

Provided for non-commercial research and education use.
Not for reproduction, distribution or commercial use.



This article appeared in a journal published by Elsevier. The attached copy is furnished to the author for internal non-commercial research and education use, including for instruction at the authors institution and sharing with colleagues.

Other uses, including reproduction and distribution, or selling or licensing copies, or posting to personal, institutional or third party websites are prohibited.

In most cases authors are permitted to post their version of the article (e.g. in Word or Tex form) to their personal website or institutional repository. Authors requiring further information regarding Elsevier's archiving and manuscript policies are encouraged to visit:

<http://www.elsevier.com/copyright>



Initial subordinate clauses in Old French: Syntactic variation and the clausal left periphery

Bryan Donaldson *

University of Texas at Austin, HRH 2.114A, Mailcode B7600, Austin, TX 78712, USA

Received 27 June 2011; received in revised form 10 April 2012; accepted 10 April 2012

Available online 23 May 2012

Abstract

This paper examines word order variation and change in Old French, in which subordinate clauses that immediately precede a main declarative can occur in at least two distinct syntactic positions with respect to the main clause. Data from a corpus of Old French texts from the 10th until the early 14th centuries show that most initial subordinates are situated outside the main clause proper, although some examples occur in the first position of the main clause. Adopting a richly articulated clausal left periphery (Benincà, 2006), the SceneSetting projection of FrameP is proposed as the default syntactic position for extra-clausal initial subordinates. Although Old French is considered a verb-second language, initial subordinates often yield sequences in which the finite verb of the main clause appears in third or higher position. Following Labelle (2007) and others, I argue that a complex left periphery accounts for descriptively non-V2 word orders, while upholding a V2 analysis for Old French. Finally, following Vance et al. (2010), who examined the role of initial subordinates in the loss of V2 in Old French, I show that for most of the Old French period, the grammar of main declaratives that follow initial subordinates is characteristically V2. Only over the course of the 13th century does the subject–verb order become dominant.

© 2012 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Old French; Syntax; Variation; Change; Subordinates; Left periphery; Verb-second

1. Introduction

This paper reports an empirical investigation of syntactic variation and change in Old French. Old French is often analyzed as a verb-second (V2) language (e.g., Adams, 1987, 1989; Roberts, 1993; Vance, 1997) because the finite verb typically occupies the second position of main declaratives. However, main declaratives whose verb appears in third position or higher ($V \geq 3$) are readily attested, an observation that underlies recent challenges to the V2 analysis of Old French (e.g., Kaiser, 2002; Becker, 2005; Rinke and Meisel, 2009; see also Meisel, 2011). An important subset of $V \geq 3$ orders involves sequences of an initial subordinate clause followed immediately by a main declarative, as noted by Vance (1997:64). Vance et al. (2010) investigated aspects of such sequences in 13th-century Old French prose. Vance et al. defended the V2 analysis but remarked that main declaratives preceded by an initial subordinate provided the earliest evidence of the loss of V2 in favor of subject–verb (SV) ordering. In this paper, I widen the inquiry to include data from the 10th to the early 14th century and investigate an aspect of the syntactic behavior of initial subordinates that was only briefly touched upon in Vance et al. (2010) – namely, the syntactic position of initial subordinate clauses with respect to the

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 512 471 5531; fax: +1 512 471 8492.

E-mail address: bdonaldson@austin.utexas.edu.

following main declarative. Following Vance et al. (2010), I also examine the effect of the initial subordinate on the word order of the main declarative.

1.1. Objectives and overview

My objectives are twofold. The first concerns the syntactic position of initial subordinates in Old French. This position evinces variation, and sequences of initial subordinate + main declarative yield either V2 or V \geq 3 orders. I track this variation empirically to investigate whether the syntactic position that hosts initial subordinates (in relation to the following main declarative) remains diachronically stable or evolves from early to later Old French. The data reveal that initial subordinates occur most frequently to the left of the main clause proper; I then draw on recent work on the clausal left periphery to identify more precisely which position typically hosts initial subordinates. My analysis joins other recent accounts (Benincà, 2006; Labelle, 2007; Mathieu, forthcoming) in arguing that a richly articulated clausal left periphery accounts for V \geq 3 orders within a V2 analysis of Old French.

The second objective of the paper concerns word order in the main declarative. I extend the analysis presented in Vance et al. (2010) for the 13th-century to an earlier period of Old French. Vance et al. documented that some types of initial subordinates favor the appearance of SV order in the following main declarative more than others. I seek early evidence of these trends in texts that predate those used by Vance et al., anticipating that the early Old French data will shed light on the beginnings of the evolution toward SV order, at least in this context.

The article is organized as follows: In the remainder of Section 1, I illustrate initial subordinates in Old French and review the findings of Vance et al. (2010). Section 2 presents the V2 analysis of Old French and discusses the clause structure of main declaratives, including the Tobler-Mussafia law (which governs the position of object clitic pronouns vis-à-vis the finite verb), and the status of V \geq 3 orders. Section 3 lays out the diagnostic criteria used to determine the syntactic position of initial subordinates, and Section 4 discusses the data collection and analysis. In Section 5, I present the results and discussion of the syntactic position of initial subordinates. Similarly, Section 6 contains the results and discussion of the influence of initial subordinates on the word order of the following main clause. Section 7 offers concluding remarks and implications for future work.

1.2. Initial Subordinates in Old French

An initial subordinate clause is a tensed dependent clause that immediately precedes, or introduces, a main declarative clause.¹ The subordinate clause is headed by an overt subordinator, such as *quant* “when, since” in (1) or *ainz que* “before” in (2); for clarity, a comma separates the initial subordinate from the main declarative.²

- (1) Quant vos ne volez entresait que nule de mes robes ait, Je ai trois palefroiz mout buens.
 since you not want absolutely that none of my dresses have I have three horses very good
 ‘Since you absolutely do not want her to have any of my dresses, I have three excellent horses’.
 (Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec et Enide*, v. 1381–1383; verse, ca. 1165)
- (2) Ainz qu’il se meïssent en voie, Ypomedon bien les conroie.
 before that.they themselves put in route Hippomedon well them organize
 ‘Before they could set out, Hippomedon organized them well’.
 (*Roman de Thèbes*, v. 7187–7188; verse, ca. 1150)

These types of phrases are traditionally analyzed as examples of subordination (as opposed to parataxis), for instance by Buridant (2000), Fleischman (1990), Foulet (1928), Grad (1961), Ménard (1988), and Torterat (2007); for an alternate view, see Combettes (2010). Discussing sequences of a *quant* subordinate + main declarative, Fleischman (1990) argued for the close relationship between the *quant* subordinate, which provides presupposed and incidental information, and the main clause, which carries the narrative burden. The two clauses thus form a single sequence; Ménard (1988) and Valli (1983) present similar arguments.

Old French initial subordinates are of theoretical interest because they present syntactic variation, both synchronically and diachronically, along two axes. First, there are at least two syntactic positions that the initial subordinate can occupy

¹ Vance et al. (2010) use the term *fronted clause*, following Vance (1997).

² The use of commas represents a modern editorial convention. The presence or absence of a comma had no bearing on the identification or analysis of initial subordinates.

with respect to the following main declarative. Second, as discussed subsequently, Vance et al. (2010) noted that different types of initial subordinates have differential effects on the word order of the following main declarative.

1.2.1. Variation in the syntactic position of initial subordinates

A descriptive examination of word order reveals variation in the syntactic behavior of the initial subordinate vis-à-vis the following main declarative (Grad, 1956, 1961; Skårup, 1975). In some cases, the finite verb of the main declarative is descriptively in second position, starting with the initial subordinate (which counts as a single constituent). In other cases, however, the verb appears in third or higher position. In examples (3) through (7), the surface V2 order is respected, as the initial subordinate occupies the first position of the main declarative. Examples are given for initial subordinates headed by *se* “if,” *quant* “when, since,” *endementiers que* “while,” *si tost comme* “as soon as,” and *por ce que* “because.” In these and all subsequent examples, brackets delimit relevant clausal positions, each of which can contain only a single constituent, representing a maximal projection (XP). The finite verb is in small capitals. Finally, note that coordinators like *et* ‘and’ and *car* ‘for’ are located to the left of the clause proper and not in first position, as in (6) and (7).

- (3) Dist Amböyns: “[Se Deux l’avoit plevi], [l’OCIRAI je]...”
said Amböyns if God him.had stood-up-for him.will-kill I
‘Amböyn said: ‘Even if God would protect him, I will kill him’.
(Gaydon, p. 196; verse, early 13th century; in Skårup, 1975:178)
- (4) [Quant en ot anfoï le mort], [s’an PARTIRENT] totes les genz.
when one had buried the dead-man themselves.from-there left all the people
‘When one had buried the dead man, all the people left.’
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain*, v. 1411; verse, ca. 1177–1181; in Skårup, 1975:271)
- (5) [Endementiers qu’il le requiert], [se PORPENSA] se il le fiert sor le hiame u sor l’escu.
while that.he him seek himself decide if he him strike on the helmet or on the.shield
‘While he seeks him, he decides whether to strike him on the helmet or on the shield.’
(*L’âtre périlleux*, v. 2313–2315; verse, ca. 1250)
- (6) Car [si tost comme vo message eurent fait convent a mi et a me gent], [KEMANDAI jou] ...
for as soon as your messengers have made agreement to me and to my men ordered I
‘For as soon as your messengers have made an agreement with me and my men, I ordered. . .’
(Robert de Clari, §11; prose, ca. 1205; in Skårup, 1975:284)
- (7) et [por ce que ele fu si hardie que ele s’en osa clamer a son pere], [l’OCISTRENT].
and for that that she was so presumptuous that she herself.of-it dared complain to her father her.killed
‘And because she was so presumptuous that she dared complain of it to her father, they killed her.’
(*Queste del saint Graal*, p. 232; prose, ca. 1225)

In (3) through (7), the initial subordinate participates in the syntax of the main declarative in the sense of Grad (1956, 1961). That is to say, the initial subordinate occupies the first position of the main declarative, whose finite verb (with any clitic pronouns) appears as the second constituent; these are clear V2 orders.

By contrast, in (8) through (12), at least two distinct XPs, including the initial subordinate, precede the finite verb of the main declarative. Examples are given for the same types of initial subordinates shown above in (3) through (7).

- (8) Et [s’il le vuelt avoir par son otrage], [encontre mei] [l’en CONVENDRA] combatre.
and if.he it wants to-have by his recklessness against me to-him.of-it will-need to-fight
‘And if he wants to get it recklessly, he will have to fight against me.’
(*Coronemenz Looïs*, v. 2370–2371; verse, ca. 1130)
- (9) [Quant vos ne volez entresait que nule de mes robes ait], [Je] [AI] trois palefroiz mout buens.
since you not want absolutely that none of my dresses have I have three horses very good
‘Since you absolutely do not want her to have any of my dresses, I have three excellent horses.’
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec et Enide*, v. 1381–1383; verse, ca. 1165)
- (10) [Endementres qu’il parloit en tel maniere], [il] [RESGARDE] loign en la mer.
while that.he spoke in such manner he look far in the sea
‘While he was speaking in such a way, he looked far away across the sea.’
(*Queste del saint Graal*, p. 112; prose, ca. 1225)

- (11) [Si tost comme il le virent], [si] [li ONT] demandé...
 as soon as they him saw then to-him have asked
 'As soon as they saw him, they asked him...'
 (*Roman de Cassidorus*, §235; prose, ca. 1267)
- (12) [Por ce qu'ele ne le connut], [vergoigne] [en OT] et si rougi.
 because that.she not him knew shame of-it had and thus blushed
 'Because she did not know him, she was timid and she blushed.'
 (Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec et Enide*, v. 446–447; verse, ca. 1170)

Of concern for the moment is simply the variation in the syntactic position of initial subordinates with respect to the following main declarative and not any eventual pragmatic or semantic differences between the two variants. Examples (3) through (12) show that all five types of initial subordinate in question participate in both V2 and V \geq 3 orders in Old French.

An early hypothesis held that the linguistic origin of the subordinator influenced the position of the initial subordinate: in Grad's (1956, 1961) view, initial subordinates headed by *se* and *quant*, both inherited from Latin (from *si* and *quando*, respectively), failed to participate in the syntax of the main declarative. On the other hand, Grad held that subordinates of Old French creation (e.g., *endementiers que*, *si tost comme*, *por ce que*) occupied the first position of the main declarative.

Recent work has moved away from the variation in the syntactic position of the initial subordinate toward the potentially troubling presence of V \geq 3 orders in an ostensibly V2 language; this work is discussed subsequently in Section 2.2.

