in *Lio Mazor* and appears characteristic of direct speech:

(15) a. ela… la quala dis… «'çeto che viti che Maria…»
she the which say.3SG.PST accept.1SG that see.1SG.PST that Maria…
'she, who said "I accept that I saw that Maria…' (Venetian, *Lio Mazor* 47)
b. (E) en q(ue)sta Pero Seren … de'=me del rem
and in this Pero Seren give.3SG.PST=me of-the oar
su la test (e) col. Sangò ben».
on the head and neck blead.3SG.PST well
'And at this moment Pero Seren hit me with the oar on my head and neck. It bled a lot' (Venetian, *Lio Mazor* 26-27)

Whilst, as noted above, Topic Continuity V1 giving rise to discourse cohesion is very frequent in the Early Germanic languages, the more restricted distribution found in *Lio Mazor* more closely parallels the Null Topic constructions found within the Modern Germanic languages. It is frequently observed, for example that in Modern Germanic Null Topics must have a very high degree of discourse salience, be deictically anchored in the 'here and now' and are characteristic of conversational style in spoken language (Önnerfors 1996, 1997; Eckert 1998; Sigurdsson 1989: 145f, 2011: 279; Sigurdsson and Maling 2010:

60f). This draws clear parallels with the Old Venetian cases which are all found in cases of direct speech and refer back to an entity mentioned in the immediately preceding clause (cf. 15a, b).

One way of accounting for the very small number of cases of V1 in Old Venetian which appear to feature a Null Topic, may be to propose that the Null Topic in question raises through the Topic layer, as in Sicilian and Occitan, but must then raise further into the Frame/Speaker Deixis layer (Haegeman 2000: 143f, 2006: 1662) where it receives its reference from the discourse context. This is similar in spirit to the proposal put forward by Sigurdsson and Egerland (2009), Sigurdsson and Maling (2010) and Sigurdsson (2011) for Modern Germanic.

Crucially, there are no cases of apparent Null Topics appearing in Rhematic V1 cases in Old Venetian, which may be indicative of an underlying distinction between the variety instantiated within the texts and those discussed for Old Sicilian and Occitan above. Any Null Topic postulated for rhematic clauses cannot by definition be linked to preceding discourse context, providing additional evidence that this context-linking is required for Old Venetian Null Topics but not for Old Sicilian or Old Occitan.

3.4. V1 in Old Spanish

Our Old Spanish texts shows even more restrictions on V1 than are witnessed in Venetian. Within *Conde Lucanor*, as Table 2 shows, there are a mere 6 instance of V1.

Two of these examples involve an initial negator, so may in fact have a V2 structure, where the negation satisfies C_{Fin}'s movement diacritic (16):

(16) Fija, non se que desaventura es esta que vuestro marido
child NEG know.1SG what misfortune be.3SG this that your husband
es muy despagado de vos
be.3SG very displease.PTCP of you
'Child, I know not what misfortune this is that your husband is so displeased with you' (Old Spanish, *Lucanor* 183)

Old Spanish would thus pattern with other V2 languages like Breton (Borsley and Kathol 2000: 670), Swedish and Norwegian (Holmberg and Platzack 1995: 17; Holmberg 2012: §2.1.6) in allowing negation to satisfy V2. This leaves 4 remaining cases of V1, all of which feature *verba dicendi* (17):

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

b. Prometo que, si poco nin mas conmigo porfias que eso mismo
promise.1SG that if little NEG more with-me trust.2SG that that same
fare a ti que al perro
do.1SG.FUT to you that to-the dog
'I promise that, if you continue just one bit more, I'll do to you the same as to the dog' (Old Spanish, *Lucanor* 157)

Following our analysis above and that already proposed by Fontana (1993: 100) on the basis of Old Spanish data, we propose that these structures involve a null discourse operator in the Force-field of the CP, which is associated with recounting a proposition rather than *asserting* its truth value (Reis 2000a: 97). The entire absence of either Topic Continuity or Rhematic V1 in the text sample considered lead us to tentatively suggest that this null operator is the only element which is involved in the licensing of a V1 structure in the Old Spanish variety instantiated within the text.

3.5. V1 in Old French

The progression through varieties so far has led from varieties where V1 orders are varied, to increasingly heavy restrictions on the contexts in which they are found. The later Old French varietyinstantiated in *Saint Graal* constitutes a logical end-point within this continuum, showing no V1 orders at all in matrix declaratives. This echoes previous observations by several scholars that in later Old French V1 matrix clauses become, if present at all, exceptionally rare (Skårup 1975; Roberts 1993: 96; Vance 1993: 281, 1997: 38; Labelle and Hirschbühler 2005, 2012).

Instead the functional load of encoding topic continuity (18) and rhematicity (19) falls to another syntactic device, the extensively discussed particle SI (< Lat. SIC 'thus')[13]:

(18) a. Si osta sa chemise de son dos
SI take-off.3SG.PST his shirt from his back
'He took off his shirt from his back' (Old French, *Quête* 121)

b. Si lace son hiaume
SI fasten.3SG his helmet
'He fastens his helmet' (Old French, *Quête* 132)

(19) Si mostra bien Nostre Sires que…
si show.3SG.PST well our Lord that…
'Our Lord showed clearly that…' (Old French, *Quête* 136)

We avoid making overly strong claims on such a controversial topic on the basis of one text, but suggest tentatively that in the variety considered SI may perform an quasi-expletive function (cf. Vance 1995: 207; Salvi 2002; Poletto 2005: 206; Ledgeway 2008; Salvesen 2013) and thus occupy Spec-$C_{Fin}P$[14]. An alternative, drawing on frequent observations that SI encodes a form of discourse continuity (Vance 1997: 54; Van Reenen and Schøsler 2000: 85; Salvi 2002: 378; Poletto 2009: 185) and indeed creating a parallelism with the structures proposed above featuring *pro*$_{Top}$, would be to locate it within Spec-$C_{Top}P$, but this incorrectly predicts the occurrence of the order SI-Focus-V_{Fin} which is unattested. Further evidence that SI in our text performs a quasi-expletive function comes

[13] See amongst others Marchello-Nizia (1985, 1997), Lemieux and Dupuis (1995), Van Reenen and Schøsler (1992, 2000), Poletto (2005, 2006a, b, 2014), Ledgeway (2008) and Salvesen (2013) on the status of Old French and Old Romance SI.

