Catalan Journal of Linguistics 16, 2017 **163-216**

Late Latin Verb Second: The Sentential Word Order of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*[*]

Adam Ledgeway
University of Cambridge
anl21@cam.ac.uk

Received: February 17, 2017
Accepted: July 17, 2017

Abstract

In this article we undertake a systematic study of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, one of the best known late Latin texts, to determine the proper characterization of the word order of the text and to consider in particular whether the *Itinerarium Egeriae* can legitimately be considered to present a verb-second (V2) grammar on the par with the well-studied grammars of medieval Romance. The results, based on detailed quantitative and qualitative analyses of the text and, where relevant, appropriate comparisons with medieval Romance, confirm the innovative nature of the syntax of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* whose word order patterns are shown to follow an asymmetric V2 constraint. The article therefore offers valuable original evidence for the often claimed, but hitherto unproven, hypothesis that the V2 syntax of medieval Romance represents the continuation of a parametric setting already well established in the grammar of late Latin.

Keywords: Verb Second (V2); late Latin; word order; left periphery; medieval Romance; Tobler-Mussafia

Resum. *Verb segon en el llatí tardà: l'ordre de paraules de l'oració en l'*Itinerarium Egeriae

En aquest article duem a terme un estudi sistemàtic de l'*Itinerarium Egeriae*, un dels textos del llatí tardà més ben coneguts, per tal de determinar la caracterització adequada de l'ordre de mots del text i veure, en particular, si l'*Itinerarium Egeriae* es pot considerar legítimament que presenta una gramàtica de verb segon (V2) de manera semblant a les gramàtiques ben estudiades del romànic medieval. Els resultats, basats en detallades anàlisis quantitatives i qualitatives del text i, on és pertinent, en comparacions adequades amb el romànic medieval, confirmen la naturalesa innovadora de la sintaxi de l'*Itinerarium Egeriae*, els patrons d'ordre de mots de la qual es demostra que segueixen una restricció asimètrica de V2. L'article, per tant, ofereix evidència original i valuosa a favor de la hipòtesi sovint proposada però fins ara no demostrada que la sintaxi V2 del romànic medieval representa la continuació d'una fixació paramètrica ja ben establerta en la gramàtica del llatí tardà.

Paraules clau: Verb segon (V2); llatí tardà; ordre de paraules; perifèria esquerra; romànic medieval; Tobler-Mussafia

* I thank two anonymous reviewers and Jim Adams, Paola Benincà, Theresa Biberauer, Federica Cognola and Nigel Vincent for their valuable comments and observations on a previous version of this article.

ISSN 1695-6885 (in press); 2014-9719 (online) https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/catjl.212

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In his discussion of late Latin word order, Herman (2000: 86) observes that '[s]tatistically, the characteristic feature of late Latin texts seems to be to have the verb between the two noun phrases if two are there (including prepositional phrases) — that is, either SVO or OVS. Both these orders seem to have gained ground statistically since Classical times, and in some texts they form the clear majority.' Significantly, it is precisely this predominant verb-medial order identified by Herman for late Latin which, under the more usual label of Verb Second (V2), has been frequently claimed to constitute the transitional phase between an original Classical Latin SOV order and the modern Romance SVO order.[1] Indeed, there is considerable consensus and increasing evidence within the descriptive[2] and theoretical[3] literature that the syntax of medieval Romance was characterized by a V2 constraint. Accordingly, in root clauses, and in certain types of embedded clause, the finite verb is argued to raise systematically to the vacant C(omplementizer) position, a movement operation which is variously accompanied by the fronting of one or more pragmatically-salient constituents to the left of the raised verb to target topic and focus positions situated in the left periphery.

Already in early and Classical Latin there is evidence for the rise of a V2 syntax (cf. Vincent 1998: 418-23, 1997: 169 n.17; Ledgeway 2012a: 150-56), if, from an underlying SOV order, we take V-initial orders to involve fronting of the verb to a vacant C position, with XVS(X) orders derived by the additional step of fronting a pragmatically-salient element to a left-peripheral position under topicalization or focalization.[4] For example, Salvi (2004: 55f., 94-98, 101-07, 2011: 356-58) argues that in early and Classical Latin overt lexicalization of C^{o} and its associated specifier with a focalized element were in strict complementary distribution (cf. classic formulations of the doubly filled COMP filter). Consequently, if a single constituent was narrowly focused, it could be fronted to clause-initial position to occupy SpecCP (Salvi 2005: 438-41; cf. also Spevak 2007), but the verb would

1. Cf. Harris (1978: 20f.), Renzi (1985: 267-75), Vincent (1988: 62, 1998: 422f.), Salvi (2000, 2004: 107-11), Ledgeway (2012a: ch. 5), Oniga (2014: 217-19).
2. Cf. Price (1971: 259f.), Skårup (1975), Herman (1990), Lombardi & Middleton (2004).
3. Cf., among others, Vanelli, Renzi & Benincà (1985), Vanelli (1986, 1999), Adams (1987), Fontana (1993, 1997), Roberts (1993), Benincà (1995, 2006, 2013), Lemieux & Dupuis (1995), Ribeiro (1995), Vance (1995, 1997), Salvi (2004, 2012, 2016b: 1005-9), Ledgeway (2007, 2008), Radwan (2011), Salvesen (2013), Bech, Salvesen & Meklenborg (2014), Poletto (2014), Wolfe (2015b), Cruschina & Ledgeway (2016: 571f.). For an analysis of V2 in old Romanian, see Nicolae (2015: 155-98), Nicolae & Niculescu (2015) and Dragomirescu & Nicolae (2015).
4. Pinkster (1990: 182, 1993b: 246), Bolkestein (2001: 249), Oniga (2004: 97f.), Salvi (2005: 436-41), Spevak (2008: 363), Danckaert (2012).