1.2.2. Word order variation in the main declarative

It is independently well known that Old French gradually lost its V2 grammar in favor of a SV grammar, starting as early as the 13th century (Adams, 1987; Roberts, 1993; Vance, 1997). Vance et al. (2010) discovered an interaction between this change and initial subordinate clauses: the evolution of the main declarative word order from conservative to innovative is (at least partially) modulated by the type of initial subordinate. Vance et al. tracked two classes of main declarative word orders: conservative orders that could be generated only by a V2 (and not a SV) grammar, and SV. Although SV is possible under a V2 grammar, the steady decline of the other conservative V2-compatible orders attests to the gradual replacement of the V2 grammar by SV, which became dominant by at least the Middle French period. For this reason, Vance et al. considered SV an innovative order.

Vance et al.'s (2010) empirical study of 13th-century and early 14th-century Old French prose revealed intermediate stages of the evolution from V2 to SV. For example, initial subordinates headed by *se* triggered the most innovative behavior in the following main declarative; SV was already dominant at the beginning of the 13th century, and remained so. After initial *quant* subordinates, main declaratives evinced a less innovative grammar than after *se* subordinates, with SV progressing from a minority order to the dominant order over the course of the 13th century. Initial subordinates of the type *por ce que*, *en ce que* 'in that,' *endementiers que*, and *avant que* 'before' facilitated a yet more conservative behavior in the following main declarative, with conservative V2-compatible orders remaining dominant for longer. In this context, SV finally broke through as the dominant order only by the end of the 13th century (albeit less strongly so than after *se* and *quant*). Table 1 details the differential evolution toward SV in main declaratives introduced by initial *se*, *quant*, and *por ce que* subordinates.

Vance et al. (2010) argued that their data revealed the earliest available evidence of the loss of V2 in Old French and that the steadily increasing proportion of SV reflected a change in progress during which the V2 grammar was replaced by SV. They couched their analysis in terms of grammars in competition (Kroch, 1989). Accordingly, at a given point in time during the loss of V2 in Old French, utterances could reflect either the conservative V2 grammar or the emerging SV grammar.³ Vance et al.'s (2010) data suggest that different types of initial subordinates facilitate the innovative SV grammar to different degrees. As an example, SV dominates after initial *se* clauses at a much earlier date than after initial *por ce que* clauses.

2. V2 and V \geq 3 in Old French: Clause structure and V \geq 3 orders

This section shows how V \geq 3 orders can be accounted for while maintaining a V2 analysis of Old French. I begin with the relevant descriptive observations on which the V2 analysis rests. I then discuss generative analyses of V2 before

³ Note that I am concerned only with surface order here. I do not claim that Old French SV presents the same underlying structure as modern French SV. The crucial observation is that increasing proportions of (surface) SV in main declaratives are prerequisite input for grammatical restructuring and loss of V2 (see Adams, 1987:25).

Table 1

Loss of V2-compatible (non-SV) orders in main declaratives introduced by initial subordinates (adapted from Vance et al., 2010:308–310).

Text, date	Type of initial subordinate								
	<i>se</i>			<i>quant</i>			<i>por ce que</i>		
	V2	SV	<i>n</i>	V2	SV	<i>n</i>	V2	SV	<i>n</i>
Villehardouin 1208	12%	88%	33	87%	13%	128	100%	0%	3
Queste 1225	24%	76%	38	84%	16%	202	100%	0%	34
Cassidorus 1267	43%	57%	56	75%	25%	409	47%	53%	19
Joinville 1306	14%	86%	56	10%	90%	128	35%	65%	34

Note. V2 = conservative orders; *n* = token count.

presenting instances of $V \geq 3$ that appear to challenge such analyses. Finally, I demonstrate how the generative analysis of Old French V2, combined with a richly articulated clausal left periphery, allows for $V \geq 3$ orders.

2.1. Properties and analyses of Old French V2

Old French is frequently analyzed as V2 because the finite verb most often occupies the second clausal position in main declaratives. This claim is neither particularly recent, dating to Thurneysen (1892), nor do its basic premises depend upon a single theoretical approach; Old French is considered V2 by, among many others, Adams (1987, 1989), Benincà (2006), Buridant (2000), Combettes (2003), Foulet (1928), Marchello-Nizia (1995), Ménard (1988), Roberts (1993), Skårup (1975), and Vance (1997).

Two salient properties of Old French V2, as demonstrated in main declaratives, are the flexibility of the first clausal position and the frequency of postverbal subjects. Whereas the second position must contain the finite verb (with any associated object clitics), the first position enjoys considerable freedom with respect to the grammatical category and information structure properties of the XP. Examples (13) through (15) illustrate XPs of different grammatical categories in first position. In these main declaratives, the first position contains, respectively, the prepositional phrase *En Bretagne* 'in Brittany' in (13), the temporal adverb *or* 'now' in (14), and the nominal (NP) direct object *ma dame* 'my wife' in (15). Other types of XP can occur in first position as well, including initial subordinate clauses, as in (3) through (7).

- (13) [En Bretagne] [MANEIT] uns ber.
in Brittany lived a baron
'A baron lived in Brittany.'
(Marie de France, *Bisclavret*, v. 15; verse, ca. 1185)
- (14) [Or] [ESTOIE je] trop a aise.
now was I too at pleasure
'I was too happy until now.'
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec et Enide*, v. 2586; verse, ca. 1165)
- (15) [Ma dame] [A] cil lerres souduite.
My wife has this scoundrel seduced
'This scoundrel seduced my wife.'
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain*, v. 2727; verse, ca. 1177–1181; in Buridant, 2000:741)

The V2 grammar also allows preverbal subjects, either nominal, as in (16), or pronominal, as in (17). Old French preverbal subject pronouns are tonic and autonomous (Foulet, 1928; Raynaud de Lage, 1962), rather than clitics as in modern French. As a result, *il* 'he' in (17) occupies the first position in the same way as *li rois* 'the king' in (16).

- (16) Et [li rois] [COMANDE] que les napes soient mises.
and the king orders that the tablecloths be put
'And the king orders that the tablecloths be put on.'
(*Queste del saint Graal*, p. 4; prose, ca. 1225)

- (17) Et [il] [MONTE] et la damoisele ausi.
and he mounts and the maiden also
'And he gets on the horse and the maiden does too.'
(*Queste del saint Graal*, p. 1; prose, ca. 1225)

Old French evinces SV in main declaratives, as (16) and (17) demonstrate. Such orders superficially resemble the dominant SV order of modern French. However, unlike in Modern French (a non-V2 language), in Old French main declaratives, subjects readily appear postverbally: If a non-subject occurs in first position, the subject – if expressed – appears immediately to the right of the finite verb (Vanelli et al., 1985). Consider (18) and (19), in which the subject (nominal in 18, pronominal in 19) surfaces immediately after the finite verb, before the past participle.

- (18) [Sor un foier] [EST] Guillelmes montez.
on a hearthstone is Guillaume climbed
'Guillaume stepped up onto a hearthstone.'
(*Charroi de Nîmes*, v. 123, ca. 1150; in Adams, 1987:5)
- (19) Et [lors] [A il] encontreé jusqu'a vint homes armez.
and then has he encountered up.to twenty men armed
'And then he encountered up to twenty armed men.'
(*Queste del saint Graal*, p. 87; prose, ca. 1225; in Vance, 1997:44)

Thus far, in purely descriptive terms, the following properties characterize Old French main declaratives:

- the finite verb (eventually with its object clitics) occurs in the second position of the clause;
- the first position hosts a single maximal projection (noun phrase, prepositional phrase, adverbial phrase, adjectival phrase, tensed phrase, etc.), which may represent the subject, the NP direct or indirect object, or a non-argument of the verb⁴;
- a non-subject XP in the first position entails the postposition of the subject.

I delay discussion of two further properties of Old French main declarative word order – null subjects and object clitic placement – until Section 3, when they become relevant diagnostics for the syntactic position of preverbal XPs, including initial subordinates.

2.1.1. Generative account of Old French V2

The descriptive observations about Old French V2 are elegantly captured in generative approaches, including Adams (1987), Roberts (1993), Vance (1997), and Vanelli et al. (1985), which all share the premise that the finite verb raises from its base position in VP to C⁰. This notion draws on den Besten's (1983) treatment of Modern German V2, which postulates that all main declaratives in a V2 grammar involve verb movement to C⁰ and saturation of SpecCP (the clausal first position) by some XP. In the generative analysis, the underlying representation of Old French main declaratives is along the lines of the following, shown in Vance et al.'s (2010) updated adaptation of Adams (1987).

- (20) [_{CP} XP [_C V_i [+fin]] [_{TP} (subject) [_T [_{VP} ... t_i ...]]]]

The finite verb, generated in VP, moves to C⁰, where it surfaces; if a non-subject XP occupies SpecCP, the subject remains in SpecTP, surfacing postverbally, as in (13) through (15). Otherwise, the subject can raise to SpecCP, yielding a surface SV order, as in (16) and (17).⁵

2.2. V_{≥3} orders in Old French

The generative analysis as presented accounts for the fundamental properties of Old French word order, and of aspects of medieval Romance syntax more generally: As Benincà (1995, 2006) noted, all the medieval Romance

⁴ In early Old French (until around 1220), V1 declaratives are possible, in which the first position remains empty.

⁵ As an anonymous reviewer notes, some generative accounts (e.g., Lemieux and Dupuis, 1995; Vance, 1997) treat instances of SV in main declaratives as IPs rather than CPs; only main declaratives in which a non-subject precedes the verb are CPs. This view contrasts with analyses that view all main declaratives as CPs, regardless of the position of the subject (Adams, 1987; Benincà, 1995, 2006; Roberts, 1993; Vance, 1993; Vance et al., 2010).

languages presented V2 characteristics to some degree. Nonetheless, among these languages, V2 is respected the most strongly in Old French. In theory at least, it has been held that Old French does not tolerate descriptively $V \geq 3$ orders (see Benincà, 1995; Posner, 1996, 1997), and, as Marchello-Nizia (1995:64–65) noted, early analyses of Old French (e.g., Thurneysen, 1892) could not satisfactorily account for $V \geq 3$ orders. Nevertheless, examples of $V \geq 3$ in main declaratives represent a non-negligible proportion of the data throughout the Old French period, even in 13th-century prose works, in which, according to Vance (1993:284, 1997) the Old French V2 grammar appears at its most pronounced.

$V \geq 3$ main declaratives have been discussed in a number of recent works. Härmä (1990) presents numerous examples of left dislocations in Old French, of which certain types are also mentioned in Vance (1997). Rouveret (2004) and Labelle (2007) cite examples of $V \geq 3$ main declaratives in their discussions of Old French clausal architecture, as does Mathieu (forthcoming) in his discussion of stylistic fronting. The $V \geq 3$ main clauses from medieval Italian dialects cited by Benincà (2006) attest to the pan-Romance nature of the phenomenon. In addition to the cases of initial subordinate + main declarative given above in (8) through (12), other representative examples of $V \geq 3$ from early Old French (10th to late 12th century) appear in (21) through (25); examples (26)–(29) are from later Old French.

In (21), both the NP subject *Messire Yvains* ‘Sir Yvain’ and the NP direct object *l’espee* ‘the sword’ precede the verb *tret* ‘draws.’

- (21) [Messire Yvains] [l’espee] [TRET].
Sire Yvain the.sword draws
‘Sir Yvain draws the sword.’
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Yvain*, v. 4200; verse, ca. 1177–1181; in Marchello-Nizia, 1995:53)

In (22), the NP direct object *un grail* ‘a grail’ and the prepositional phrase *entre ses ii. mains* ‘between her two hands’ precede the NP subject *une dameisele* ‘a maiden,’ which is followed by the verb *tenoit* ‘was holding’ in the fourth clausal position.

- (22) [Un grail] [entre ses ii. mains] [une dameisele] [TENAIT...]
a grail between her two hands a maiden held
‘A maiden was holding a grail in her two hands.’
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Perceval*, v. 3220–3221; verse, ca. 1181; in Mathieu, submitted for publication)

In (23), the verb *unt* ‘have’ is preceded by both a NP subject and an adverbial phrase.

- (23) [Icoste fole gent de France.] [mut par] [UNT il] fole esperance.
these crazy people from France very-much have they crazy hope
‘These crazy people from France, they truly have crazy hope(s).’
(Gormont et Isembart, v. 78–80; verse, ca. 1125; in Labelle, 2007:303)

Some cases resemble modern left dislocation. In (24), the subject *Domine Dieu* ‘God’ appears first as a full NP, then as a subject pronoun, both of which are XPs.