[14] Note for completeness that the analysis of Ledgeway (2008) differs from our own in that Ledgeway analyses SI as a head. For arguments against this view see Wolfe (2015d).

from the discussion in Poletto (2009: 196) who states 'if SI were a real expletive, no V1 would be allowed in Old Italian'. The absence of V1 is of course exactly what is found in Old French, lending support to our proposed analysis. Thus, although the later Old French variety considered does not show V1 in matrix declaratives, an alternative device is used to indicate continuing topicality and rhematicity in the absence of a Null Topic.

3.6. V1 in Old Sardinian

Finally we come to an examination of our Old Sardinian texts, which as already noted are somewhat of an outlier in terms of verb placement. In part due to the relatively obscure nature of the Old Sardinian textual record, which is made up exclusively of legal and administrative documents (Wagner 1951: 46–17; Blasco-Ferrer 1984: Ch6; Bentley 1999: 324−325) the syntax of Sardinian in the medieval period has received very little attention in the literature. We suggest here, however, that the Old Sardinian textual record, interpreted with an appropriate degree of caution, has an important contribution to make to both synchronic and diachronic studies on the nature of Old Romance clausal structure.

V1 order is shown in Table 2 to occur in 52.24% of matrix clauses in the texts examined. Such a high proportion of V1 would be challenging to account for if it were a marked word order as in the other languages. Virdis (1996), Lombardi (2007) and Wolfe (2015a, b, c) all come to the conclusion, in fact, that Old Sardinian is a V-initial language (19a), with SVO (19b) and $XP_{NonSubject}$—V-(S) (19c) alternative word orders conditioned by Information Structure:

(20) a. Posit Iorgi Capai terra de Gavini Capra a clesia
donate.3SG.PST Iorgi Capai land of Gavini Capra to church
'Iorgi Capai donated Gavini Capra's land to the church.' (Sardinian, *SMDB* 116)

b. Ego debi=li sa binia…
I give.3SG.PST=him the vineyard
'I gave him the vineyard…' (Sardinian, *SNDT* 76)

c. Custu totu deti prossa anima sua a sancta Maria de Bonorcarnu
this all give.3SG.PST for-the soul his to Santa Maria di Bonarcado
'He gave all this for the good of his soul to Santa Maria di Bonarcado' (Sardinian, *SMDB* 16)

Further evidence that V1 is an unmarked word order in Old Sardinian in contrast to the other Old Romance languages comes from embedded clauses which are consistently VSO (Lombardi 2007: 139–140; Wolfe 2015b: §2.3):

(21) Iudicait isse a bature ego testimonios ca servirunt a clesia ipsas et parentes issoro
order.3SG.PST he to produce.INF I witnesses that serve.3PL.PST to church them and relatives their

'He ordered me to produce witnesses that they and their relatives served the church (Sardinian, *SMDB* 151)

As noted above in §2.1, Old Sardinian shows a preverbal field similar to the Germanic V2 languages, the possibility of direct object fronting without clitic resumption and widespread verb-subject 'inversion' which can be interpreted tentatively as reflexes of an underlying grammar with V-to-C_{Fin} movement. Wolfe (2015a, b, c) also reaches this conclusion based on additional evidence from the placement of the verb relative to TP-adverbs (cf. Cinque 1999; Ledgeway in press) and widespread enclisis in the *condaghes*[15]. Topicalisation or focalisation of a subject or non-subject as in (19b, c) is however strictly optional in the texts, unlike the other Old Romance varieties considered above. Wolfe (2015b: §5.3) suggests therefore that Old Sardinian has 'half the V2 constraint' in the terms of Roberts (2005: 27) in featuring V-to-C_{Fin} movement, but no movement diacritic on C_{Fin} obligatorily triggering phrasal movement into the C-layer. Old Sardinian is then the mirror-image of the later Old French variety considered. V1 is a generalised word order pattern, derived via V-to-C_{Fin} movement.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1. A Synchronic Typology

Drawing together the observations made above on the basis of individual varieties, we can formulate a fine-grained synchronic proposal as to how different classes of V1 orders are licensed in Old Romance.

First, at one end of the continuum we have Old Sardinian. V1 here is in fact the unmarked order as the topicalisation or focalisation obligatory in other V2 varieties is optional. V-to-C_{Fin} movement is generalised to all matrix clauses (Wolfe 2015a, b, c).

Second, there is a group of languages where V1 is regularly licensed as a discourse-marked word order alternative. In the case of Old Sicilian, this can indicate rhematicity or topic continuity with (potentially distinct instantiations of) pro_{Top} occupying the Topic field in the left periphery in addition to Narrative V1 structures, where we posited a discourse operator associated with non-assertion within the Force field of the CP. Old Occitan only makes use of the former options, with pro_{Top} in the text studied.