remain within the sentential core (1a). When however the scope of focus did not range over a single constituent, but over the entire event (thetic sentences),[5] or over the illocutionary force of the clause (optatives, jussives, concessives, emphatic assertives, interrogatives, imperatives),[6] the verb could raise to the vacant C position to license the relevant marked pragmatic effect. In such cases, SpecCP hosts a null operator variously associated with a locative, temporal, or causal interpretation (narrative, thetic sentences; 1b) or with a particular modal illocutionary force (1c), the content of which is licensed and made explicit by the verb raising to Cº (cf. also Polo 2004: 402; Devine & Stephens 2006: 157-72).[7]

(1) a. [$_{CP}$ [$_{Spec}$ MAGNAM] [$_{C'}$ **Ø** [$_{TP}$ haec res Caesari ~~magnam~~
big.ACC this.NOM thing.NOM Caesar.DAT
difficultatem ad consilium capiendum adferebat]]] (Lat., Caes. *B.G.* 7.10.1)
difficulty.ACC to plan.ACC seize.GER caused
'this matter caused Caesar great difficulty in forming his plan of campaign'

b. [$_{CP}$ [$_{Spec}$ Ø-Op$_{Temporal}$] [C' **conclamatur** [$_{TP}$ ad arma ~~conclamatur~~]]]
call.together.PRS.PASS.3SG to arms
(Lat., Caes. *B.C.* 1.69.4)
'there is a call to arms'

c. [$_{CP}$ [$_{Spec}$ Ø-Op$_{Optative}$] [$_{C'}$ **ualeant** [$_{TP}$ ciues mei ~~ualeant~~!]]]
be.strong.SBJV.3PL citizens.NOM my.NOM.MPL
(Lat., Cic. *Mil.* 93)
'may my fellow citizens fare well!'

Only in lower registers from the second century AD and in the later Latin period in the transition to Romance is this marked process of verb-fronting to Cº argued to become generalized in root clauses (Salvi 2004: 96f., 107-11, 111). Consequently, even narrow focus constructions are integrated into this new unmarked order, such that the former complementarity between V-raising to Cº (cf. 1b) and overt raising to the latter's left-peripheral specifier (cf. 1a) is now lost with simultaneous lexicalization of both positions (2a).[8] At first, however, SpecCP could only be occupied by fronted rhematic/focused constituents, but from the sixth, possibly fourth (cf. analysis of *Itinerarium Egeriae* below), century onwards we also begin to find thematicized elements in preverbal position (2b), a fact which Salvi (2004:

5. Linde (1923: 159), Marouzeau (1938: 81f.), Ernout & Thomas ([1953] 1993: 161), Pinkster (1993a: 649, 1993b: 246), de Jong (1994: 92), Bauer (1995: 93-95, 2009: 276-79), Salvi (2004: 50f.), Devine & Stephens (2006: 145-52).
6. Schneider (1912: §13-33), Linde (1923: 159, 161), Möbitz (1924: 118f.), Rosén (1998), Devine & Stephens (2006: 144-50), Polo (2004: 381), Bauer (2009: 276).
7. As suggested by Theresa Biberauer (p.c.), one way of unifying these pragmatic and modal cases as a single class is to characterize them in terms of their reference to the category of 'speaker perspective'.
8. The rise of generalized V-fronting in conjunction with fronted focused constituents in root clauses finds a natural explanation in terms of the analysis of *esse* 'be' fronting developed in Ledgeway (2012a: §5.4.2.4), where it is shown how the distributional pattern of *esse*, a Wackernagel element that precisely seeks out a focal host to which to attach, could subsequently generalize to all verbs.

110f.) interprets as strong evidence for the independent development of focus- and theme-fronting under V2 (for similar assumptions about the nature of V2 in modern German, see Frey 2006).

(2) a. [$_{CP}$ [$_{Spec}$ LITEM] [$_{C'}$ **habuit** [$_{TP}$ Ptolemes pater meus ~~item~~
quarrel had.3SG Ptolemy.NOM father.NOM my.NOM
sopera uestimenta mea ~~**habuit**~~]]] (Lat., *Terent.* 254.20)
over clothes.ACC my.ACC
'my elderly relative Ptolemy quarrelled about my clothes'

b. [$_{CP}$ [$_{Spec}$ purpurius episcopus] [$_{C'}$ **tulit** [$_{TP}$ ~~purpurius episcopus~~
Purpurius.NOM bishop.NOM carried
centum folles ~~tulit~~]]] (Lat., *Gest. Zen.* 194.31)
hundred purses.ACC
'Bishop Purpurius received one hundred bags of silver'

In addition to these pragmatic interpretations, there is also evidence that Latin verb-fronting is often syntactically motivated, inasmuch as it can be triggered by a preceding subordinate clause (especially conditional and temporal types), an ablative absolute, a negation, an adverb, or an adverbial phrase,[9] as illustrated in the following representative examples:

(3) a. Quod si resilierit, **destinaui** illum artificium
because if he.will.be.restless I.determined him.ACC trade.ACC
docere (Lat., Petr. *Sat.* 46.7)
learn.INF.ACT
'Because if he is restless, I have determined that he will learn a trade'

b. cum […] et puer iacentem sustulisset, **animaduertit**
when and boy.NOM prostrate.ACC had.picked.up noticed
Trimalchio (Lat., Petr. *Sat.* 34.2)
Trimlachio.NOM
'when the boy had picked it up from the ground, Trimalchio noticed it'

c. non **respuit** condicionem (Lat., Caes. *B.G.* 1.42.2)
not he.rejected proposal.ACC
'he did not reject the proposal'

In short, these syntactically-determined contexts of verb-fronting appear to represent a precursor to the full-fledged V2 syntax of late Latin/early Romance, a conclusion further confirmed by the observation that verb-fronting in Latin rarely occurs in subordinate clauses (Bauer 1995: 96; Salvi 2004: 102).

9. For discussion, see Kroll (1918), Orinsky (1923: 93), Möbitz (1924: 120f.), Marouzeau (1938: 80), Adams (1976b: 137), Bauer (1995: 95f., 2009: 275f.), Polo (2004: 399f.). Whether these cases are genuinely syntactically motivated is, however, less clear inasmuch as they could presumably be readily integrated with the preceding pragmatic and modal cases of verb-fronting since, with the exception of negation, the triggers all involve reference to speaker perspective.

Now, while the V2 status of medieval Romance is widely supported by detailed statistical studies like those cited in footnote 3 above (but see Martins 1994; Kaiser 1999, 2002, 2002-3; Sornicola 2000; Rinke 2009; Sitaridou 2012), similar conclusions for late Latin are based on somewhat superficial and impressionistic evidence. For example, Clackson & Horrocks (2007: 292) recognize a V2 pattern in the late fourth-century *Itinerarium Egeriae* 'Travels of Egeria', where they identify 'an underlying order with the verb occupying the first position in the sentence, with an optional focus slot before it, which may be filled by a verbal argument (subject as default) or an adverbial phrase' (cf. also Salvi 2004: 207), although they offer no detailed quantitative or qualitative evidence for this view.[10] Equally inconclusive in this respect are otherwise valuable studies like those of Hinojo (1986: 83, 1988, 2012: 329) which are concerned with the distribution of OV/VO orders in the *Itinerarium Egeriae*: although he reports an overwhelming majority of innovative VO orders (61.5%) over conservative OV orders (38.5%),[11] this finding does not in itself reveal anything about the V2 nature or otherwise of the text, though it does highlight how late Latin had clearly transitioned from a (S)OV to a (S)VO language in line with a macroparametric shift (formalized in the loss of roll-up movement) from an original head-final to an innovative head-initial order (Ledgeway 2012a: 202-58; 2012b; in press b; Oniga 2014: 196-98).

Also highly suggestive of a V2 syntax is Väänänen's (1987:104f.) insightful observation that in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* verb-subject inversion, interpreted here as the surface reflex of V-to-C raising,[12] 'is conditioned 1) by the clause-initial constituent: adverbial, conjunction, circumstantial clause (or absolute construction or equivalent); 2) by the nature of the verb: passive or intransitive; 3) by the content of the utterance, whenever it introduces new information' in accordance with a canonical V2 pattern which aligns the licensing of V-to-C movement with the presence of an overt (case 1) or covert (cases 2-3) left-peripheral constituent.[13] The potential V2 nature of this late Latin text also finds indirect support in Spevak's (2005: 260) conclusion that word order variations such as the clause-initial and postverbal positions of the object in the *Itinerarium Egeriae* are not syntactically-driven but, rather, are conditioned by pragmatic considerations such as those traditionally recognized in V2 systems.[14]

10. The word order of the *IE* is the subject of Haida's (1928) unpublished dissertation which, however, I have been unable to consult.
11. See also Linde (1923), Adams (1976a: 93), Väänänen (1987: 106), Nocentini (1990: 151, 156), Pinkster (1991: 7 2), Cabrillana (1999: 231f.), Spevak (2005: 235, 241 n.5), Ledgeway (2012a: §5.3.2).
12. Here and below, all non-English quotations have been translated.
13. See Casalicchio and Cognola (in press) for similar V2 patterns in Raeto-Romance varieties and in Mòcheno (Cognola 2013a). It is also interesting to observe that the unaccusative structures listed by Väänänen under (2) are also the same class that resisted the loss of V2 longest in the history of English. As noted by Theresa Biberauer (p.c.), the rise and loss of V2 in late Latin and English, respectively, therefore highlight similar stopping points, regardless of the direction, in the development of V2.
14. Presumably the interaction between the two positions can be accounted for in terms of the interaction of the high and low peripheries; cf. Cognola (2013a) for similar arguments in relation to Raeto-Romance varieties

The time is therefore ripe for a detailed study of the sentential word order of late Latin, and in particular of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* since we have seen that this text has already been singled out as presenting both a high incidence of Romance-like V2 and head-initial VO word orders, not to mention many other non-classical features (Löfstedt 1911; Herrero 1963: 16; Maraval 1982: 54; Väänänen 1987: 11-14; González 2009: §2).[15] In what follows, we therefore undertake a systematic study of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*, one of the best known late Latin texts, to determine the proper characterization of the word order of the text and to consider in particular whether it can legitimately be considered to present a V2 grammar on the par with the well-studied V2 grammars of medieval Romance.