- (24) [Domine Dieu] [il] [les LUCRAT].
Lord God he them won
‘God, he won them.’
(*Vie de Saint Léger*, v. 214; verse, ca. 980)

In (25), the NP direct object *ceste bataille* ‘this battle’ is left-dislocated (Priestley, 1955), and the subject pronoun *je* ‘I’ is a tonic XP. I follow Skårup (1975) in analyzing the vocative *sire* ‘lord’ as an intercalation that temporarily suspends the structure of the main clause.⁶

- (25) [Ceste bataille], sire, [je] [la DEMANT].
this battle lord I it demand
‘This battle, lord, I ask for it.’
(*Coronemenz Looïs*, v. 2446; verse, ca. 1130; in Blasco, 1997:3)

⁶ See also Vance (1997:193–194) for a similar treatment of intercalations and parentheticals.

Comparable examples of $V \geq 3$ occur in later Old French; the following examples date from the 13th and 14th centuries. In (26), both the pronominal subject and the NP direct object precede the finite verb.

- (26) et [il] [ses freres] [ANCUSA].
and he his brothers accused
'and he accused his brothers.'
(*La bible de Jehan Malkaraume*, v. 2054; verse, ca. 1283; in Becker, 2005:353)

In (27), an adverbial phrase and a pronominal subject precede the verb.

- (27) Et [devant vostre conseil] [nos] [VOS DIRONS] ce que nostre seignor vos mandent.
and in-front-of your counsel we to-you will-tell that which our lords to-you ask
'And in front of your counsel, we will tell you what our lords ask of you.'
(Villehardouin, *La conquête de Constantinople*, §4; prose, ca. 1208; in Ferraresi and Goldbach, 2002:9)

In (28), a subject NP and the adverb *si* precede the verb *estoit* 'was.'

- (28) et [la raison] [si] [ESTOIT]. . .
and the reason thus was
'and the reason was. . .'
(*Roman de Cassidorus*, §251; prose, ca. 1267)

In (29), a complex NP direct object and a pronominal subject precede the verb *envenima* 'poisoned.'

- (29) [Laquele natte sur quoy il sot que le soudanc s'asseoit touz les jours], [il] [L'ENVENIMA].
which rug on which he knew that the sultan himself.sat all the days he it.poisoned
'The rug on which he knew that the sultan sat down every day, he poisoned it.'
(Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, §145; prose, ca. 1306)

Several recent studies (Kaiser, 2002; Becker, 2005; Rinke and Meisel, 2009) have interpreted the presence of main $V \geq 3$ as evidence that Old French was not truly a V2 language. If, as Kaiser (2002) and others argue, the grammar of Old French was similar to the V2 grammar of Modern German, then surface $V \geq 3$ orders should be rare, if they exist at all. Despite the overall predominance of word orders that are, from a purely descriptive perspective, V2-compatible (see Vance, 1997:38 for data from *Queste*, ca. 1225), Kaiser, Becker, and Rinke and Meisel point out that Old French evinces considerably higher proportions of $V \geq 3$ main declaratives than Modern German. Becker (2005) cites striking data from main clauses introduced by initial *quant* clauses, a context in which the main clause verb fails to occur in second position in as many as 87% of the tokens (pp. 353–354). As Becker argues, such results are "not at all what is expected from a V2 grammar" (p. 354, my translation). At the same time, however, one should bear in mind Mathieu's (forthcoming) observation that comparing V2 in Old French to V2 in modern German represents a sort of comparative fallacy, and that a more valid comparison would consider Old Germanic V2, in which $V \geq 3$ orders appear to have been more common.

2.3. Clausal left periphery

Other recent work accounts for $V \geq 3$ main declaratives in Old French by appealing to a richly articulated clausal left periphery; this is the approach adopted here. Following Rizzi (1997), the CP domain at the left edge of the clause consists of multiple functional projections (or series thereof). These projections host diverse phrase-initial XPs that are in some sense peripheral to rather than part and parcel of the clause as traditionally defined. For Old French, a similar idea appeared in Skårup (1975), whose model of the Medieval Romance clause appears in (30). Following Diderichsen's positional syntax (e.g., 1957), Skårup posits a series of zones: the verbal zone hosts the finite verb and corresponds descriptively to the second position, and the preverbal zone corresponds to the first position. Importantly, the preverbal zone is preceded by the *extraposition* zone, which could host XPs that Skårup considered to be outside the clause proper ("hors de la proposition", p. 179) but nonetheless attached to the following clause (p. 416).

- (30) [Extraposition] [Preverbal zone (=fondement)] [VERBAL ZONE] [Postverbal zone]

Work in the cartographic approach (following Rizzi, 1997) has provided numerous refinements to the notion of *extraposition* articulated by Skårup (1975). Studies of both historical (e.g., Benincà, 1995, 2004, 2006; Benincà and

Poletto, 2004; Labelle, 2007) and modern Romance data (e.g., Frascarelli, 2007; Rizzi, 2004; Pöll, 2010) have focused on detailing the hierarchization and properties of the CP-projections that constitute the left periphery. Slight differences aside, this perspective informs the discussions of Old French V \geq 3 and clause structure in Rouveret (2004), Labelle (2007), Mathieu (2006, forthcoming), and others.

In this study, I adopt Benincà's (2006) model of the Medieval Romance clause, whose basic architecture (p. 55) appears in (31). Benincà's model was conceived on the basis of historical Romance data, and its basic tenets date at least as far back as Benincà (1995), preceding the cartographic movement per se. The model is well known, serving as a basis for, among others, the analyses in Labelle (2007), Mathieu (forthcoming), and Vance et al.'s (2010) comparative discussion of Old French and Old Occitan. The presence of multiple leftward projections (i.e., ForceP, FrameP, TopicP) allows for multiple preverbal XPs. Benincà (2006) follows the generative approach to V2, positing verb movement to the lowest head in the CP domain; in Benincà's terminology, this is Focus⁰.

(31) [Force] [Frame] [Topic] [Focus] [Fin]

Henceforth, I adopt Benincà's (2006) terms when discussing clause structure. SpecFocus thus designates the first position (*fondement* in Skårup, 1975; SpecCP in Adams, 1987; Vance, 1997), and Focus⁰ designates the second position (verbal zone, C⁰). It is unclear whether Skårup's *extraposition* maps to Benincà's TopicP alone or to all the left-peripheral projections.

2.3.1. V2 with a complex left periphery

A complex CP-domain accounts for V \geq 3 orders in a principled manner and captures the behavior of initial XPs that occur left of SpecFocus. On the other hand, such an approach implies that the question of Old French V2 is more complex than surface word order alone. With this model, it would be reductionist to reject a V2 analysis solely on account of surface order. A heightened understanding of the left periphery has not led proponents of the approach to abandon the V2 analysis for Old French, which, in the prototypical generative analysis, postulates verb raising in main clauses (e.g., Adams, 1987; Roberts, 1993; Vance, 1997). It is this fundamental property of the grammar, and not – despite its frequency – the descriptive V2 order that often results, that defines Old French as a V2 language. By combining the standard generative analysis of V2 with a richly articulated left periphery, analyses such as Benincà (2004, 2006), Labelle (2007), Poletto (2005), and Rouveret (2004) are able to account for both the pervasive V2 effects and the descriptively V \geq 3 orders attested in Old French main declaratives. In Old French, the verb raises to Focus⁰ and is preceded by a XP in SpecFocus (see Benincà, 2006:70); this is in essence the core of the V2 declarative clause. To this structure, however, can be associated various (optional) left-peripheral XPs, such as left dislocations (see Labelle, 2007:303), and, as the present study will show, initial subordinates.

3. Diagnostics for the syntactic position of initial subordinates

Old French initial subordinates occur variously in SpecFocus or in the left periphery. To determine the syntactic position of initial subordinates, I draw on theoretical claims about the syntax of Old French and medieval Romance, adducing properties of postverbal subject pronouns, the variable position of object clitic pronouns, and the position of other XPs. Ambiguous orders, in which the syntactic position of the initial subordinate cannot be reliably determined, are also discussed.

3.1. SpecFocus orders

Following accepted syntactic theory, two main clause word orders attest to the saturation of SpecFocus, in this case by the initial subordinate: postverbal subject pronouns and preverbal object clitics.

3.1.1. Initial subordinate + verb + subject pronoun

Foulet (1928:307–308) observed that when a non-subject XP occurs sentence-initially, the subject, if expressed, must appear postverbally. A refined version of this observation is accepted in the generative literature on Old French: the presence of an expressed postverbal subject pronoun indicates verb raising to Focus⁰ and saturation of SpecFocus by another XP (e.g., Adams, 1987:12; Benincà, 2006:61; Vance, 1997:54; Vanelli et al., 1985:166). In other words, subject pronouns occur postverbally only when SpecFocus is saturated, thus preventing the subject pronoun from appearing before the verb. It follows that, in a sequence of initial subordinate + finite verb + subject pronoun as in (3) and (6), the initial subordinate saturates SpecFocus; no other preverbal XP is available to do so.

3.1.2. Initial subordinate + object clitic + verb

Further indications about the position of preverbal XPs come from the position of object clitic pronouns. Object clitics in Medieval Romance varieties always surface immediately adjacent to the finite verb but may appear either preverbally or postverbally. According to well-known observations made in the 19th century by the philologists Tobler and Mussafia, object clitics appear postverbally to avoid appearing clause-initially when no other XP begins the clause. Conversely, if another XP appears clause-initially, clitics appear preverbally. Consider the contrasting examples in (32), where the clitic *li* 'to him' is preverbal, and (33), where *le* 'him' is postverbal.

(32) Or *li* FESONS toz les chevels trenchier.
now to-him do all the horses cut-off-head
'Now let us kill all his horses.'
(*Coronemenz Looïs*, v. 95; verse, ca. 1130)

(33) От *le* li enfes.
heard him the child
'The child heard him.'
(*Coronemenz Looïs*, v. 87; verse, ca. 1130)

Descriptively, object clitics appear preverbally when the first position is filled, as in (32), where the adverb *or* 'now' fills the first position. The so-called Tobler-Mussafia Law has been formalized by Benincà (1995, 2004, 2006); in her account, supported by data from a range of Medieval Romance varieties, object clitics are preverbal when SpecFocus is saturated. By contrast, if SpecFocus is empty, object clitics – if present – must surface postverbally. Following Benincà, I take preverbal object clitics as evidence that SpecFocus is saturated. In such cases, if the only preverbal XP is the initial subordinate, it stands to reason that the initial subordinate saturates SpecFocus.

3.2. Left-peripheral orders

Again following accepted theory, I present two orders that testify to the position of the initial subordinate to the left of rather than in SpecFocus: the presence of a separate XP (or XPs) between the initial subordinate and the finite verb, and postverbal object clitics.

3.2.1. Initial subordinate + XP + verb

On the uncontroversial premise that only one XP may occupy SpecFocus, I infer that a XP situated immediately to the left of the finite verb – and thereby intervening between the initial subordinate and the finite verb – saturates SpecFocus. As a consequence, the initial subordinate occupies a syntactic position somewhere to the left of SpecFocus. This is the case in all the examples in (8) through (12).

3.2.2. Initial subordinate + verb + object clitic

In Benincà's (1995, 2004, 2006) interpretation of the Tobler-Mussafia Law, postverbal object clitics in the main declarative indicate that SpecFocus is empty. Consider (34), in which the surface order presents an immediately preverbal NP *la chere sainte pucele* 'the dear holy maiden' but the object clitics are postverbal rather than preverbal.

(34) E la chere sainte pucele PARTI s'en gloriuse e bele.
and the dear holy maiden left herself.from-there blessed and beautiful
'And the dear holy maiden left blessed and beautiful.'
(Adgar, *Miracles*, v. 199–200; verse, late 12th century; in Skårup, 1975:397)

Benincà's (2006) approach corroborates the conclusion reached by Skårup (1975) with respect to this and comparable examples: the subject NP is outside the clause proper, and SpecFocus is empty, hence the postverbal object clitics.

The same logic explains the postverbal clitic *i* 'there' in (35), whose surface order otherwise appears – speciously – to mirror the examples in (3) through (7), in which the verb appears second. Although an XP (the subordinate in *cum*) precedes the finite verb *truvad* 'found' in (35), the postposition of the clitic *i* shows that SpecFocus is in fact empty. It follows that the initial subordinate is left-peripheral (corroborating Labelle and Hirschbühler, 2005).

(35) [Cum il vint a únes loges à pasturs en cel chemin] [TRUVAD i] les freres Achazie.
when he came to a lodge to shepherd in that path found there the brothers Achazie
'When he came to a shepherd's lodge on that path, there he found the Achazie brothers.'
(*Li Quatre Livre des reis*, IV, v. 195–196; verse, ca. 1170; in Labelle and Hirschbühler, 2005:66)

The position of object clitics is a useful criterion in early Old French but ceases to be operative in main declaratives around 1200 or 1220, after which time SpecFocus can no longer be empty (Skårup, 1975; Rouveret, 2004); this change in the grammar of Old French has the effect of – at least descriptively – strengthening the V2 constraint (see Vance, 1997) and brings about a decline in verb-initial (V1) declaratives of the type in (33). Once the overt saturation of SpecFocus becomes obligatory, the possibility of postverbal object clitics in main declaratives is lost, as the condition that triggered them – empty SpecFocus – is no longer licit. Note that this change in clause structure affected declaratives, imperatives, and interrogatives differentially: In imperatives, for example, the finite verb continues to appear initially, and postverbal object clitics remain possible (see Labelle and Hirschbühler, 2005).