Third, we find Old Venetian which features extensive V1 structures which are, however, qualitatively more restricted. A Null Topic is only licensed if deictically linked and used in conversational style, in a similar fashion to the Modern Germanic languages (Sigurdsson 2011 and references above). Narrative V1 is also found in abundance in *Lio Mazor*.

[15] The typological correlation between enclisis and V-to-C movement although not always direct (Tortora 2002:744), is well-established. See Lema and Rivero (1991), Benincà (1995), Fontana (1997) and Roberts (2010, 2012).

Fourth, later Old Spanish licenses V1 in the text considered, but only very rarely. Genuine V1 where no overt constituent occupies initial-position within the clause only ever occurs with Narrative V1 in the presence of *verba dicendi.*

Fifth and finally, we note that in the later Old French text studied, V1 with matrix declaratives is not found at all. The particle SI is instead found to indicate both rhematicity and topic continuity. The relevant descriptive generalisations are summarised in Table 3:

Table 4

V1 in Old Romance

	Sicilian	Occitan	Venetian	Spanish	French	Sardinian
Rhematic V1	✓	✓	×	×	×	
Topic Continuity V1	✓	✓	×	×	×	Generalised V1
Deictic Topic V1	×	×	✓	×	×	
Narrative V1	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	

These descriptive generalisations can, however, inform a theoretical account of how each of the Old Romance languages makes use of the clausal left periphery. As already noted briefly, a wealth of theoretical work has emerged in the last two decades concerning the fine structure of the C-domain. Thus in the left-most portion of the CP the Frame/Speaker Deixis field hosts frame-setters and elements which anchor the clause deictically, in terms of location, time and speech participants (Poletto 2000, 2002; Haegeman 2000; Giorgi 2010, 2012; Sigurdsson 2004, 2011). This in turn precedes the Force field which is concerned with polarity, clause-typing and illocutionary force (Poletto and Zanuttini 2003; Coniglio and Zegrean 2010; Munaro 2010) which itself occurs to the left of the Topic and Focus fields (Benincà 2001; Rizzi 2005; Cruschina 2006, 2012; Frascarelli and Hinterhölzl 2007). The Topic-Focus layer itself occurs before the Fin(iteness) head (Rizzi 1997, 2001: §1) which we suggested above hosts the moved verb in V2 languages:

(22) $[\mathbf{CP}\{C_{Frame/SpeakerDeixis}\}\{C_{Force}\}\{C_{Topic}\}\{C_{Focus}\}\{C_{Fin}\}\ [\mathbf{TP}\ldots[\boldsymbol{v}\mathbf{P}\ldots]]]$

The descriptive generalisations reached in this paper can be used to further explore the fine structure of the left periphery, with a particular focus on the null elements which can lexicalise each of the projections. The functional projection associated with Frame and Speaker Deixis in the uppermost portion of the left periphery can be lexicalised by a particular variant of Null Topic, which must be readily accessible from the discourse and is generally only used in direct speech. These *'Deictic' Topics* are employed across a range of Germanic languages (Huang 1984; Sigurdsson and Maling 2010; Sigurdsson 2011). The functional projection(s) associated with illocutionary force can in turn be lexicalised by null discourse operator which is licensed in non-asserted clause-types with *verbadicendi* in all the languages studied where V1 is a marked word order. Finally, the Topic field can be

lexicalised by two variants of pro_{Top}, one of which is licensed in rhematic clauses and another in structures where this discourse cohesion and topic continuity which we linked to the featural matrix of the Null Topic, which is [+Shift] in rhematic clauses and [+ Shift, +Fam] in topic continuity structures. Note in line with previous comments by Benincà (2004: 290) that there is no evidence for null elements which lexicalise the Focus field. This may simply be a reflex of interface conditions: information which is either contrastive or in some sense prominent cannot be realised as null. The range of null elements licensed within the CP in matrix declaratives in Old Romance is outlined in the schema in (23):

(23) $[\mathbf{CP}\{C_{\text{Frame/SpeakerDeixis}}\ Top_{Deictic}\}\{C_{\text{Force}}\ DiscOp_{[-Asserted]}\}\{C_{\text{Topic}}\ pro_{Top[+Shift,\ \pm Fam]}\}\{C_{\text{Focus}}\}\{C_{\text{Fin}}\}\ [\mathbf{TP}\ldots[\boldsymbol{v}\mathbf{P}\ldots]]]$

4.2. Summary and Questions for Future Research

This article has set out to provide a first account from a comparative perspective of the types of V1 orders which are found within Old Romance. Far from representing a homogeneous picture, the one that emerges is of very rich syntactic microvariation under which none of the varieties studied is exactly alike. All vary in their lexical inventory in terms of which of the layers within the CP can be lexicalised by an element which is phonologically null.

We argued, however, that the varieties are remarkably homogeneous in licensing verb movement out of the clausal core into the C-layer. The variation in the types of V1 orders licensed within these V2 systems thus represents one of the key areas in which they vary. Crucially, we saw that both on empirical and conceptual grounds, the mere presence of V1 in the textual record should not be viewed as incontrovertible evidence against a V2 hypothesis.

Two key questions remain for future research. Firstly, does the typology of V1 orders licensed in the V2 systems studied extend beyond the varieties discussed here to other Old Romance languages and indeed both the Early and Modern Germanic V2 languages? Secondly, what role does diachrony play in accounting for the variation reported here and to what extent can any of the languages be viewed as 'relics' or 'innovators' relative to Latin? A preliminary answer to the second question is offered in Wolfe (2015b, d, in press).