2. Late Latin: a V2 Grammar?

2.1. Some Superficial Empirical Generalizations

For the purposes of the present study, the entire text of the Franceschini & Weber ([1958] 1965) edition of the *Itinerarium Egeriae* (henceforth *IE*) was analysed and all examples of finite declarative root and embedded clauses were recorded, with the exception of relative clauses which arguably present some quite different properties in that they generally seem to be more resistant to V2 (for discussion and references, see Holmberg 2015). This late Latin text – also previously known as the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* 'Pilgrimage of Aetheria' or the *Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta* 'Pilgrimage to the Holy Lands' – is so well-known in both the Latin and Romance literature that it hardly requires introduction here.[16] Suffice it to say that the *IE* is an account by a devout Christian woman (previously assumed to be a nun) of her three-year stay in the Holy Land, most probably written some time between 381-84, but in any case no earlier than 363 and no later than 540 (Arce 1980: 55, Maraval 1982: 28; Väänänen 1987: 8). The author of the text, which is preserved in a single 11th-c. manuscript (*Codex Aretinus*) copied at Montecassino, is today most commonly referred to as Egeria (in the past variously thought to be or known as Silvia, Aegeria, Aetheria, Etheria, Eiheria, E(u)cheria, Heteria) and is believed to originate either from (southern) Gaul or northwestern Iberia, although her Galician provenance is today the most widely accepted hypothesis (cf. Väänänen 1987: 8, 156f.; González 2009: §§3-5). The text itself, whose initial and final sections have

15. Instructive in this respect are Cuzzolin & Haverling's (2009: 55) remarks about the language of the *IE*:

    > By the end of the fourth century CE, the language had undergone some substantial changes, which were almost entirely avoided by the educated authors at the time: a striking example of this development is provided by the *Itinerarium Egeriae* from the late fourth century, written in a language with almost no literary ambitions, providing us with a lot of interesting information regarding the language of everyday conversation at the time. It is, however, quite clear that the author belonged to a rather elevated social category and it is therefore likely that she would have moved without difficulty in the circles in which the educated authors of the time were moving, although she has not learned the rules for writing literary prose in the way they had […].

16. For full discussion, see Väänänen (1987), and for some recent bibliography, see Janeras (2003). See also Hertezenberg's recent (2015) study of third person deixis in the *IE*.

not survived, is divided into two parts, linguistically quite distinct in many respects (cf. Spevak 2005: 239): the first is composed of 23 chapters and constitutes the travelogue proper, hence frequently narrated in the first person, whereas the final 26 chapters which make up the second part provide an account of liturgical practices in Jerusalem predominantly written in the third person.[17]

The statistical information regarding root clauses gleaned from the text is presented below in Table 1, where clauses have been further classified according to whether they contain a transitive, unaccusative or athematic predicate.[18]

The results of Table 1 highlight how in purely statistical terms there are enough superficially V2 structures in the late Latin of the *IE* for us to raise the serious formal question as to whether V2 is in play or not, inasmuch as just over 40% of all root clauses were found to be superficially V2, whereas V3, V1 and V4 clauses only account for half or less of this same figure (namely, 22.7%, 15.9% and 13.3% respectively).[19] Of course, such crude statistical data cannot be taken to provide

Table 1. Verb positions in root clauses in *IE*

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals
V1	46 (3.8%)	120 (9.9%)	26 (2.2%)	192 (15.9%)
V2	106 (8.8%)	159 (13.1%)	224 (18.5%)	489 (40.4%)
V3	58 (4.8%)	112 (9.3%)	104 (8.6%)	274 (22.7%)
V4	40 (3.3%)	69 (5.7%)	52 (4.3%)	161 (13.3%)
V5	19 (1.6%)	32 (2.6%)	16 (1.3%)	67 (5.5%)
V6	7 (0.6%)	10 (0.8%)	3 (0.2%)	20 (1.6%)
V7	1 (0.1%)	3 (0.3%)	—	4 (0.4%)
V8	—	2 (0.2%)	—	2 (0.2%)
Total	277 (22.9%)	507 (41.9%)	425 (35.2%)	1209

17. In citing from the text, the first number after each example refers to the chapter and the second to the paragraph within the chapter from which the example has been taken. Sufficiently detailed glosses are provided in all cases, as well as free translations principally based on the translation of McClure & Feltoe (1919).
18. We use 'transitive' here as a short-hand term to refer to all predicates with an external argument, irrespective of whether they additionally assign one or more internal arguments (viz. unergatives, mono-, and ditransitives). 'Athematic' is used here to refer to those functional (viz. raising) predicates, including *esse* 'be', which do not assign either an external or internal argument but, rather, inherit their argument structure directly from their non-finite verbal complement (infinitive, participle, or gerund) or small clause.
19. Note that, although these counts include V2-final structures where the verb occurs in second, third, fourth, etc. position (viz. V2*), such clauses are not structurally ambiguous since, as observed in §1 following studies such as Hinojo (1986: 83, 1988, 2012: 329), OV had already been largely replaced by VO in the *IE*. It follows therefore that V-final structures are rarely to be interpreted as archaicizing OV orders. To be precise, from a total of 1209 examples of root clauses just 233 (viz. 19.3%) are V-final sequences and hence potentially structurally ambiguous, the majority of which are found in: (i) unaccusative (170: 73%) rather than transitive (63: 27%) structures, inasmuch as the former take less arguments than the latter thereby producing V-final structures more frequently