3.3. Ambiguous orders

In three further cases, the word order of the main declarative does not elucidate the syntactic position of the initial subordinate; these cases involve the negative particle *ne* ‘not,’ null subjects, and certain postverbal nominal subjects.

3.3.1. Initial subordinate + *ne* + verb

Preverbal *ne* presents a hybrid behavior, acting for some purposes like a clitic but elsewhere like a (tonic) XP (Foulet, 1928; Grad, 1961; Labelle and Hirschbühler, 2005, etc.). Whether or not *ne* saturates SpecFocus is unclear: although *ne* allows object clitics to occur preverbally, as if it were an XP, *ne* can also co-occur with any type of subject in SpecFocus, as if it were a clitic. Within the context of the present study, the difficulty is illustrated in (36), in which an initial *se* clause is followed by a main declarative negated by *ne*.

- (36) Se lui lessez, n'i TRAMETREZ plus saive.
 if him you-leave, not.to-there will-you-send more wise
 ‘If you pass him by, you will not (be able to) send a wiser man.’
 (*Chanson de Roland*, v. 279; verse, ca. 1100)

The objective is to ascertain whether the initial subordinate in (36) occupies SpecFocus or a position in the left periphery, but the hybrid nature of *ne* could allow for either interpretation. On the one hand, *ne* alone allows clitics to appear preverbally (Grad, 1961). On the other hand, *ne* can act like a clitic, allowing another XP to occupy SpecFocus. As a consequence, one possibility is that the initial *se* clause is left-peripheral, and *ne* allows the clitic *i* ‘there’ to be preverbal. Alternately, the *se* clause could be in SpecFocus, in which case the clitic would still be preverbal. The syntactic status of *ne* is complex enough to warrant further research; in the present study, cases like (36) are classified as ambiguous because the syntactic position of the initial subordinate is not clear.

3.3.2. Initial subordinate + verb + null subject

Old French allows null subjects (*pro*), and in some word orders in which the subject is null, it is not possible to identify the syntactic position of the initial subordinate. Referring to an observation dating to Foulet (1928) and still widely supported, Vance (1993) notes that “Old French allows null subjects only in environments where the subject would be postverbal if expressed” (p. 281; see also Roberts, 1993:123 and the numerous references therein). Vanelli et al. (1985) and many subsequent approaches link the ability to license *pro* with verb raising, which occurs in main declaratives in Old French. Old French *pro* is therefore more characteristic of main rather than embedded clauses, although Labelle (2007), Rouveret (2004), and others document *pro* in embedded clauses, especially in early Old French.

Overt subject pronouns appear postverbally only when SpecFocus is otherwise saturated, as discussed in Section 2.1.1. The occurrence of *pro*, however, tells us only that the subject is postverbal, without evincing the saturation of SpecFocus.⁷ As an example, sequences like (35), repeated here as (37), are not rare before about 1220.

- (37) [Cum il vint a únes loges à pasturs en cel chemin], [TRUVAD i] les freres Achazie.
 when he came to a lodge to shepherd in that path found there the brothers Achazie
 ‘When he came to a shepherd's lodge on that path, there he found the Achazie brothers.’
 (*Li Quatre Livre des reis*, IV, v. 195–196; verse, ca. 1170; in Labelle and Hirschbühler, 2005:66)

The subject is null in (37); accepted theory identifies it as (postverbal) *pro*. In this example, it is clear that *pro* occurs in a main declarative in which SpecFocus is empty, as the postposed clitic *i* attests. Given the position of the clitic, the initial

⁷ Vance (1997:251) implies that *pro* occurs only in declaratives in which SpecFocus is saturated. The claim is accurate for later stages of Old French when overt saturation of SpecFocus is independently obligatory.

Table 2

Initial subordinate in SpecFocus.

Initial subordinate	Declarative word order
Subordinate +	V Sp CI V

Note. CI = object clitic pronoun(s); Sp = subject pronoun; V = finite verb.

Table 3

Initial subordinate is left-peripheral.

Initial subordinate	Declarative word order
Subordinate +	XP V (S) Sp V Sn V V CI

Note. CI = object clitic pronoun(s); S = any subject; Sn = nominal subject; Sp = subject pronoun; V = finite verb; XP = maximal projection; parentheses indicate optional element.

subordinate must be left-peripheral. In other cases, however, *pro* occurs in a main declarative devoid of object clitics, as in (38).

- (38) [E pur ço que mielz puisse pes garder el país], [voLT] aveir leis e us qui sunt
 and for it that better can peace keep in-the country wants to-have laws and customs that are
 el regne asis.
 in-the land imposed
 'And so he can better keep peace in the country, he wants to have laws and customs that are imposed in the land.'
 (Guernes de Pont-Sainte-Maxence, *Vie de Saint Thomas Becket*, v. 3289–3290; verse, ca. 1174)

Here, the subject of the verb *volt* 'wants' is null, and – unlike in (37) – no clitics are present to provide evidence about the saturation of SpecFocus. The position of the initial subordinate is ambiguous, as it could plausibly be either in SpecFocus or left-peripheral.⁸

3.3.3. Initial subordinate + verb + nominal subject

Whereas postverbal subject pronouns always occur immediately adjacent to the finite verb, the same does not hold true of postverbal nominal subjects, which can occur in multiple positions (Roberts, 1993:122). Although postverbal subject pronouns attest to verb movement to Focus⁰ and the saturation of SpecFocus, postverbal nominal subjects are a less reliable indicator. Specifically, when other VP material such as a (short) adverb, past participle, or nominal direct object is not available as a diagnostic (see Vance, 1997:67–92), the position of the postverbal nominal subject is not readily discernible and does not offer incontrovertible evidence of verb movement to Focus⁰. It follows that the position of the initial subordinate is ambiguous. This is the case in (39):

- (39) Car [se Franceis te veient entrepiez], [Diront] Normant en nom de reprovier...
 for if Frenchmen you see trampled will-say Normans in name of insult
 'For if the Frenchmen see you trampled, the Normans will say, as an insult...'
 (*Coronemenz Looïs*, v. 197–198; verse, ca. 1130)

In examples where no VP material is available from which to infer the position of the postverbal nominal subject, the position of the initial subordinate is considered ambiguous.

3.4. Summary of diagnostics

Tables 2–4 provide a summary of the diagnostics used to determine the syntactic position of initial subordinate clauses. Table 2 presents the word orders in which the initial subordinate unambiguously occupies SpecFocus.

⁸ Following Benincà (2006:77), Roberts (1993:96), Rouveret (2004:231), and others, I assume that SpecFocus is projected despite not being overtly saturated in V1 clauses.

Table 4
Ambiguous orders.

Subordinate +	ne (Cl) V V <i>pro</i> V (XP) Sn
---------------	--

Note. Cl = object clitic pronoun(s); *pro* = null subject; Sn = nominal subject; XP = maximal projection; parentheses indicate optional element.

Table 3 presents orders in which the initial subordinate occurs in a left-peripheral position, to the left of SpecFocus.

Table 4 completes the diagnostic criteria by presenting the ambiguous orders, in which the position of the initial subordinate cannot be determined with certainty.

4. Data

In this section, I discuss the choice of texts, the data collection, and how the analyses were conducted.

4.1. Texts

To examine the syntactic position of initial subordinates and the effect of the initial subordinate on the word order of the following main declarative, data was analyzed from early and later Old French texts. For early Old French, five major texts were chosen, spanning the period from about 980 to the end of the 12th century. These five texts are necessarily in verse, given the dearth of substantial prose texts prior to the early 13th century. The texts are the *Vie de Saint Léger* (ca. 980; 242 lines), the main text (excluding the prologue) of the *Vie de Saint Alexis* (ca. 1040; 625 lines), the epic *Chanson de Roland* (ca. 1100; 4002 lines), the *Coronemenz Looïs* (ca. 1130, 2733 lines), and the earliest of Chrétien de Troyes' romances, *Erec et Enide* (ca. 1165; 6950 lines). Each text was analyzed in its entirety. To represent the later Old French period, the four major prose texts of which Vance et al. (2010) analyzed extracts were given complete analyses. These texts are: Villehardouin's *La Conquête de Constantinople* (ca. 1208), the *Queste del saint Graal* (ca. 1225), the *Roman de Cassidorus* (ca. 1267), and Joinville's *Vie de Saint Louis* (ca. 1306). The nine texts provide an overview of the Old French period from the late 10th to the early 14th century.⁹

4.2. Procedure

Each text was analyzed in its entirety for sequences of initial subordinate + main declarative. To be considered initial, the subordinate appeared either in absolute initial position or was preceded only by a coordinating conjunction (e.g., *et* 'and,' *car* 'for'); I follow Becker (2005), Englebert (2000), and others in considering that coordinating conjunctions mark boundaries between clauses.¹⁰ Coordinating conjunctions are not considered to participate in V2 – that is, they do not count as filling a clausal projection for the purposes of satisfying V2 order (Vance, 1997; Vance et al., 2010:303n; but see a limited number of putative exceptions in Skårup, 1975:241–251). The presence of a constituent other than a coordinating conjunction entailed that the subordinate was not initial, and the sequence was not included. The initial subordinate in such cases acts as an interpolation (Grad, 1961:6–7; Skårup, 1975:420–424) or a parenthetical (see related discussion in Vance, 1997:194n), as in (40), where the subordinate intervenes between the NP subject and the verb:

- (40) Cligés, *quant Fenice cria*, l'oï molt bien et entendi.
Cligés when Fenice cried-out her-heard very well and heard
'Cligés, when Fenice cried out, heard her very well.'
Chrétien de Troyes, *Cligés*, lines 4062–4063, ca. 1176; in Skårup, 1975:422)

I follow Grad (1961) and Skårup (1975) in treating the subordinate here as an interpolation that temporarily suspends the overall structure of the main clause.

⁹ An anonymous reviewer notes that the early texts are verse, whereas the later ones are prose (by which time both are available). In Donaldson (2011), I examined prose and verse texts from the 13th century and found no grounds to attribute the syntactic variation observed to the choice of prose versus verse. The reviewer questions in particular whether factors such as word stress and line-initial (if not sentence-initial) position could influence the position of object clitics. I adopt Benincà's (1995, 2006) purely syntactic account of clitic placement; Labelle (2007:301) provides examples of clitics appearing line-initially or in ostensibly stressed positions, and similar examples are found in the present corpus.

¹⁰ *Et* can of course also coordinate NPs, VPs, etc.

Similarly, sequences of initial subordinate + *et* + main declarative, in which the main declarative is separated from the subordinate by the conjunction *et* 'and' are excluded (following Vance et al., 2010), as *et* may change the structural and semantic relationship between the initial subordinate and the declarative (see discussion in Combettes, 2010; Poletto, 2005).

The corpus yielded a total of 3157 initial subordinate + main declarative sequences. Each token was coded for a variety of linguistic features. The discussion will be limited to the five types of initial subordinates that occurred in sufficient numbers to allow for meaningful quantitative analyses, although the texts presented one or more occurrences of numerous other types of initial subordinates as well. The types retained are: *endementiers que* 'while,' *por ce que* 'because, so that,' *quant* 'when, since' (including *quandius* and *cum*), *se* 'if,' and *si tost come* 'as soon as.' Old French inherited relatively few subordinators directly from Latin: *quant* (and *cum* and *quandius*, found only in quite early texts) and *se* (see discussion in Grad, 1961). The remaining subordinators, constructed with *que*, are later creations (see, e.g., Grad, 1956) whose first attestations date throughout the Old French period (Greimas, 1979). The data reflect this fact, as some types of subordinates are not represented in all the texts in the corpus. In particular, the data from the earliest texts are limited to initial *quant* and *se* subordinates.

Each token was analyzed to determine the syntactic position of the initial subordinate and the word order of the following main declarative. The position of the subordinate was classified as SpecFocus, left-peripheral, or ambiguous, following the criteria discussed in Section 3. The analysis of word order generally followed the approach in Vance et al. (2010) by contrasting orders characteristic only of a V2 grammar with the SV ordering that characterizes the innovative grammar. Thus, main declaratives with an overt preverbal subject immediately followed by a finite verb (optionally with intervening object clitics or negative *ne*) were classified as SV.¹¹ Main declaratives with a postverbal subject pronoun, null subject (*pro*), or the resumptive adverb *si* (with or without overt postverbal subject) were classified as V2-compatible, as they could not be generated by a SV grammar of the Modern French type. Finally, two orders were considered ambiguous. The first involves postverbal nominal subjects not accompanied by resumptive *si*, given that Modern French occasionally licenses postverbal nominal subjects in main declaratives (although note that Vance et al., 2010, classified this order as "probably conservative," p. 307). The second involves preverbal nominal subjects separated from the verb by another XP, which presumably involves a left-dislocated subject without a resumptive pronoun or clitic.