REFERENCES

Adams, M., 1987, "From Old French to the Theory of Pro-Drop", *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 5, 1, 1–32.

Allan, K., 2006, "Clause Type, Primary Illocution and Mood-like Operators in English", *Language Sciences*, 28, 1–50.

Axel, K., 2007, *Studies on Old High German Syntax Left Sentence Periphery, Verb Placement and Verb-Second,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins.

Axel, K., 2009, "The Verb-Second Property in Old High German: Different Ways of Filling the Prefield", in: R. Hinterhölzl, S. Petrova (eds), *Information Structure and Language Change*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 17–44.

Belletti, A., U. Shlonsky, 1995, "The Order of Verbal Complements: A Comparative Study", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,*13, 489–526.
Benincà, P., 1983−1984, "Un'ipotesi Sulla Sintassi Delle Lingue Romanze medievali", *Quaderni Patavini Di Linguistica,* 4 (April), 3–19.
Benincà, P., 1995, "Complement Clitics in Old Romance: The Tobler-Mussafia Law", in: I. Roberts, A. Battye (eds), *Clause Structure and Language Change,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, 325–44.
Benincà, P., 2001, "On the Position of Topic and Focus in the Left Periphery", in: G. Cinque, G. Salvi (eds.), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, North Holland Linguistic Series, London; New York, Elsevier, 39–64.
Benincà, P., 2004, "The Left Periphery of Old Romance", *Studi Linguistici E Filologici Online,* 2, 2, 243–297.
Benincà, P., 2006, "A Detailed Map of the Left Periphery of Old Romance", in: R. Zanuttini, H. Campos, E. Herburger, P. H. Portner (eds), *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics: Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*, Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press, 53–86.
Benincà, P., 2013, "Caratteristiche Del V2 Romanzo. Lingue Romanze Antiche, Ladino Dolomitico E Portoghese", in: E. Bidese, F. Cognola (eds), *Introduzione Alla Linguistica Del Mòcheno*, Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 65–84.
Benincà, P., C. Poletto, 2004, "Topic, Focus, and V2", in: L. Rizzi (ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 52–75.
Bentley, D., 1999, "On the Origin of Sardinian Àere a plus Infinitive", *Medioevo Romanzo,* XXIII, 3, 321–58.
Bentzen, K., 2005, "What's the Better Move? On Verb Placement in Standard and Northern Norwegian", *Nordic Journal of Linguistics,* 28, 2, 153–188.
Bentzen, K., 2009, "Subject Positions and Their Interaction with Verb Movement", *Studia Linguistica,* 63, 3, 1–31.
Bentzen, K., 2011, "Exploring Embedded Main Clause Phenomena: The Irrelevance of Factivity and Some Challenges from V2 Languages", *Theoretical Linguistics,* 36, 2−3, 163–72.
Bentzen, K, G., H. Hrafnbjargarson, Þ. Hróarsdóttir, A. Wiklund., 2007, "The Tromsø Guide to the Force behind V2", *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax,* 79, 93–118.
Biberauer, T., 2002, "Verb Second in Afrikaans: Is This a Unitary Phenomenon?", *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics,* 34, 19–68.
Biberauer, T., 2010, "Semi Null-Subject Languages, Expletives and Expletive *pro* Reconsidered", in: T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts, M. Sheehan (eds), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 153–199.
Blasco-Ferrer, E., 1984, *Storia Linguistica Della Sardegna*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag.
Borsley, R. D., A. Kathol, 2000, "Breton as a V2 Language", *Linguistics*, 38, 4, 665−710.
Bossong, G. 2006, "La Sintaxis de Las Glosas Emilianeses En Una Perspectiva Tipológica", in: G. Alconchel, J. Luis, D. Tovar, J. Jesus (eds), *Actas Del VI Congreso Internacional de Historia de La Lengua Española*, Madrid, Arco, 529–44.
Cardinaletti, A., 1990, "Subject/object Asymmetries in German Null Topic Constructions and the Status of Spec, CP", in: J. Mascarò, M. Nespor (eds), *GLOW Essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*, Dordrecht, Foris, 75–84.
Cardinaletti, A., I. Roberts, 2002, "Clause Structure and X-Second", in: G. Cinque (ed.), *Functional Structure in DP and IP*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 123–166.
Chafe, W., 1987, "Cognitive Constraints and Information Flow", in R. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse: Outcome of a Symposium*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 21–51.
Chomsky, N., 2000, "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework", in: R. Martin, D. Michaels, J. Uriagereka (eds), *Step by Step, Essays in Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge MA, MIT Press, 89–155.