conclusive evidence, especially in view of the existence of other competing orders, in particular V1, V3 and V4. Nevertheless, it is still possible to maintain a V2 analysis for late Latin,[20] if V2 is strictly understood in a technical sense and not as a simple descriptive label regarding superficial linearizations. In particular, as frequently argued for early Romance (Benincà 1995: 326, 329, 331-33, 338, 2013; Lemieux & Dupuis 1995: 83; Ribeiro 1995: 26; Fontana 1997: 210; Ledgeway 2007; 2008; Wolfe 2015b; Salvi 2016b: 1005f.), V2 is understood here as a syntactic constraint which can be decomposed into two operations, only the first of which is obligatory and can be understood to represent the core of the V2 constraint (cf. also Holmberg 2015).[21] The first consists in the obligatory movement of the finite verb in root clauses to the C-domain (4b), a movement operation often, though not invariably, accompanied by a further operation (4c) which merges one or more salient constituents in a preverbal specifier position in the extended left periphery (Rizzi 1997; Benincà & Poletto 2004), where it receives a (contrastively / informationally) focalized or thematicized interpretation.[22] Consequently, whether the verb superficially occurs, for example, in first, second, third, or fourth position, the V2 generalization consistently holds, insofar as the finite verb is invariably assumed to have moved to the vacant C-Fin position, as sketched in (5).

(4) a. [$_{CP}$ Ø] episcopus perleget omnem ipsam allocutionem ⇒
bishop.NOM reads.through whole.ACC that.ACC speech.ACC

b. [$_{CP\,[C'}$ **perleget**]] episcopus ~~perleget~~ omnem ipsam allocutionem ⇒

c. [$_{SpecCP}$ **omnem ipsam allocutionem** [$_{C'}$ perleget]] episcopus ~~perleget~~ ~~omnem ipsam allocutionem~~ (33.2)

'the bishop reads through the whole of that discourse'

(5) [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{TopP}$ (XP) [$_{FocP}$ (XP) [$_{FinP}$ (XP) [$_{Fin'}$ V [$_{TP}$ ~~V~~…]]]]]]

From a typological perspective we can then distinguish on the one hand between so-called strict (or rigid) V2-languages and broad (or relaxed) V2-languages on the other (Benincà 2013; Casalicchio & Cognola in press). In languages of the former

whenever one or more constituents are fronted; and (ii) in V3* structures where the final position of the verb is a natural consequence of multiple fronting (namely, V2: 32; V3: 88; V4: 65; V5: 33; V6: 9; V7: 4; V8: 2),

20. Unless otherwise indicated, in what follows we informally use the label 'late Latin' as a short-hand to mean 'the late Latin of the *IE*', insofar as we take the language of the *IE* to represent an authentic sample of late Latin in which we can test deep properties of the grammar that do not depend on the specific stylistic choices of the author. However, Adams (2013: 148) rightly cautions against over-reliance on the *IE* as the sole representative source of late Latin syntax.
21. Cf. in this respect the conservative nature of V2 in early Sardinian which only displays obligatory (V-to)T-to-C movement (Lombardi 2007; Wolfe 2015a). For further discussion, see §2.2.3 below.
22. As discussed below in §2.2.4 and §2.2.5.3 in relation to second-position pronouns, we must distinguish between different types of left-peripheral element since some (typically foci) are moved to the C-domain as part of the V2 constraint, while others (typically topical in nature) are arguably base-generated there and, strictly speaking, therefore irrelevant to the fulfillment of the V2 requirement while superficially placing the verb in third or fourth position or still further (cf. Wolfe 2015b; Salvi 2016b: 1006).

type, including, for example, some varieties of Raeto-Romance (Haiman & Benincà 1992: 150; Poletto 2000; Anderson 2016: 179-81; Salvi 2016a: 164-65, 2016b: 1009), but not those spoken in the Italian Alps (Casalicchio & Cognola in press), and modern Germanic (Vikner 1995: 41; Holmberg 2015: 242), V-to-C raising is accompanied by obligatory fronting of a single constituent such that the descriptive V2 constraint is invariably superficially satisfied.[23] By contrast, in languages of the latter type, including early Germanic, medieval Romance and, as we shall see, late Latin, only V-movement proves obligatory, with variable application of fronting of one or more sentential constituents such that the purely superficial descriptive V2 constraint is not invariably met. Indeed, from a historical perspective the oft-cited rigid characterizations of the V2 constraint represent only a very recent innovation within a small subset of modern Germanic and Raeto-Romance varieties, the original situation in the Indo-European proto-language (witness the comparative evidence of Vedic, Greek, Hittite, early Germanic, and early Romance) being that of a broader V2 type with at least two left-peripheral (preverbal) positions (Kiparsky 1995; Walkden 2014, 2015).