5. Syntactic position of the initial subordinate: results and discussion

This section presents the results and discussion of the syntactic position of each of the five types of initial subordinate clause analyzed.

5.1. Results

The results for initial *se* clauses are given in Table 5. In this corpus, initial *se* clauses occur almost categorically in the left periphery (i.e., to the left of SpecFocus) at all stages of the Old French period. A single exception in which the *se* clause is unambiguously in SpecFocus occurs in *Queste*. Most of the ambiguous tokens involve the negative particle *ne* (see Section 3.3.1).

The data for initial *quant* clauses present nearly the same pattern, as shown in Table 6. Setting the ambiguous examples aside (again mostly involving *ne*), initial *quant* clauses are overwhelmingly hosted in a position in the left periphery of the following main declarative. The corpus does not contain a single exception, although occasional examples are attested in Old French (see Skårup, 1975:269; Donaldson, 2011).

Table 7 presents the data for initial subordinates headed by *endementiers que*. Unlike *se* and *quant*, *endementiers que* was not inherited directly from Latin and instead represents a creation within Old French; Greimas (1979) dates its first attestation to 1155, and in the present corpus, *endementiers que* does not appear prior to 1208. Once it appears, the number of occurrences is admittedly small but nevertheless provides a clear picture: initial *endementiers que* clauses occur in the left periphery rather than in SpecFocus.

Likewise, subordinates introduced by *si tost comme* (Table 8), also of Old French rather than Latin creation, do not occur in the present corpus prior to Villehardouin (1208) and do not occur initially until 1225 in *Queste*. In this text, however, there is variation; although most occurrences (82.2%) of initial *si tost comme* clauses are left-peripheral, a non-negligible quantity (11.3%) are situated in SpecFocus. The two later texts, however, do not show this variation, and all tokens of initial *si tost comme* clauses are left-peripheral.

¹¹ As Paul Hirschbühler (p.c., May 17, 2011) is correct to point out, linear SV does not directly verify the replacement of a V2 grammar, in which main clauses are CPs, with the modern SV grammar, in which main clauses are no longer CPs. As proportions of SV increase, however, proportions of necessarily V2 orders decline commensurately, suggesting the decline of the V2 grammar.

Table 5
Syntactic position of initial *se* clauses.

Text, date	Syntactic position of the subordinate											Total
	Left periphery				SpecFocus			Ambiguous				
	V cl	XP V	S V	Total	cl V	V Sp	Total	ne V	V <i>pro</i>	V Sn	Total	
Léger 980	0	1	2	3 100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Alexis 1040	0	9	2	11 91.7%	0	0	0	1	0	0	1 8.3%	12
Roland 1100	3	19	15	37 78.7%	0	0	0	9	1	0	10 21.3%	47
Loois 1130	0	25	23	48 84.2%	0	0	0	8	0	1	9 15.8%	57
Erec 1165	0	40	13	53 81.5%	0	0	0	11	1	0	12 18.5%	65
Villehardouin 1208	2	7	32	41 97.6%	0	0	0	1	0	0	1 2.3%	42
Queste 1225	0	23	128	151 99.3%	0	1	1 0.7%	0	0	0	0	152
Cassidorus 1267	0	117	166	283 95.6%	0	0	0	12	1	0	13 4.4%	296
Joinville 1306	0	10	108	118 100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

Note. cl = object clitic; *pro* = null (postverbal) subject; S = expressed subject; Sn = nominal subject; Sp = subject pronoun; XP = non-subject XP. The following orders may be accompanied by an optional preverbal object clitic or clitics: XP V, S V, V Sp, ne V; the presence of this clitic does not change the diagnostic properties of these orders.

Table 6
Syntactic position of initial *quant* clauses (*quant*, *quandius*, *cum*, etc.).

Text, date	Syntactic position of the subordinate											Total
	Left periphery				SpecFocus			Ambiguous				
	V cl	XP V	S V	Total	cl V	V Sp	Total	ne V	V <i>pro</i>	V Sn	Total	
Léger 980	3	6	2	11 84.6%	0	0	0	0	1	1	2 15.4%	13
Alexis 1040	0	10	3	13 86.7%	0	0	0	0	1	1	2 13.3%	15
Roland 1100	0	39	5	44 86.3%	0	0	0	5	1	1	7 13.7%	51
Loois 1130	0	19	15	34 87.2%	0	0	0	4	1	0	5 12.8%	39
Erec 1165	1	54	17	72 93.5%	0	0	0	5	0	0	5 6.5%	77
Villehardouin 1208	0	107	18	125 97.7%	0	0	0	1	2	0	3 2.3%	128
Queste 1225	0	559	62	621 99.8%	0	0	0	0	1	0	1 0.2%	622
Cassidorus 1267	0	607	266	873 98.8%	0	0	0	11	0	0	11 1.2%	884
Joinville 1306	0	33	265	300 99.7%	0	0	0	0	1	0	1 0.3%	301

Subordinates introduced by *por ce que* are present in the earliest texts but do not occur initially in the corpus until *Erec et Enide* (ca. 1165). Initial *por ce que* clauses (Table 9) differ from the previous types in that they reveal – albeit in one text only – a strong preference for SpecFocus. Thus, in *Queste*, 78% of the initial *por ce que* subordinates occupy SpecFocus. Nonetheless, in the same text, some occurrences of initial *por ce que* are unambiguously left-peripheral. In the corpus as a whole, *por ce que* clauses tend to be left-peripheral, although of the clause types analyzed, *por ce que* shows the greatest variation and is the most likely to appear in SpecFocus. Even in Joinville, the latest text, a notable number of *por ce que*

Table 7
Syntactic position of initial *endementiers que* clauses.

Text, date	Syntactic position of the subordinate											Total
	Left periphery				SpecFocus			Ambiguous				
	V cl	XP V	S V	Total	cl V	V Sp	Total	ne V	V <i>pro</i>	V Sn	Total	
Léger 980												No examples
Alexis 1040												No examples
Roland 1100												No examples
Looïs 1130												No examples
Erec 1165												No examples
Villehardouin 1208	0	1	5	6 100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Queste 1225	0	7	1	8 88.9%	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	9
Cassidorus 1267	0	1	1	2 100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Joinville 1306	0	1	14	15 100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

Table 8
Syntactic position of initial *si tost comme* clauses.

Text, date	Syntactic position of the subordinate											Total
	Left periphery				SpecFocus			Ambiguous				
	V cl	XP V	S V	Total	cl V	V Sp	Total	ne V	V <i>pro</i>	V Sn	Total	
Léger 980												No examples
Alexis 1040												No examples
Roland 1100												No examples
Looïs 1130												No examples
Erec 1165												No examples
Villehardouin 1208												No initial examples
Queste 1225	0	36	15	51 82.2%	3	4	7 11.3%	0	3	1	4 6.5%	62
Cassidorus 1267	0	2	1	3 100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Joinville 1306	0	0	27	27 100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

clauses are unambiguously in SpecFocus rather than the left periphery despite Joinville's strong preference to place other types of initial subordinates in the left periphery (Tables 5–8).

5.2. Discussion

Initial subordinates generally occupy a left-peripheral position (identified in more detail in Section 5.2.1) in Old French. Given the few examples in SpecFocus, I interpret the left periphery as the default position for initial subordinates, all throughout the Old French period. Nonetheless, variation is present both synchronically and diachronically, as *por ce que*

Table 9
Syntactic position of initial *por ce que* clauses.

Text, date	Syntactic position of the subordinate											Total
	Left periphery				SpecFocus			Ambiguous				
	V cl	XP V	S V	Total	cl V	V Sp	Total	ne V	V <i>pro</i>	V Sn	Total	
Léger 980	No initial examples											
Alexis 1040	No examples											
Roland 1100	No initial examples											
Looïs 1130	No initial examples											
Erec 1165	0	2	0	2 66.7%	0	0	0	0	1	0	1 33.3%	3
Villehardouin 1208	0	5	0	5 83.3%	1	0	1 16.7%	0	0	0	0	6
Queste 1225	0	2	2	4 12.5%	5	20	25 78.1%	1	0	2	3 9.4%	32
Cassidorus 1267	0	5	19	24 54.5%	1	16	17 38.6%	3	0	0	3 6.9%	44
Joinville 1306	0	1	15	16 61.5%	2	6	8 30.8%	0	1	1	2 7.7%	26

clauses show. In the 13th-century texts, *por ce que* shows a greater propensity than the other types to occur in SpecFocus. In *Queste* (ca. 1225), this tendency is especially strong, with 78.1% of the tokens unambiguously in SpecFocus. In the later texts, however, the behavior of *por ce que* clauses evolves, increasingly resembling that of the other clause types, with increasing proportions of left-peripheral tokens.

Although the syntactic position of initial subordinates is subject to variation in Old French, as the *por ce que* data and examples (3) through (12) show, this variation does not characterize the entire Old French period. Data from Skårup (1975) and Donaldson (2011) reveal an important generalization: no unambiguous SpecFocus examples are attested before the mid-12th century. Skårup's data reveal the following: For *se* clauses, the earliest SpecFocus attestation comes from the *Roman de Renart* (ca. 1171 at the earliest); the remaining examples are mostly clustered at the end of the 12th century and beginning of the 13th. For *quant* clauses, the earliest attested unambiguous SpecFocus examples date from the *Roman de Troie* (ca. 1160). The earliest SpecFocus *dementres que* (a variant of *endementiers que*) comes from Gautier d'Arras' *Ille et Galeron*, circa 1167. Robert de Clari (ca. 1205) contains the first attested SpecFocus *si tost come*. Finally, even initial *por ce que* upholds the observation: attested SpecFocus examples appear no earlier than about 1155 in Wace's *Roman de Brut*. As Donaldson (2011) demonstrated, most occurrences of initial subordinates in SpecFocus occur between about 1150 and 1220.

The timing of these occurrences corresponds remarkably well to a major grammatical change in Old French, in which the possibility for SpecFocus to be empty in main declaratives was lost. Whatever the causes of this change, its effects were profound in Old French grammar: V1 declaratives disappeared (Skårup, 1975; Rouveret, 2004; Simonenko and Hirschbühler, 2012), and the behavior of object clitics evolved in a variety of clause types and in coordinated clauses (Hirschbühler and Labelle, 2000; Labelle and Hirschbühler, 2005). The earliest attestations of initial subordinates in SpecFocus, in the mid-12th century, coincide with the emerging requirement to overtly saturate SpecFocus. In Donaldson (2011), I proposed that initial subordinates – whose default position is left-peripheral – are sometimes placed in SpecFocus as a syntactic strategy to satisfy the new requirement. Ultimately, however, this strategy is abandoned, and other means are preferred, including the adverb *si*, which in 13th-century Old French often acts simply as a syntactic placeholder, nearly devoid of semantic import (Adams, 1987; Ferraresi and Goldbach, 2002; Vance, 1997). Such a hypothesis plays well to the timing of occurrences of initial subordinates in SpecFocus. Prior to the mid-12th century, initial subordinates are predominantly left-peripheral. Most SpecFocus examples date from the late 12th and early 13th century, when the change was thought to be in progress (Hirschbühler and Labelle, 2000; Skårup, 1975; Rouveret, 2004). After the completion of the change around 1220, the proportions of SpecFocus examples decline visibly.

If this hypothesis is correct, then it challenges Grad's (1956, 1961) view that the syntactic position of initial subordinates reflected the etymology of the subordinator. Recall that Grad argued that initial subordinates of Latin descent were situated outside the clause itself, whereas those of Old French creation occurred in SpecFocus. The data in the present study cast doubt on this view. First, initial *endementiers que* and *si tost come*, both of Old French creation, occur

overwhelmingly in the left periphery. Second, although *por ce que* occurs most frequently in SpecFocus in *Queste* (but not in the other texts), it is nonetheless subject to variation, with a non-negligible quantity of left-peripheral tokens. Data from other non-Latinate initial subordinate types in Donaldson (2011) further substantiate these claims.

5.2.1. Position of initial subordinates in the left periphery

The data from initial subordinates headed by *se*, *quant*, *endementiers que*, *si tost comme*, and *por ce que* show that initial subordinates typically occur in the left periphery. In this section, I consider in greater detail what this left-peripheral position could be, using Benincà's (2006) model of the Medieval Romance left periphery, repeated in (41). Recall that the first position of the main clause per se is SpecFocus; the second position is Focus⁰. Force, Frame, and Topic regroup series of projections, all situated to the left of the clause as traditionally defined.