Cinque, G., 1999, *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Coniglio, M., I. Zegrean, 2010, "Splitting up Force, Evidence from Discourse Particles", *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics,* 20, 8–34.
Craenenbroeck, J., L. Haegeman, 2007, "The Derivation of Subject-Initial V2", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 38, 1, 167–178.
Cruschina, S., 2006, "Information Focus in Sicilian and the Left Periphery", in: M. Frascarelli (ed.), *Phases of Interpretation*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 363–385.
Cruschina, S., 2012, *Discourse-Related Features and Functional Projections,* Oxford/New York, Oxford University Press.
Den Besten, H., 1983, "On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules", in: W. Abraham (ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 47–61.
Diesing, M., 1990, "Verb Movement and the Subject Position in Yiddish",*Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* 8, 1, 41–79.
Diesing, M., 1997, "Yiddish VP Order and the Typology of Object Movement in Germanic", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory,* 15, 2, 369–427.
Donaldson, B., 2012, "Initial Subordinate Clauses in Old French: Syntactic Variation and the Clausal Left Periphery", *Lingua*, 122, 9, 1021–1046.
Eckert, M., 1998, "The German Topic Position and Null Anaphora", in: S. Botley, T. McEnery (eds), *Proceedings of the 2nd Colloquium on Discourse Anaphora and Anaphor Resolution*, Lancaster, University of Lancaster.
Eide, K., 2006, *Word Order Structures and Unaccusative Verbs in Classical and Modern Portuguese*, PhD Dissertation, University of Oslo.
Faarlund, J.T., 2007, *The Syntax of Old Norse,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Ferraresi, G., 2005,*Word Order and Phrase Structure in Gothic,* Leuven, Peeters.
Fontana, J., 1993, *Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish*, PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
Fontana, J., 1997, "On the Integration of Second Position Phenomena", in: A. Van Kemenade, N. Vincent (eds), *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 207–249.
Fiéis, A., 2003, *Ordem de Palavras, Transitividade E Inacusatividade. Relflexão Teórica E Análise Do Português Dos Séculos XIII a XVI*, PhD Dissertation, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
Frascarelli, M., 2007, "Subjects, Topics and the Interpretation of Referential *pro*", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 25, 4, 691–734.
Frascarelli, M., R. Hinterhölzl, 2007, "Types of Topics in German and Italian", in: S.Winkler, K. Schwabe (eds), *On Information Structure, Meaning and Form*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 87–116.
Frey, W., 2004, "The Grammar-Pragmatics Interface and the German Prefield", *Sprache Und Pragmatik*, 52, 1–30.
Giorgi, A., 2010, *About the Speaker: Towards a Syntax of Indexicality,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Giorgi, A., 2012, "The Theory of Syntax and the Representation of Indexicality", in: L. Brugè, A. Cardinaletti, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, C. Poletto (eds), *Functional Heads*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 42–54.
Givón, T., 1983, "Topic Continuity in Discourse: An Introduction", in: T. Givón (ed.), *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Crosslanguage Study*, Amsterdam, John Benjaims, 5–41.
Guasti, T., L. Rizzi, 2002, "Agreement and Tense as Distinct Syntactic Positions. Evidence from Acquisition", in: G. Cinque (ed.), *The Structure of DP and IP*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 167–194.