The (broad) V2 nature of late Latin finds further confirmation in the distribution of finite verbs in embedded contexts reported in Table 2.[24]

Interpreting V2 as the result of verb movement to the vacant C position, we should *a priori* expect V2 to be blocked, or at the very least severely restricted, in embedded clauses since C° is typically already lexicalized by an overt complementizer/subordinator. Consequently, in contrast to what was noted for root clauses, superficial V2 is not the dominant order in embedded clauses but now comes second to V1. Thus, although V2 admittedly continues to prove a relatively common

Table 2. Verb positions in embedded clauses in *IE*

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals
V1	67 (13.5%)	71 (14.3%)	70 (14.1%)	208 (41.9%)
V2	57 (11.5%)	46 (9.3%)	67 (13.5%)	170 (34.3%)
V3	22 (4.5%)	23 (4.6%)	33 (6.7%)	78 (15.8%)
V4	6 (1.2%)	9 (1.8%)	9 (1.8%)	24 (4.8%)
V5	2 (0.4%)	6 (1.2%)	5 (1%)	13 (2.6%)
V6	—	2 (0.4%)	—	2 (0.4%)
V7	—	1 (0.2%)	—	1 (0.2%)
Total	154 (31.1%)	158 (31.8%)	184 (37.1%)	496

23. Even in so-called well-behaved V2 languages the V2 constraint is not absolute, inasmuch as V1 and V3 orders, are, albeit to a limited extent, also found there (cf. Vikner 1995: 90; Poletto 2002: 230; Nielsen 2003; Boeckx & Grohmann 2005; Holmberg 2015). For instance, in the Raeto-Romance varieties of Gardenese and Badiotto, Casalicchio & Cognola (in press) observe that the exceptions to strict V2 are more pervasive than those documented in Poletto (2000), inasmuch as V3 does not simply obtain with scene-setters and hanging topics, as in Germanic strict V2 languages, but the distribution of V3 proves more fine-grained and dependent on information structure.
24. The complementizer is, of course, clause-external and does not count as the first constituent, such that embedded V1 orders, for example, involve the order Complementizer + Verb (+ X).

superficial word order even in embedded contexts, what is remarkable is that the frequency of V1 has more than doubled in relation to that found in root clauses, namely, 15.9% > 41.9%%. This would be a somewhat surprising result if late Latin were not a V2 language, since we would expect (S)VO order to occur with equal frequency in both root and embedded contexts. However, under an asymmetrical V2 analysis in which V2 systematically obtains in root clauses but proves much more constrained in embedded contexts, the increased frequency of V1 in a null subject language like late Latin (bearing in mind that the embedded subject is very frequently a null pronominal) and the concomitant decrease in V2 and especially V3 orders and above (viz. V3*) are quite expected.

Although such superficial interpretations of the data have provided some significant insights into late Latin word order, and indeed in some respects are arguably indicative of asymmetrical V2, qualitative interpretations of the data undoubtedly prove far more reliable in assessing the V2 status or otherwise of late Latin, especially when coupled together with relevant quantitative information. It is to this approach that we turn in the following sections.

2.2. Theoretical Analysis

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

2.2.1. Constituent-fronting

Out of a total of 489 superficially V2 root clauses only 190 (16 transitives, 22 unaccusatives, 152 athematics), namely 38.9%, were found to be subject-initial, a somewhat surprising result if late Latin were not a V2 language. Rather, as is to be expected of a V2 language, the preverbal position is not a privileged subject position as in SVO languages, but constitutes a pragmatically salient position licensing thematic and rhematic interpretations that is potentially available to all syntactic categories, irrespective of their syntactic function and their thematic relation to the predicate. Indeed, as Spevak (2005: 246f.) observes, the preverbal position is not a dedicated position for subjects in the *IE*, but is also frequently targeted by focused objects. Consequently, besides subjects (6a), among the various constituents occurring in preverbal position we also find all complement types, including direct objects (6b), prepositional (6c), oblique (6d), predicative (6e) and clausal (6f) complements, as well as various kinds of adjunct, including adverbs (6g-h), adverbial phrases (6i) and various circumstantial clauses (6j-k):

(6) a. **unus ex diaconibus** facit commemorationem singulorum (24.5)
one.NOM out.of deacons.ABL makes commemoration.ACC individuals.GEN
'one of the deacons makes the customary commemoration of individuals'

b. **Illud etiam** requisiui a sancto episcopo, ubinam esset
that.ACC also I.asked from holy.ABL bishop.ABL where be.PST.SBJV
locus ille Chaldaeorum (20.12)
place.NOM that.NOM Chaldees.GEN
'I also asked the holy bishop where was that place of the Chaldees'

c. et **trans uallem** apparebat mons sanctus Dei Syna. (1.1)
and across valley.ACC it.appeared mount.NOM holy.NOM god.GEN Sinai
'and across the valley appeared Sinai, the holy mountain of God'

d. et **ibi** sedet episcopus et presbyteri (43.5)
and there sits bishop.NOM and priests.NOM
'and the bishop and the priests take their seat there'

e. et **quasi terribilis** est (18.2)
and as.if terrible.NOM it.is
'and it is, as it were, terrible'

f. et **ecce occurrere** dignatus est sanctus presbyter
and behold meet.INF.ACT deign.PRF.PTCP is holy.NOM priest.NOM
ipsius loci et clerici (14.1) [25]
the.same.GEN place.GEN and clergy.NOM.PL
'and lo! the holy priest of the place and the clergy deigned to meet us'

g. **tantum** eminebat excelsus locus ubi stabamus (12.4)
so projected high.NOM place.NOM where we.stood
'to so great a height rose the lofty place where we stood'

h. et **statim** ingreditur intro spelunca (24.2)
and at.once enters.PASS in cave.ABL
'and he immediately enters the cave'

i. et **cum ymnis** itur ad illam ecclesiam (43.6)
and with hymns.ABL go.PASS.3SG to that.ACC church.ACC
'and with hymns they go to that church'

j. Et **cum ceperit se facere hora nona**,
and when will.have.begun self.ACC make.INF.ACT hour.NOM nine.NOM
subitur cum ymnis in Inbomon (31.1)
mount.3SG.PASS with hymns.ABL in Imbomon
'And when the ninth hour approaches they go up with hymns to the Imbomon'

k. **Euntibus nobis** commonuit presbyter loci ipsius (10.8)
go.PTP.ABL.PL we.ABL advised priest.NOM place.GEN the.very.GEN
'As we went, the priest of the place advised us'