(41) [Force] [Frame] [Topic] [Focus] [Fin]

On the basis of the available data, I hypothesize that, when initial subordinates are not hosted in SpecFocus, they occur in a FrameP position, to the left of the Topic positions (which may or may not be filled). The crucial observation is that XPs commonly thought to occupy Topic positions intervene between the initial subordinate and the core of the main clause formed by the XP in SpecFocus (when present) and the finite verb in Focus⁰. As a first step, it follows that if SpecTopic is filled, and the initial subordinate precedes the XP situated in SpecTopic, then the initial subordinate occupies a projection to the left of SpecTopic.

Consider first cases in which the grammatical subject of the main clause occurs not in SpecTopic, immediately before the verb, but further to the left. Examples like (42), in which the subject is followed by the resumptive adverb *si* 'thus' are not infrequent in Old French or in other Medieval Romance varieties.

(42) [_{SpecTop} *l'cil Alexis*] [_{SpecFocus} *si*] [_{Focus} *PRIST*] *son frere l'empereor.*
 this Alexis thus took his brother the-emperor
 'Alexis took his brother the emperor.'
 (Villehardouin, *Conquête de Constantinople*, §15; prose, ca. 1208)

There is widespread consensus that the adverb *si* in contexts like (42) occupies SpecFocus (or the terminologically equivalent position; Benincà, 1995, 2006; Fleischman, 1991; Grad, 1961; Rouveret, 2004; Skårup, 1975; Vance, 1997) and that subjects followed by *si* are left-dislocated (Benincà, 1995, 2006; Buridant, 2000; Fleischman, 1991; Härmä, 1990; Vance, 1997). This interpretation is entirely compatible with the observation that *si* functions as a type of (functional) link between the main clause and the material that precedes it (e.g., Buridant, 2000; Fleischman, 1991; Ledgeway, 2008; Poletto, 2005). Benincà (1995, 2006) follows standard procedure (e.g., Frascarelli, 2007; Rizzi, 1997) by placing Romance left dislocations in a Topic projection, as do Ferraresi and Goldbach (2002), Labelle (2007), Mathieu (forthcoming) and others specifically for Old French. These theoretical assumptions are reflected in the structure proposed for (42) above, in which the nominal subject *l'cil Alexis* 'this Alexis' is treated as a left dislocation in a SpecTopic position.

When left-dislocated subjects co-occur with an initial subordinate, the initial subordinate precedes the left dislocation, as in (43); the proposed underlying structure reflects the hypothesis that the initial subordinate occurs in a SpecFrame position.

(43) [_{SpecFrame} *Quant elles orent assez chanté*], [_{SpecTopic} *l'une*] [_{SpecFocus} *si*] [_{Focus} *S'EST*] *partie de la quarole.*
 when they had enough sung the.one thus herself.is left from the dance
 'When they had sung a great deal, one of them left the dance.'
 (*Roman de Cassidorus*, §116; prose, ca. 1267)

I adopt the same analysis for examples such as (44) and (45), in which a subject NP appears to the left of SpecFocus but a XP other than the adverb *si* occurs in SpecFocus. In (44), SpecFocus contains a spatial adverbial, and in (45), a direct object. I analyze the subject in both examples as left-dislocated.

(44) [_{SpecFrame} *Quant cil a Rome sont ensi repairié*], [_{SpecTopic} *li cuens Guillelmes*] [_{SpecFocus} *sor un perron*]
 when those to Rome are thus left-again the count Guillaume on a rock
 [_{Focus} *S'ASSIET*].
 himself.sat
 'When they returned to Rome, the count Guillaume sat down on a rock.'
 (*Coronemenz Loois*, v. 1352–1353; verse, ca. 1130)

- (45) [SpecFrame Quant ses plaies orent lavees, ressuiees et rebandeas], [SpecTopic li rois] [SpecFocus lui et
when his wounds had cleaned wiped and dressed the king him and
Enide] [Focus an MAINNE] an la soe tante demainne.
Enide from-there led to the his tent his-own
'When they had cleaned, wiped, and dressed his wounds, the king led him, with Enide, into his tent.'
(Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec et Enide*, v. 4225–4232; verse, ca. 1165)

In addition to subjects, objects may be left-dislocated in Old French, as is the case with *ta lasse medre* 'your weary mother' in (46) and *de reençon* 'ransom' in (47). In both cases, a resumptive object clitic pronoun located inside the core of the clause is co-indexed with the left-dislocated object: *la* 'her' in (46) and the partitive *en* 'some' in (47).

- (46) [SpecFrame Sed a mei sole vels une feiz parlasses], [SpecTopic ta lasse medre], [SpecFocus si]
if to me only at-least une time had-spoken your weary mother thus
[Focus la RECONFORTASSES,] ki si'st dolente.
her would-have-comforted who so.is sad
'If you had only once talked to me, your weary mother, you would have comforted her, (she) who is so sad.'
(*Vie de Saint Alexis*, v. 448; verse, ca. 1040)
- (47) [SpecFrame Se gel puis prendre, par Deu le fill Marie], [SpecTopic de reençon] [SpecFocus ge] [Focus n'en
if I.it can take by God the son Mary of ransom I not.of-it
VUEIL] avoir mi.
want to-have none
'If I can take it, by God the son of Mary, ransom, I want to have none of it.'
(*Coronemenz Loois*, v. 171–172; verse, ca. 1130)

In Benincà's (2006) analysis, a left-dislocated object with a clause-internal resumptive pronoun, as in (46) and (47), is generated directly in SpecTopic.

Other XPs can occur between the initial subordinate and SpecFocus; in (48), I situate the adverbial *par bel amour* 'by friendship' in SpecTopic.

- (48) [SpecFrame Cum il entrerent en la cambre voltice], [SpecTopic par bel amour] [SpecFocus malvais
when they entered in the room vaulted by beautiful friendship bad
saluz] [Focus li FIRENT].
salutations to-him made
'When they entered into the vaulted room, they feigned a welcome toward him, pretending to be friends.'
(*Chanson de Roland*, v. 2709–2710; verse, ca. 1100)

I take the examples in (43) through (48) as evidence that initial subordinates occur in a position to the left of the SpecTopic projection that accommodates left dislocations, and there are reasons to situate this position in the FrameP field. In Benincà's (2006:61) model, the expanded Frame and Topic fields of the left periphery include at least the projections listed in (49), ordered as follows:

- (49) {Force...} {Frame [SceneSetting] [HangingTopic]} {Topic [Left dislocation] [List-int.]} {Focus...}

It is problematic to determine precisely how far to the left in the CP-domain initial subordinates occur, and, for example, whether they occur in a SpecTopic position to the left of left dislocations or, as I argue, in Frame. Further evidence comes from *quant* clauses in particular. Fleischman (1990) considers *quant* clauses in Old French to be akin to a temporal adverbial, Ménard (1988) categorizes *quant* clauses as (temporal) circumstantial phrases, and Buridant (2000) considers *quant* clauses followed by main clauses to constitute a temporal-main sequence. Similarly, Labelle and Hirschbühler (2005), working in a generative framework, consider initial *quant* clauses as adverbials. If the reasoning of these diverse scholars is correct, then it is reasonable to situate initial *quant* clauses, as temporal circumstantial phrases, in the SceneSetting projection of Frame, as Benincà (2006:56, 76) and Benincà and Poletto (2004:66) do for other temporal adverbials; more generally, Skårup (1975:399) offers independent confirmation that adverbials (temporal and other) can occur in the left periphery.

Evidence from left dislocations shows empirically that initial subordinates occur further left than the [Left dislocation] projection in TopicP, and an analysis of initial subordinates as circumstantials or adverbials suggests the SceneScetting position in Frame. Benincà (2006) follows Rizzi (1997) in placing ForceP at the left extremity of the left periphery (see 49); as Rizzi notes, ForceP is the upper terminus of the CP system (1997:288).¹² In this model, initial subordinates occur to the right of ForceP, which is reserved for complementizers and other overt or null elements that provide information about clause type (Rizzi, 1997). The initial subordinate does not determine the illocutionary force of the following clause: Although declaratives are most frequent after an initial subordinate, interrogatives are also possible, as in (50) and (51):

(50) Dame, fet il, puis que vos le savez si bien, a que fere le vos deisse je?
 Lady said he since that you it know so well to what to-do it to-you must I
 'Lady, he said, since you know it so well, what purpose would it have served for me to tell you?'
 (*Queste del saint Graal*, p. 20; prose, ca. 1225)

(51) Se je demeure, demourrez-vous?
 If I stay will-stay you
 'If I stay, will you stay?'
 (Joinville, *Vie de Saint Louis*, §433; prose, ca. 1308)

Similarly, an initial subordinate can introduce an imperative, as in (52):

(52) Ha! Seignor, por Dieu, fet ele, se vos poez si vos en retornez!
 ha Lord by God said she if you can thus yourself from-here return
 'Ha! Lord, by God, she said, if you can, return there!'
 (*Queste del saint Graal*, p. 230; prose, ca. 1225)

The fact that an initial subordinate can occur with declaratives, interrogatives, and imperatives, suggests that it has no role in determining the illocutionary force of the following declarative; it follows that initial subordinates are not situated in Force.

6. Syntax of the main declarative: results and discussion

This section presents the results and discussion of the word order in the main declarative introduced by the initial subordinate.

6.1. Results

In each table, orders compatible only with a V2 grammar (and not with the emerging SV grammar) are given under the column entitled *necessarily V2*; SV orders include both nominal and pronominal preverbal subjects. Table 10 presents the data for initial *se* clauses. With the exception of the earliest text, *St. Léger*, which presents only three tokens of initial *se* clauses, SV does not become the dominant order in the main declarative until Villehardouin, the first prose text in the corpus. From the beginning of the 13th century, SV is the dominant order after initial *se* clauses.

A distinctly different situation obtains in main declaratives introduced by an initial *quant* clause, shown in Table 11. In this context, the word order of the main declarative remains predominantly V2-compatible until the early 14th-century (Joinville), as Vance et al. (2010) have already pointed out. Across nearly four centuries, the proportions of V2 to SV orders remain relatively stable. Some evolution is evident in the V2 grammar, however, as the proportion of *V pro* orders decreases markedly, and the *si V* strategy gains importance. With respect to the rise of SV, it is interesting to remark that, rather than showing a gradual progression from V2 to SV, SV gains currency rather sharply in the last part of the 13th century. Unfortunately, the sequencing of texts in the present corpus, from *Queste* (1225) to

¹² Labelle (2007, p. 308) and Mathieu (forthcoming) follow Poletto's (2005) analysis of Rhaetoromance by placing Force between FrameP and TopicP, thus departing from Benincà (2006), Rizzi (1997), Rouveret (2004), and others. Mathieu (forthcoming) posits a representation of the left periphery for Old French as in (i).

(i) {Frame [HangingTopic] [SceneScetting]}{Force...} {Theme [Left dislocation] [List-int.]}{Focus...}

Table 10
Syntax of main declaratives introduced by initial *se* clause.

Text, date	Syntax of the declarative						Total
	Necessarily V2				SV	Unclear	
	V Sp	V <i>pro</i>	si V (S)	XP V Sp/ <i>pro</i>	S V	(XP) V Sn, Sn XP V	
Léger 980	0	0	0	1 33.3%	2 66.7%	0	3
Alexis 1040	0	1 8.3%	4 33.3%	4 33.3%	3 25.0%	0	12
Roland 1100	0	13 27.7%	0	17 36.3%	15 31.9%	2 4.3%	47
Loois 1130	0	7 12.3%	1 1.8%	19 33.3%	23 40.4%	7 12.3%	57
Erec 1165	3 4.6%	9 13.8%	1 1.5%	37 56.9%	13 20.0%	2 3.1%	65
Villehardouin 1208	0	3 7.1%	1 2.4%	3 7.1%	32 76.1%	3 7.1%	42
Queste 1225	1 0.7%	0	3 1.9%	13 8.6%	133 87.5%	2 1.3%	152
Cassidorus 1267	5 1.7%	5 1.7%	25 8.5%	81 27.4%	164 55.4%	16 5.4%	296
Joinville 1306	0	0	3 2.6%	7 5.9%	108 91.5%	0	118

Note. *pro* = null (postverbal) subject; S = expressed subject (Sn or Sp); Sp = subject pronoun; Sn = nominal subject; V = finite verb; XP = non-subject XP; optional presence of *ne* and/or object clitics not noted here. Percentages may not sum to 100.0 because of rounding error.