Haegeman, L., 1996, "Verb Second, the Split CP and Null Subjects in Early Dutch Finite Clauses", *GenGenP*, 4, 2, 135–175.
Haegeman, L., "Inversion, Non-Adjacent Inversion and Adjuncts in CP", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 98, 1, 121–160.
Haegeman, L., 2006, "Conditionals, Factives and the Left Periphery", *Lingua,* 116, 10, 1651–1669.
Haegeman, L., 2012, *Adverbial Clauses, Main Clause Phenomena, and Composition of the Left Periphery,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Haider, H., 2010, *The Syntax of German*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Haiman, J., P. Benincà, 1992, *The Rhaeto-Romance Languages*, London/New York, Routledge.
Han, C.-H., 2000, *The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar,* New York, Garland Publishing.
Hinterhölzl, R., S. Petrova, 2010, "From V1 to V2 in West Germanic", *Lingua*, 120, 2, 315–328.
Hjartadóttir, T., 1987, *Getið I Eyðurnar*, Masters Thesis, University of Iceland, Reykjavik.
Holmberg, A., 2012, "Verb Second", in: T. Kiss, A. Alexiadou (eds), *Syntax − an International Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Research*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
Holmberg, A., C. Platzack, 1995, *The Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Huang, C.-T. J, 1984, "On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 15, 531–574.
Hulk, A., J-Y. Pollock, 2001, "Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar", in: A. Hulk, J-Y. Pollock (eds), *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 3–19.
Hulk, A., A.Van Kemenade, 1995, "Verb-Second, Pro-Drop, Functional Projections and Language Change", in: I. Roberts, A. Battye (eds), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 227–256.
Jensen, F., 1990, *Old French and Comparative Gallo-Romance Syntax,* Tübingen, Walter de Gruyter.
Jensen, F., 1994, *Syntaxe de L'ancien Occitan,* Tübingen, Niymeyer.
Julien, M., 2007, "Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish", Unpublished Manuscript, Lund University.
Kaiser, G. A., 2002, *Verbstellung Und Verbstellungswandel in Den Romanischen Sprachen,*Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag.
Kaiser, G. A., 2009, "Losing the Null Subject. A Contrastive Study of (Brazilian) Portuguese and (Old) French." in: G.A. Kaiser, E.M. Remberger (eds), *Proceedings of the Workshop "Null Subjects, Expletives and Locatives in Romance", University of Konstanz: Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft,* 131–156.
Katz, J. J., P. Postal, 1964, *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions,* Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
Kiparsky, P., 1995, "Indo-European Origins of Germanic Syntax", in: I. Roberts, A. Battye (eds), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 140–169.
Koeneman, O., 2002, "The Distribution of Declarative Verb Second in Germanic", in: C. J.-W. Zwart, W. Abraham (eds), *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax: Proceedings from the 15th Workshop on Comparative Germanic Syntax* (Groningen, May 26-27, 2000), Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 175–201.
Koster, J., 1975, "Dutch as an SOV Language", *Linguistic Analysis,* 1, 111–136.
Labelle, M., 2007, "Clausal Architecture in Early Old French", *Lingua,* 117, 1, 289–316.
Labelle, M., P. Hirschbühler, 2005, "Changes in Clausal Structure and the Position of Clitics in Old French", in: M. Batllori, M-L. Hernanz, C. Picallo, F. Roca (eds), *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 149−178.
Labelle, M., P. Hirschbühler, 2012, "Topic and Focus in Old French V1 and V2 Structures", Unpublished Manuscript, Université du Québec à Montréal.
Lambrecht, K., 1994, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Ledgeway, A., In Press, "The Verb Phrase", in: G. Longobardi (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Ledgeway, A., 2007, "Old Neapolitan Word Order: Some Initial Observations", in: A. L. Lepschy, A. Tosi (eds), *Histories and Dictionaries of the Languages of Italy*, Ravenna, Longo, 121–49.
Ledgeway, A., 2008, "Satisfying V2 in Early Romance: Merge vs. Move", *Journal of Linguistics*, 44, 2, 437−470.
Ledgeway, A., 2009, *Grammatica diacronica del napoletano,* Tübingen, Niemeyer.
Lema, J., M. Rivero, 1991, "Types of Verbal Movement in Old Spanish: Modals, Futures and Perfects",*Probus*, 3, 3, 237–278.
Lemieux, M., F. Dupuis, 1995, "The Locus of Verb Movement in Non-Asymmetric Verb-Second Languages: The Case of Middle French", in: I. Roberts, A. Battye (eds), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 80–110.
Lenerz, J., 1984, *Syntaktischer Wandel Und Grammatiktheorie. Eine Untersuchung an Beispielen Aus Der Sprachgeschichte Des Deutschen,* Tübingen, Niemeyer.
Lightfoot, D., 1995, "Why UG Needs a Learning Theory: Triggering Verb Movement", in: I. Roberts, A. Battye (eds), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 31–52.
Lightfoot, D., 1999, *The Development of Language: Acquisition, Change, and Evolution*, Wiley-Blackwell.
Lightfoot, D., M. Westergaard, 2007, "Language Acquisition and Language Change: Interrelationships", *Language and Linguistics Compass,* 1, 5, 396−416.
Lombardi, A, 2007, "Posizione Dei Clitici E Ordine Dei Constituenti Della Lingua Sarda Medievale," in: A. Ledgeway, D. Bentley (eds), *Sui Dialetti Italoromanzi: Saggi in Onore Di Nigel B. Vincent*, Norfolk, Biddles, 133–148.
Lombardi, A., R. S. Middleton, 2004, "Alcune Osservazioni Sull'ordine Delle Parole Negli Antichi Volgari Italiani", in: M. Dardano, G. Frenguelli (eds), *Sint Ant: La Sintassi Dell'italiano Antico. Atti Del Convegno Internazionale Di Studi*, Rome, Arcane, 553–582.
Marchello-Nizia, C., 1985, *Dire Le Vrai: L'adverbe «si» en Français Médieval: Essai de Linguistique Historique,* Geneva, Droz.
Marchello-Nizia, C., 1997, *La Langue Française Aux XIVe et XVe Siècles,* Paris, Nathan.
Müller, G., 2004, "Verb-Second as vP First", *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics,* 7, 179–234.
Munaro, N., 2010, "Towards a Hierarchy of Clause Types", in: P. Benincà, N. Munaro (eds), *Mapping the Left Periphery*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 126–162.
Önnerfors, O., 1996, "On Narrative Declarative V1 Sentences in German", in: T. Swan, O. Jansen (eds), *Modality in Germanic Languages*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 293−320.
Önnerfors, O., 1997, *Verb-Erst-Delkarativsätze. Grammatik Und Pragmatik,* Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiskell International.
Petrova, S., 2011, "Modelling Word Order Variation in Discourse: On the Pragmatic Properties of VS Order in Old High German", *Indo-European Syntax and Pragmatics: Contrastive Approaches,* 3, 3, 209–228.
Petrova, S., M. Solf, 2008, "Rhetorical Relations and Verb Placement in Early Germanic. A Cross Linguistic Study", in: C. Fabricius-Hansen, W. Ramm (eds), *"Subordination" vs. "Coordination" in Sentence and Text. A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 333–351.
Platzack, C., 1995, "The Loss of Verb Second in English and French", in: I. Roberts, A. Battye (eds), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 200–226.
Poeppel, D., K. Wexler., 1993, "The Full Competence Hypothesis of Clause Structure in Early German", *Language*, 69, 1–33.
Poletto, C., 2000, *The Higher Functional Field: Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Poletto, C., 2002, "The Left-Periphery of V2-Rhaetoromance Dialects: A New View on V2 and V3",in: S. Barbiers, L. Cornips, S. van der Kleij (eds), *Syntactic Microvariation*, Amsterdam, Meertens Institute, 214–242.
Poletto, C., 2005, "'Si' and 'E' as CP Expletives in Old Italian", in: M. Batllori, M-L. Hernanz, C. Picallo, F. Roca (eds), *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 206–235.