25. Note that (passive/deponent) perfect participle + *esse* 'be' consistently forms a single complex constituent in the *IE* (Väänänen 1987: 107, 164), presumably the result of the participle incorporating by left head-adjunction into clitic forms of ESSE (Adams 1994b) under T°, viz. $[_{T}\,[_{v}$ PtP] *esse*]]. This is further substantiated, among other things, by the position of second-position pronouns and particles discussed in §2.2.4, §2.2.5.3 and in Ledgeway (in prep.).

The unrestricted accessibility of the immediately preverbal position exemplified in (6a-k) is further confirmed by sentences like those illustrated in (7a-b) which exemplify subextraction via scrambling of individual constituents under focus in apparent violation of the Left Branch Condition (cf. Ledgeway 2014; in press a). The result is discontinuous structures – so-called hyperbata (cf. Väänänen 1987: 111-13) – in which, for example, modifiers and complements are separated from their heads (*singulae septimanae…quadragesimarum*; *tantus rugitus et mugitus… omnium hominum*).

(7) a. Sic ergo **singulae** **septimanae** celebrantur
thus so single.NOM.PL weeks.NOM celebrate.PASS.3PL
quadragesimarum (27.8)
Lent.GEN
'Thus, then, is each week of Lent kept'

b. Quod cum ceperit legi, **tantus** **rugitus**
that when will.have.begun read.INF.PASS so.much.NOM moaning.NOM
et **mugitus** fit **omnium** **hominum** (24.10)
and groaning.NOM do.PASS.3SG all.GEN.PL men.GEN
'And when the reading is begun, there is so great a moaning and groaning among all'

Such discontinuous structures, which are widely attested in the history of Latin (for discussion and relevant bibliography, see Ledgeway 2012a: §3.2.1.1, §3.3.1.1, §5.4.3; Oniga 2014: 223-25), underline how the immediately preverbal position is available to all types of constituent, including scrambled categories (Bolkestein 2001), in accordance with the assumed V2 nature of late Latin. Significantly, scrambling, at least of the liberal type exemplified here, seems to be typologically correlated with the V2 parameter (cf. West Germanic languages),[26] and its availability in late Latin must consequently be considered another piece of indirect evidence in support of our proposed V2 analysis.

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

In a massive 61.1% of all V2 root clauses the preverbal position is filled by a constituent other than the subject, typically an adjunct but not infrequently also an internal argument. These findings are entirely in line with Wolfe's (2015b, 2016) examination of five medieval Romance V2 varieties (French, Occitan, Sicilian, Spanish, Venetian) where non-subject-initial clauses account for at least ~30% of matrix V2 clauses in individual varieties (ranging from 29.87% in Venetian to 76.22% in Occitan), with adjuncts equally representing a large proportion (on average 30.88%) of such cases (ranging from 7.2% in Venetian to 53.9% in Spanish).

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

Table 3. Distribution of immediately preverbal elements in V2 root clauses in *IE*

	Subject[1]	Direct Object	Indirect Object	Oblique Object	Adjunct	Total
Transitives	16 (15.1%)	12 (11.3%)	—	1 (0.9%)	77 (72.7%)	106
% of all V2	3.3%	2.5%		0.2%	15.7%	489
Unaccus.	22 (13.9%)	—	1 (0.6%)	7 (4.4%)	129 (81.1%)	159
% of all V2	4.5%		0.2%	1.4%	26.4%	489
Athematics	152 (67.9%)	1 (0.4%)	—	22 (9.8%)	49 (21.9%)	224
% of all V2	31.1%	0.2%		4.5%	10%	489
Total (%)	190 (38.9%)	13 (2.7%)	1 (0.2%)	30 (6.1%)	255 (52.1%)	489
			44 (9%)			

1. Of the total of 489 root clauses displaying a superficial V2 linearization, 329 of these occur with an overt lexical subject with the following distributions: 13 pronominal (10/3 immediately pre-/postverbal), 316 DPs (180/113 immediately pre-/postverbal, 23 postverbal). Of the 112 occurrences of immediately postverbal subjects, 84 predictably occur in unaccusative structures.

By the same token, in Wolfe's sample preverbal subjects across all five medieval Romance varieties make up an average of 44.13% of all V2 root clauses (ranging from 23.78% in Occitan to 70.13% in Venetian), a figure considerably higher than that observed for the *IE* (38.9%). Overall, the late Latin evidence therefore fits squarely with a V2 grammar, in that the distribution of preverbal constituents mirrors similar distributions attested in medieval Romance varieties which have independently been shown to be V2.

This conclusion is further supported by an analysis of the immediately preverbal position in root clauses in which the verb occurs in third position or beyond (viz. V3*). The relevant facts, together with those of V2 root clauses, are presented in Table 4.

As can be seen, the occurrence of immediately preverbal subjects in V3* contexts barely reaches more than 20% in individual linearizations and less than 6% in the overall V3* sample; even in the overall V2* sample preverbal subjects only account for 29.2% of all clauses. These facts provide incontrovertible proof that the immediately preverbal position in late Latin is not a grammaticalized subject position as in many (though not all) SVO languages, but, rather, functions as a pragmatically salient position unrestricted by grammatical function.