Table 11
Syntax of main declaratives introduced by initial *quant* clause.

Text, date	Syntax of the declarative						Total
	Necessarily V2				SV	Unclear	
	V Sp	V <i>pro</i>	si V (S)	XP V Sp/ <i>pro</i>	S V	(XP) V Sn, Sn XP V	
Léger 980	0	4 30.8%	0	4 30.8%	2 15.4%	3 23.7%	13
Alexis 1040	0	1 6.7%	1 6.7%	7 43.8%	3 20.0%	3 20.0%	15
Roland 1100	0	5 9.8%	7 13.7%	28 54.9%	5 9.8%	6 11.8%	51
Loois 1130	0	5 12.8%	7 17.9%	11 28.2%	14 35.9%	2 5.1%	39
Erec 1165	0	6 7.8%	14 18.2%	40 51.9%	17 22.1%	0	77
Villehardouin 1208	1 0.8%	2 1.6%	103 80.5%	2 1.6%	18 14.1%	2 1.6%	128
Queste 1225	0	1 0.2%	556 89.4%	3 0.5%	62 10.0%	0	622
Cassidorus 1267	0	8 0.9%	400 45.2%	165 18.7%	268 30.3%	43 4.9%	884
Joinville 1306	0	1 0.3%	31 10.3%	3 1.0%	266 88.4%	0	301

Note. *pro* = null (postverbal) subject; S = expressed subject (Sn or Sp); Sp = subject pronoun; Sn = nominal subject; V = finite verb; XP = non-subject XP; optional presence of *ne* and/or object clitics not noted here. Percentages may not sum to 100.0 because of rounding error.

Cassidorus (1267) and finally Joinville (1306), does not offer as fine-grained a view of this particular evolution as would be desired.

In the case of initial *endementiers que* clauses (Table 12), the low number of tokens precludes strong conclusions. What is clear, however, is that by the time of Joinville (early 14th century), *endementiers que* clauses strongly facilitate a SV order in the following main clause, just as *se*- and *quant* clauses do in the same text.

Table 12
Syntax of main declaratives introduced by initial *endementiers que* clause.

Text, date	Syntax of the declarative						Total
	Necessarily V2				SV	Unclear	
	V Sp	V <i>pro</i>	si V (S)	XP V Sp/ <i>pro</i>	S V	(XP) V Sn, Sn XP V	
Léger 980				No examples			
Alexis 1040				No examples			
Roland 1100				No examples			
Looïs 1130				No examples			
Erec 1165				No examples			
Villehardouin 1208	0	0	1 16.7%	0	5 83.3%	0	6
Queste 1225	0	1 11.1%	7 77.8%	0	1 11.1%	0	9
Cassidorus 1267	0	0	0	1 50.0%	1 50.0%	0	2
Joinville 1306	0	0	0	0	14 93.3%	1 6.7%	15

Note. *pro* = null (postverbal) subject; S = expressed subject (Sn or Sp); Sp = subject pronoun; Sn = nominal subject; V = finite verb; XP = non-subject XP; optional presence of *ne* and/or object clitics not noted here. Percentages may not sum to 100.0 because of rounding error.

Table 13
Syntax of main declaratives introduced by initial *si tost comme* clause.

Text, date	Syntax of the declarative						Total
	Necessarily V2				SV	Unclear	
	V Sp	V <i>pro</i>	si V (S)	XP V Sp/ <i>pro</i>	S V	(XP) V Sn, Sn XP V	
Léger 980				No examples			
Alexis 1040				No examples			
Roland 1100				No examples			
Looïs 1130				No examples			
Erec 1165				No examples			
Villehardouin 1208				No initial examples			
Queste 1225	4 6.5%	5 8.1%	34 54.8%	1 1.6%	15 24.2%	3 4.8%	62
Cassidorus 1267	0	0	2 66.7%	0	1 33.3%	0	3
Joinville 1306	0	0	0	0	27 100.0%	0	27

Note. *pro* = null (postverbal) subject; S = expressed subject (Sn or Sp); Sp = subject pronoun; Sn = nominal subject; V = finite verb; XP = non-subject XP; optional presence of *ne* and/or object clitics not noted here. Percentages may not sum to 100.0 because of rounding error.

In the present corpus, the data for initial *si tost comme* clauses are limited to the last three texts, as seen in Table 13. The pattern resembles that of *endementiers que* clauses, in that a strong preference (categorical, in this case) for SV order in the following main clause emerges only in the last text (Joinville, ca. 1306). Both *Queste* and *Cassidorus* present variation between V2-compatible and SV orders.

The interpretation of *por ce que* clauses (Table 14) is similarly limited by small token counts. It is nonetheless possible to verify Vance et al.'s (2010) observation that initial *por ce que* clauses occasion conservative behavior in the following

Table 14
Syntax of main declaratives introduced by initial *por ce que* clauses.

Text, date	Syntax of the declarative						Total
	Necessarily V2				SV	Unclear	
	V Sp	V <i>pro</i>	si V (S)	XP V Sp/ <i>pro</i>	S V	(XP) V Sn, Sn XP V	
Léger 980				No initial examples			
Alexis 1040				No examples			
Roland 1100				No initial examples			
Looïs 1130				No initial examples			
Erec 1165	0	1 33.3%	0	2 66.7%	0	0	3
Villehardouin 1208	0	1 16.7%	5 83.3%	0	0	0	6
Queste 1225	22 68.8%	3 9.4%	2 6.3%	0	2 6.3%	3 9.4%	32
Cassidorus 1267	17 38.6%	1 2.3%	3 6.8%	2 4.5%	19 43.2%	2 4.5%	44
Joinville 1306	6 23.1%	3 11.5%	1 3.8%	0	15 57.7%	1 3.8%	26

Note. *pro* = null (postverbal) subject; S = expressed subject (Sn or Sp); Sp = subject pronoun; Sn = nominal subject; V = finite verb; XP = non-subject XP; optional presence of *ne* and/or object clitics not noted here. Percentages may not sum to 100.0 because of rounding error.

main clause. Although main declaratives after *por ce que* clauses demonstrate an evolution toward the SV order, the change begins later than with other initial subordinates and remains incomplete at the end of the period examined. The V2 grammar remains more robustly represented in main clauses preceded by *por ce que* clauses than in those preceded by other initial subordinate types. One reason is that *por ce que* clauses are more likely than the other clause types studied to occur in SpecFocus, which by definition precludes the possibility of main clause SV (in a V2 structure); witness the rates of V Sp and V *pro* (see Table 2), which indicate that the initial subordinate saturates SpecFocus.

6.2. Discussion

The sequence of initial subordinate + main declarative was identified by Vance et al. (2010:318) as the first context in which the evolution toward SV became apparent in Old French. In their view, the distinct moments at which the change affects different types of initial subordinates illustrate the advances of the change in progress, with initial *se* clauses leading the way. The data from the present study in Tables 10–14 corroborate these claims. The case of initial *se* clauses is striking, and further analysis shows that SV prevailed earlier in main declaratives preceded by an initial *se* clause than in main declaratives more generally. An informal investigation of Villehardouin (ca. 1208) illustrates this point: In the first 200 main declaratives that are not introduced by an initial subordinate, the rate of SV is only 32%. By contrast, after an initial *se* clause, the rate of SV jumps to 76.1% (Table 10). For *Queste* (ca. 1225), data about main declarative word orders are available from both Marchello-Nizia (1995:82) and Vance (1997:38). Vance reports an overall SVO rate of 46%. Marchello-Nizia reports a rate of 36% in a different extract. Both rates are noticeably lower than the rate of 87.5% found in main declaratives that follow an initial *se* clause (Table 10).

The high rates of SV after initial *se* clauses in Villehardouin and *Queste* are particularly striking when compared to rates of non-SV orders. Initial *quant* clauses (the most frequent type) provide a useful comparison, especially as Becker (2005) used them to argue against the V2 status of Old French, citing the high frequency of V \geq 3 orders involving initial *quant* clauses. In Table 6, I showed that *quant* clauses occur overwhelmingly in the left periphery of the main clause, outside the domain in which V2 phenomena (i.e., verb raising to Focus⁰) occur. As a left-peripheral element, initial *quant* clauses are syntactically optional and not required for the sake of the main clause; the syntactic well-formedness of the main clause is entirely independent of the presence or absence of an initial *quant* clause.¹³ What, then, of the grammar of the main clause

¹³ I set aside the rare examples in which the *quant* clause occurs in SpecFocus (see Skårup, 1975, for attestations).

per se? In Villehardouin (ca. 1208), after initial *quant* clauses, at least 84.4% of the main declaratives present a word order that is characteristically and necessarily V2 (Table 11).¹⁴ In *Queste* (ca. 1225), the figure is 90.0%. In the second half of the 13th century and the early 14th century, however, the rates of necessarily V2 orders after initial *quant* clauses decline, to 64.8% in *Cassidorus* (ca. 1267) and 11.6% in Joinville (ca. 1306). The decline of strictly V2-compatible orders is compatible with a diachronic change in which V2 is lost in Old French, as Vance et al. (2010) argue.

Over time, main declaratives were preceded by initial subordinates with increasing frequency, as shown by a series of rough estimates.¹⁵ The first 100 verses of the *Chanson de Roland* (verse, ca. 1100) contain 71 main declaratives, by my count. Extrapolating across the total 4002 verses, *Roland* contains something like 2841 main declaratives. Of these, 71 (about 3.5%) are preceded by an initial subordinate. A similar procedure reveals that about 4.8% of the estimated 3128 main declaratives in *Erec et Enide* (verse, ca. 1165) are preceded by an initial subordinate. The percentages for prose are higher: In Villehardouin (prose, ca. 1208), about 11.8% of the estimated 1740 main declaratives are preceded by an initial subordinate. In Joinville (prose, ca. 1306), approximately 14.9% of the estimated 3259 main declaratives are preceded by an initial subordinate. Several factors could underlie this apparent evolution. First, the inventory of available subordinate clause types increased significantly over time. In *Roland* (ca. 1100), for example, only *quant* and *se* are available, whereas at least 19 distinct types occur in the lengthy *Roman de Cassidorus* (prose, ca. 1267). Second, it is often remarked (e.g., Fleischman, 1990:179) that the use of hypotaxis increased at the expense of parataxis as Old French evolved. Finally, inter-author variation and stylistic differences between prose and verse probably play a role. In any case, initial subordinates were common by the 13th century, occurring with more than 1 in 10 main declaratives in the prose data.

7. Conclusion

This study presents a corpus-based investigation of two axes of variation related to sequences of initial subordinate + main declarative in Old French. Although inspired by Vance et al. (2010), the present study expands the scope of inquiry by examining the syntactic position of initial subordinates in addition to the word order of the main declarative; the data set is also larger, including texts from early and later Old French, all analyzed in their entirety.

The data show that most initial subordinates are located in the left periphery of the main clause, and I suggest the SceneSetting projection (in Frame) as a likely position. An approach that appeals to a complex left periphery is in line with analyses of other Medieval Romance languages, including Vance et al. (2010) for Old Occitan and Benincà (1995) for varieties of Old Italian. Old French exploited the left periphery as well, as studies by Labelle (2007), Labelle and Hirschbühler (2005), Mathieu (forthcoming), and Rouveret (2004) suggest. The present study demonstrates the availability of positions in the left periphery from the earliest stages of Old French. Such results are not surprising if the structure of the CP-domain is a linguistic universal, as Rizzi (1997) and Benincà (2006), among others, have argued. As a consequence, the findings invite a revision of claims that echo Roberts (1993, cited in Poletto, 2005:212), to the effect that $V \geq 3$ orders are only attested late in the development of Old French. Although $V \geq 3$ orders increase in frequency once SpecFocus must obligatorily be saturated, they are possible at all stages in Old French, as the data from initial subordinates make clear.

For analyses that postulate a richly articulated CP-domain, the presence of surface $V \geq 3$ orders does not cast into doubt the analysis of Old French as a V2 language. In theory-neutral terms, the relevant observation is that the left-peripheral material precedes the core of the main clause as traditionally defined. The syntactic behavior of the main clause proper, where verb movement occurs, is identical to that of a V2 clause that lacks a left periphery, or – more likely in my view – whose left periphery is projected but empty, and thus indiscernible.

A key observation, as Vance et al. (2010) also note, lies in the word order of the main declarative. First, proportions of SV rise over the 13th century in main declaratives preceded by an initial subordinate, which suggests a grammatical change in progress. Before SV becomes the dominant order, the other orders found in the core of the main clause are strongly characteristic of a V2 grammar. As the data from early Old French show, the word order of the main declarative remains strongly V2 until well into the 13th century, when a single order – SV – begins to prevail. The presence of an initial subordinate and the $V \geq 3$ order that often results is compatible with a V2 analysis of Old French, and with the gradual loss of V2, which is independently well documented (Adams, 1987, 1989; Roberts, 1993; Vance, 1997; Vanelli et al., 1985).