Poletto, C., 2006a, "Old Italian Scrambling: The Low Left Periphery of the Clause", in: P. T. Brandt, E. Fuss (eds), *Form, Structure, and Grammar: A Festschrift Presented to Günther Grewendorf on Occasion of His 60th Birthday*, Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 209–229.
Poletto, C., 2006b, "Parallel Phases: A Study of the High and Low Periphery of Old Italian", in: M. Frascarelli (ed.), *Phases of Interpretation*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 261–295.
Poletto, C., 2013, "On V2 Types", in: S. Luraghi, C. Parodi (eds), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Syntax*, London, Bloomsbury, 154–164.
Poletto, C., 2014, *Word Order in Old Italian,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Poletto, C., R. Zanuttini, 2003, "Making Imperatives: Evidence from Central Rhaetoromance", in: C. Tortora (ed.), *The Syntax of Italian Dialects*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 175−207.
Pollock, J-Y., 1989, "Verb Movement, UG and the Structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20, 365–425.
Reis, M., 1995, "Wer Glaubst Du Hat Recht? On So-Called Extractions from Verb-Second Clauses and Verb-First Parenthetical Constructions in German", *Sprache Und Pragmatik*, 36, 27–83.
Reis, M., 2000a, "Anmerkung Zu Verb-Erst-Satz-Typen Im Deutschen", in: R. Thieroff, M. Tamrat, N. Furhop, O. Teuber (eds), *Deutscher Grammatik in Theorie Und Praxis*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 215–227.
Reis, M., 2000b, "Review of O. Önnerfors: Verb-Erst-Deklarativsätze. Grammatik Und Pragmatik", *Studia Linguistica,* 54, 90–100.
Ribeiro, I., 1995, "Evidence for a Verb-Second Phase in Old Portuguese",in: I. Roberts, A. Battye (eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change,* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 110–139.
Rinke, E., 2003, "On the Licensing of Null Subjects in Old French", in: U. Junghanns, L. Szucsich (eds), *Syntactic Structures and Morphological Information*, Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, 217–247.
Rinke, E., 2007, *Syntaktische Variation Aus Synchronischer Und Diachronischer Perspektive*, Frankfurt am Main, Vervuert.
Rinke, E.,2009, "Verb Placement in Old Portuguese," in: A. Dufter, D. Jacob (eds), *Focus and Background in the Romance Languages*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 309–332.
Rinke, E., M. Elsig., 2010, "Quantitative Evidence and Diachronic Syntax", *Lingua*, 120, 11, 2557–2568.
Rinke, E., J. Meisel, 2009, "Subject Inversion in Old French: Syntax and Information Structure", in: G.A. Kaiser, E. M. Remberger (eds), *Proceedings of the Workshop on Null Subjects, Expletives and Locatives in Romance*, Konstanz, Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft, 93–130.
Rivero, M., 1993, "Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian Yes-No Questions: Raising to *Li* versus *Li* Hopping", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 24, 3, 567–575.
Rizzi, L., 1986, "Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*", *Linguistic Inquiry,* 17, 501–57.
Rizzi, L., 1997, "The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery", in: L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Grammar*, Dodrecht, Kluwer, 281–338.
Rizzi, L., 2005, "On Some Properties of Subjects and Topics",in: L. Brugé, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, W. Schweikert, G. Turano (eds), *Proceedings of the XXX Incontro Di Grammatica Generativa*, Venice, Cafoscarina, 203–224.
Roberts, I., 1993, *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: A Comparative History of English and French*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
Roberts, I., 2009, "A Deletion Analysis of Null Subjects", in: T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts, M. Sheehan (eds), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 58–87.
Roberts, I., 2010,*Agreement and Head Movement,* Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Roberts, I., 2012, "Phases, Head Movement and Second-Position Effects", in: A. J. Gallego (ed.), *Phases Developing the Framework*, Berlin/Boston, Mouton De Gruyter, 385–440.
Salvesen, C., 2011, "Stylistic Fronting and Remnant Movement in Old French", in: J. Berns, H. Jacobs, T. Scheer (eds), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2009: Selected Papers from "Going Romance" Nice 2009*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 323–342.
Salvesen, C., 2013, "Topics and the Left Periphery: A Comparison of Old French and Modern Germanic", in: T. Lohndal (ed.), *In Search of Universal Grammar: From Old Norse to Zoque*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 131–172.
Salvi, G., 1991, "Defesa E Illustrazione Della Legge Di Wackernagel Applicata Alle Lingue Romanze Antiche: La Posizione Delle Forme Pronominali Clittiche", in: L. Vanelli, A. Zamboni (eds), *Per Giovan Battista Pellegrini. Scritti Degli Allievi Padovani,* Padua, Unipress, 439–462.
Salvi, G., 2000, "La Formazione Della Sistema V2 Delle Lingue Romanze Antiche", *Lingua E Stile,* 35, 665–692.
Salvi, G., 2002, "Il Problema Di Si E L'uso Riflessivo Di Essere", *Verbum*, IV, 2, 377–398.
Salvi, G., 2004, *La formazione della struttura di frase romanza: ordine delle parole e clitici dal latino alle lingue romanze antiche,* Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag.
Salvi, G., 2012, "On the Nature of the V2 System of Old Romance" in: L. Brugè, A. Cardinaletti, G. Giusti, N. Munaro, C. Poletto (eds), *The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Vol. 7, Functional Heads*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 103–111.
Santorini, B., 1989, *The Generalization of the Verb-Second Constraint in the History of Yiddish*, PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
Sheehan, M., 2009, "'Free' Inversion in Romance and the Null Subject Parameter", in: T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, I. Roberts, M. Sheehan (eds), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 231–262.
Sigurdsson, H., 1989, *The Syntax of Person, Tense and Speech Features*, PhD Dissertation, University of Lund.
Sigurdsson, H., 1990, "V1 Declaratives and Verb Raising in Icelandic", *Syntax and Semantics*, 24, 41–69.
Sigurdsson, H., 1993, "Argument-Drop in Old Icelandic", *Lingua*, 89, 2–3, 247–280.
Sigurdsson, H., 2004, "The Syntax of Person, Tense and Speech Features", *Italian Journal of Linguistics*, 16, 219–251.
Sigurdsson, H., 2011, "Conditions on Argument Drop",*Linguistic Inquiry,* 42, 2, 267–304.
Sigurdsson, H, J. M. Maling, 2010, "The Empty Left Edge Condition", in: M. Putnam (ed.), *Exploring Crash-Proof Grammars*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 57–84.
Sigurdsson, H., V. Egerland, 2009, "Impersonal Null-Subjects in Icelandic and Elsewhere", *Studia Linguistica*, 63, 1, 158–185.
Sitaridou, I., 2011, "Word Order and Information Structure in Old Spanish", *Catalan Journal of Linguistics*, 10, 159–184.
Sitaridou, I., 2012, "A Comparative Study of Word Order in Old Romance", *Folia Linguistica*, 46, 2, 1–51.
Skårup, P., 1975, *Les Premières Zones de La Proposition En Ancien Français,* Copenhagen, Akademisk Forlag.
Thráinsson, H., 2007, *The Syntax of Icelandic,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Tomaselli, A., 1990, "COMP as a Licensing Head: An Argument Based on Cliticization", in: J. Mascarò, M. Nespor (eds), *Grammar in Progress: GLOW Essays for Henk van Riemsdijk*, Dordrecht, Foris, 433–445.
Tortora, C., 2002, "Romance Enclisis, Prepositions and Aspect", *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 20, 725–58.
Vance, B., 1993, "Verb-First Declaratives Introduced by *et* and the Position of *pro* in Old and Middle French", *Lingua*, 89, 2–3, 281–314.

Vance, B., 1995, "On the Decline of Verb Movement to Comp in Old and Middle French", in I. Roberts, A. Battye (eds), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 173–199.
Vance, B., 1997, *Syntactic Change in Old French: Verb-Second and Null Subjects,* Dordrecht, Kluwer.
Vance, B., B. Donaldson, B. D. Steiner, 2009, "V2 Loss in Old French and Old Occitan: The Role of Fronted Clauses", in: S. Colina, A. Olarrea, A.M. Carvalho (eds), *Romance Linguistics 2009. Selected Papers from the 39th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Tuscon, Arizona*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 301–320.
Vanelli, L., 1986, "Strutture Tematiche in Italiano Antico", in H. Stammerjohann (ed.), *Tema-Rema in Italiano*, Tübingen, Gunter Narr Verlag, , 249–273.
Vanelli, L., 1998, "Ordine Delle Parole E Articolazione Pragmatica Dell'italiano Antico: La 'Prominenza' Pragmatica Della Prima Posizione Nella Frase", *Medioevo Romanzo,* 23, 2, 229–246.
Vanelli, L., L. Renzi, P. Benincà, 1986, "Tipologia Dei Pronomi Soggetto Nelle Lingue Romanze Medievali", *Quaderni Patavini Di Linguistica*, 5, 49–66.
Van Kampen, J., 2010, "Typological Guidance in the Acquisition of V2 Dutch", *Lingua,* 120, 2, 264–283.
VanKemenade, A., 1987, *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English,* Dordrecht, Foris.
Van Reenen, P., L. Schøsler, 1992, "Ancien et Moyen Français: SI 'Thématique', Analyse Exhaustive D'une Série de Textes", *Vox Romanica,* 51, 101–127.
Van Reenen, P., L. Schøsler, 2000, "The Pragmatic Functions of the Old French Particles Ainz, Apres, Donc, Lors, Or, Pluis, and Si", in: S. C. Herring, P. van Reenen, L. Schøsler (eds), *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 59–105.
Vikner, S., 1995, *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Virdis, M., 1996, "Note di sintassi sarda medievale" in: D. Kremer, A. Monjour (eds), *Studia et Hilaritate: Melanges de Linguistique Am et D'onomastique Sardes et Romanes Offerts a Monsieur Heinz Jurgen Wolf*, Strasburg/Nancy, Klincksieck, 507–527.
Wagner, M. L., 1951, *La Lingua Sarda; Storia, Spirito E Forma,* Berna, A. Francke.
Walkden, G., 2014, *Syntactic Reconstruction and Proto-Germanic,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Walkden, G, 2015, "Verb-Third in Early West Germanic: A Comparative Perspective", in T. Biberauer, G. Walkden (eds.), *Syntax Over Time*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 236–248.
Westergaard, M., 2008, "Acquisition and Change: On the Robustness of the Triggering Experience for Word Order Cues", *Lingua,* 118, 12, 1841–1863.
Westergaard, M., 2009, *The Acquisition of Word Order: Micro-Cues, Information Structure, and Economy,* Amsterdam, John Benjamins.
Wolfe, S., In Press, "Old Spanish Verb Second Reconsidered", *Lingua.*
Wolfe, S., 2015a. "The Old Sardinian Condaghes. A Syntactic Study", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 113, 2, 177–205.
Wolfe, S., 2015b, "Medieval Sardinian: New Evidence for Syntactic Change from Latin to Romance" in: D. T. T. Haug (ed.), *Historical Linguistics 2013: Selected Papers from the 21st International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Oslo*, *5-9 August 2013*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 303–324.
Wolfe, S., 2015c, "Microvariation in Old Italo-Romance Syntax: The View from Old Sardinian and Old Sicilian", *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, 100, 1, 3–36.
Wolfe, S., 2015d, *Microvariation in Medieval Romance Syntax: A Comparative Study*, PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge.
Yang, C. D., 2000, *Knowledge and Learning in Natural Language*, PhD Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Zubizarreta, M.L., 1998, *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order,* Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
Zwart, C. J., 1997, *Morphosyntax of Verb Movement: A Minimalist Approach to the Syntax of Dutch,* Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.