In the present corpus, relatively few initial subordinates occur in SpecFocus, and I propose that the few instances in SpecFocus are closely related to an independent syntactic change in Old French, in which the saturation of SpecFocus

¹⁴ This figure is conservative. SV orders are also compatible with a V2 grammar but are not necessarily V2. I follow Vance et al. (2010) in characterizing SV as innovative.

¹⁵ An anonymous reviewer inquired about the overall frequency of the initial subordinates in the corpus, and how much influence they could have had in the loss of V2. The same reviewer inquired about the role of other adverbials in the loss of V2, a question that I am unable to address within the scope of this paper.

became obligatory. This hypothesis is explored in detail in Donaldson (2011), which closely examines the dates when initial subordinates are attested in SpecFocus in a corpus of texts that target the period from 1130 to 1220. Other inquiries for future work include an analysis of possible pragmatic or semantic distinctions between left-peripheral and SpecFocus variants of the same initial subordinate type, in those texts where such variation exists, and the behavior of initial subordinates during the transition from Old French to Middle French.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Barbara Vance for a great amount of discussion and ideas during the research for Vance et al. (2010). Both Paul Hirschbühler and the audience at *Le français en diachronie-V* (Lyon, October 2010) provided insightful comments and discussion on an earlier version of this work. Finally, I am particularly grateful to the anonymous *Lingua* reviewers; the value of their detailed comments and suggestions cannot be overstated. All remaining errors and shortcomings are mine alone.

References

Primary sources

- Anonymous [ca. 980], Koschwitz, E. (Ed.), *La vie de Saint Léger* (Les plus anciens monuments de la langue française) (6th ed.). Max Hueber Verlag, Munich, 1964 [Léger].
- Anonymous [ca. 1040], Jensen, F., *La vie de Saint Alexis* (The language of the eleventh-century “Vie de Saint Alexis:” a philological commentary). Molière & Co., Newark, DE, 2003 [Alexis].
- Anonymous [ca. 1100], Segre, S., Ricciardi, R. (Eds.), *Chanson de Roland* (La chanson de Roland), Milan, 1971 [Roland].
- Anonymous [ca. 1130], Langlois, E. (Ed.), *Li coronementz Looïs* (Le couronnement de Louis), chanson de geste du XIIe siècle. Honoré Champion, Paris, 1968 [Looïs].
- Anonymous [ca. 1150], Petit, A. (Ed.), *Roman de Thèbes* (Le roman de Thèbes). Honoré Champion, Paris, 2008.
- Anonymous [ca. 1225], Pauphilet, A. (Ed.), *La queste del saint graal* (La queste del saint graal), roman du XIII siècle. Honoré Champion, Paris, 1923 [Queste].
- Anonymous [ca. 1250], Woledge, B. (Ed.), *L'âtre périlleux* (L'âtre périlleux). Honoré Champion, Paris, 1936.
- Anonymous [ca. 1267], Palermo, J. (Ed.), *Le roman de Cassidorus* (Le roman de Cassidorus). Société des anciens textes français, Paris, 1963 [Cassidorus].
- Chrétien de Troyes [ca. 1165], Zink, M. (Ed.), *Erec et Enide* (Erec et Enide). Librairie Générale Française, Paris, 1994 [Erec].
- Geoffroi de Villehardouin [ca. 1208], de Wailly, N. (Ed.), *Conquête de Constantinople* (La conquête de Constantinople). Firmin Didot, Paris, 1874 [Villehardouin].
- Jehan de Joinville [1306], Corbett, N. (Ed.), *La vie de Saint Louis* (La vie de Saint Louis by Jehan de Joinville). Editions Naaman, Sherbrooke, 1977 [Joinville].
- Marie de France [ca. 1185], Harf-Lancner, L., Warnke, K. (Eds.), *Lais* (Lais). Librairie Générale Française, Paris, 1990.

Secondary sources

- Adams, M., 1987. From Old French to the theory of pro-drop. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5, 1–32.
- Adams, M., 1989. Verb second effects in Medieval French. In: Kirschner, C., Decesaris, J. (Eds.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 1–31.
- Becker, M.G., 2005. Le Corpus d'Amsterdam face à une vieille question: L'ancien français est-il une langue V2? In: Pusch, C.D., Kabatek, J., Raible, W. (Eds.), *Romance Corpus Linguistics II: Corpora and Diachronic Linguistics*. Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, pp. 345–358.
- Benincà, P., 1995. Complement clitics in medieval Romance: the Tobler-Mussafia law. In: Battye, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 325–344.
- Benincà, P., 2004. The left periphery of medieval Romance. *Studi Linguistici e Filologici Online* 2, 243–297.
- Benincà, P., 2006. A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance. In: Zanuttini, R., Campos, H., Herburger, E., Portner, P. (Eds.), *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics: Negation, Tense, and Clausal Architecture*. Georgetown University Press, Washington, DC, pp. 53–86.
- Benincà, P., Poletto, C., 2004. Topic, focus, and V2: defining the CP sublayers. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), *The Structure of IP and CP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 52–75.
- Blasco, M., 1997. Pour une approche syntaxique des dislocations. *Journal of French Language Studies* 7, 1–21.
- Buridant, C., 2000. *Grammaire Nouvelle de l'Ancien Français*. Sedes, Paris.
- Combettes, B., 2003. Aspects diachroniques des constructions à détachement. *Cahiers de Praxématique* 40, 71–96.
- Combettes, B., 2010. Aspects diachroniques de la parataxe: Les propositions temporelles en position initiale en ancien français. In: Béguelin, M.-J., Avanzi, M., Corminbœuf, G. (Eds.), *La Parataxe: Entre Dépendance et Intégration* (Tome 1). Peter Lang, Bern, pp. 115–137.
- den Besten, H., 1983. On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In: Abraham, W. (Ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 47–131.
- Diderichsen, P., 1957. *Elementær Dansk Grammatik*. Gyldendal, Copenhagen.

- Donaldson, B., 2011. Etude de variation syntaxique en ancien français: le comportement variable de quelques subordonnées initiales. In: Paper given at the first meeting of the Société Internationale de Diachronie du Français. University of Nancy, France.
- Englebert, A., 2000. Si, car, que, et, or... signes de ponctuation de l'ancien français. In: Englebert, A., Pierrard, M., Rosier, L., Van Raemdonck, D. (Eds.), Actes du XXI^e Congrès International de Linguistique et de Philologie Romanes. Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, pp. 175–184.
- Ferraresi, G., Goldbach, M., 2002. V2 syntax and topicalisation in Old French. *Linguistische Berichte* 189, 3–25.
- Fleischman, S., 1990. Tense and Narrativity: From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction. University of Texas Press, Austin, TX.
- Fleischman, S., 1991. Discourse pragmatics and the grammar of Old French: a functional reinterpretation of "si" and the personal pronouns. *Romance Philology* 44, 251–283.
- Foulet, L., 1928. *Petite Syntaxe de l'Ancien Français*. Honoré Champion, Paris.
- Frascarelli, M., 2007. Subjects, topics, and the interpretation of referential pro: an interface approach to the linking of null pronouns. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25, 691–734.
- Grad, A., 1956. L'inversion du sujet dans la principale précédée d'une subordonnée en ancien français. *Razprave SAZU* 2, 65–90.
- Grad, A., 1961. Remarques sur l'emploi de l'adverbe de reprise si en ancien français. *Linguistica* 4, 5–20.
- Greimas, A.J., 1979. *Dictionnaire de l'Ancien Français*. Larousse, Paris.
- Härmä, J., 1990. Les constructions disloquées en ancien français: Problèmes de définition et de délimitation. In: Kleiber, G., Tyvaert, J.E. (Eds.), *L'Anaphore et Ses Domaines*. Université de Metz Press, Metz, pp. 159–182.
- Hirschbühler, P., Labelle, M., 2000. Evolving Tobler-Mussafia effects in the placement of French clitics. In: Dworkin, S.N., Wanner, D. (Eds.), *New Approaches to Old Problems: Issues in Romance Historical Linguistics*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 165–182.
- Kaiser, G., 2002. *Verbstellung und Verbstellungswandel in den romanischen Sprachen*. Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen.
- Kroch, A., 1989. Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change. *Language Variation and Change* 1, 199–244.
- Labelle, M., 2007. Clausal architecture in Early Old French. *Lingua* 117, 289–316.
- Labelle, M., Hirschbühler, P., 2005. Changes in clausal organization and the position of clitics in Old French. In: Batllori, M., Hernanz, M.-L., Picallo, C., Roca, F. (Eds.), *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 60–71.
- Ledgeway, A., 2008. Satisfying V2 in early Romance: merge vs. move. *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 437–470.
- Lemieux, M., Dupuis, F., 1995. The locus of verb movement in non-asymmetric verb-second languages: the case of Middle French. In: Battye, A., Roberts, I. (Eds.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 80–109.
- Marchello-Nizia, C., 1995. *L'Evolution du Français: Ordre des Mots, Démonstratifs, Accent Tonique*. Armand Colin, Paris.
- Mathieu, E., 2006. Stylistic fronting in Old French. *Probus* 18, 219–266.
- Mathieu, E., forthcoming. The left-periphery in Old French. In: Arteaga, D. (Ed.), *Research on Old French: The state of the art*. Springer, Berlin.
- Meisel, J., 2011. Bilingual language acquisition and theories of diachronic change: Bilingualism as cause and effect of grammatical change. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 14, 121–145.
- Ménard, P., 1988. *Syntaxe de l'Ancien Français*. Editions Bière, Pompignac, France.
- Poletto, C., 2005. Si and e as CP expletives in Old Italian. In: Batllori, M., Hernanz, M.-L., Picallo, C., Roca, F. (Eds.), *Grammaticalization and Parametric Variation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 206–235.
- Pöll, B., 2010. Some remarks on subject positions and the architecture of the left periphery in Spanish. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 55, 359–385.
- Posner, R., 1996. *The Romance Languages*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Posner, R., 1997. *Linguistic Change in French*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Priestley, L., 1955. Reprise constructions in French. *Archivum Linguisticum* 7, 1–28.
- Raynaud de Lage, G., 1962. *Introduction à l'Ancien Français*. Société d'édition d'enseignement supérieur, Paris.
- Rinke, E., Meisel, J., 2009. Subject inversion in Old French: syntax and information structure. In: Kaiser, G.A., Remberger, E.-M. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop "Null-subjects, Expletives, and Locatives in Romance. Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft" Universität Konstanz*, Konstanz, pp. 93–130.
- Rizzi, L., 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In: Haegeman, L. (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 281–337.
- Rizzi, L., 2004. On the cartography of syntactic structures. In: Rizzi, L. (Ed.), *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, vol. 2. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 3–15.
- Roberts, I.G., 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax: A Comparative History of English and French*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Rouveret, A., 2004. Les clitiques pronominaux et la périphérie gauche en ancien français. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 99, 181–237.
- Simonenko, A., Hirschbühler, P., 2012. Placement de clitiques dans les propositions V1 et évolution de la structure de la proposition en ancien français. In: Dufresne, M. (Ed.), *Typologie, ordre des mots et groupe verbal en français médiéval*. Les Presses de l'Université Laval, Laval, Québec, pp. 11–53.
- Skårup, P., 1975. Les premières zones de la proposition en ancien français. *Revue Romane*, special issue 6.
- Thurneysen, R., 1892. Die Stellung des Verbums in Altfranzösischen. *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie* 16, 289–307.
- Torterat, F., 2007. Emplois interjectifs, injonctifs et co-subordinatifs des coordonnants en ancien et moyen français. In: Rousseau, A., Begioni, L., Quayle, N., Roulland, D. (Eds.), *La Coordination*. Presses Universitaires de Rennes, Rennes, France, pp. 225–249.
- Valli, A., 1983. Un exemple d'approche du problème des variantes syntaxiques en linguistique diachronique. *Recherches sur le Français parlé* 5, 125–146.
- Vance, B., 1993. Verb-first declaratives introduced by *et* and the position of *pro* in Old and Middle French. *Lingua* 89, 281–314.
- Vance, B., 1997. *Syntactic Change in Medieval French: Verb-second and Null Subjects*. Kluwer, Dordrecht.
- Vance, B., Donaldson, B., Steiner, B.D., 2010. V2 loss in Old French and Old Occitan: the role of fronted clauses. In: Colina, S., Olarrea, A., Carvalho, A.M. (Eds.), *Romance Linguistics 2009: Selected Papers from the 39th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 301–320.
- Vanelli, L., Renzi, L., Benincà, P., 1985. Typologie des pronoms sujets dans les langues romanes. In: Actes du XVII^e Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes 3. pp. 163–176.