Finally, interpreting the surface linearizations of late Latin syntax as the output of a V2 rule provides us with a principled explanation why, in contrast to the variability of the constituent(s) occurring before the finite verb, word order in the sentential core (T-*v*-VP domain) following the raised finite verb is subject to a relatively fixed order, namely S+Adv+Inf+*Compl+*X (Salvi 2016b: 1006). The representative sentences in (8a-d) cumulatively exemplify different partial instantiations of this order.

Table 4. Distribution of immediately preverbal subjects in root clauses in *IE*

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals
V2	16 (15.1%)	22 (13.9%)	152 (67.9%)	190 (38.9%)
% of all V2*	1.6%	2.2%	14.9%	18.7%
V3	15 (25.9%)	22 (19.6%)	22 (21.1%)	59 (21.5%)
% of all V2*	1.4%	2.2%	2.2%	5.8%
V4	7 (17.5%)	12 (17.4%)	13 (24.9%)	32 (19.9%)
% of all V2*	0.6%	1.2%	1.3%	3.1%
V5	2 (10.5%)	7 (21.9%)	6 (37.5%)	15 (22.4%)
% of all V2*	0.2%	0.7%	0.6%	1.5%
V6	1 (14.3%)	–	–	1 (5%)
% of all V2*	0.1%			0.1%
V7	–	–	–	0
% of all V2*				
V8	–	–	–	0
% of all V2*				
Total	41 (17.7%)	63 (16.3%)	193 (48.4%)	297
% of all V2*	4%	6.2%	19%	29.2%

(8) a. Et si probauerit sine reprehensione esse de
and if he.will.have.proved without blame.ABL be.INF.ACT of
his omnibus […], annotat ipse manu sua nomen
these.ABL all.ABL notes he.NOM hand.ABL his.ABL name.ACC
illius (45.4; S+Adv+Compl)
that.one.GEN
'And if he has proved him to be blameless in all these matters […], he writes down his name with his own hand'

b. Completo ergo omni desiderio […], cepimus iam et
completed.ABL.SG thus all.ABL.SG desire.ABL we.began already and
descendere ab ipsa summitate montis Dei
descend.INF.ACT from the.very.ABL summit.ABL mount.GEN god.GEN
(4.1; Adv+Inf+Compl)
'Having then fulfilled all the desire […], we began our descent from the summit of the mount of God'

c. Et sic ponitur cathedra episcopo in Golgotha post
and thus place.PASS.3SG chair.NOM bishop.DAT in Golgotha.ABL after
Crucem (37.1; S+Compl+Compl)
cross.ACC
'Then a chair is placed for the bishop in Golgotha behind the Cross'

d. Postmodum autem alloquitur episcopus populum
afterwards but addresses.PASS bishop.NOM people.ACC
confortans eos (36.5; S+Compl+X)
comfort.PRS.PTCP.NOM.SG them.ACC
'And afterwards the bishop addresses the people, comforting them'

In summary, the evidence considered in this section reveals how the *IE* bears all the hallmarks of a V2 grammar.

2.2.1.1. Informational Focus

One of the characteristic features of the unrestricted nature of the preverbal position in medieval Romance V2 systems is its ability to host informationally-new fronted constituents which introduce into the narrative a referent that has not previously figured in the discourse, giving rise to an example of what is generally known as informational focus (see Vanelli 1986, 1999; Lambrecht 1994: 201; Benincà & Poletto 2004: §3; Cruschina 2012; 2016: 605f.).[27] Below follow some representative examples involving direct objects (cf. also 7a-b above) where the lack of a resumptive pronoun further supports the non-topical nature of the fronted object:

(9) a. **omnium nomina** annotat presbyter (45.1)
all.PL.GEN names.ACC notes priest.NOM
'the priest writes down the names of all'

b. **Pulchriorem territorium** puto me nusquam
more.beautiful.ACC.SG territory.ACC I.believe me.ACC nowhere
uidisse (9.4)
see.PFV.INF.ACT
'I believe never to have seen a more beautiful country anywhere else'

c. Nam **et eulogias** dignati sunt dare michi et
for and eulogiae deign.PFV.PTCP are give.INF.ACT me.DAT and
omnibus (21.3)
all.DAT
'They deigned also to give me and all who were with me *eulogiae*'

d. **biduanas** facit per totas quadragesimas (28.3)
two.days.ACC does for all.ACC quadragesima.ACC.PL
'he keeps two days' fast (in the week) all through Quadragesima'

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

Although rhematic objects can equally occur in postverbal position,[28] especially when they occur in wide focus together with their associated predicate, they also frequently occur in preverbal position as part of a syntactic strategy which serves to isolate the object from its verb when the former alone constitutes under narrow focus the central informational focus of the clause (Vanelli 1999: 84-86). Significantly, such a strategy is systematically found in medieval Romance V2 languages, but is typically not available in the modern Romance SVO languages where rhematic direct objects (whether under wide or narrow focus) are restricted to occurring in postverbal position,[29] and direct objects can only be fronted under particular pragmatic conditions such as when they bear contrastive focus or when they are topicalized through clitic left-dislocation.

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

2.2.2. Verb-Subject Inversion

Another significant piece of evidence that points to the V2 nature of the late Latin *IE* comes from the well-known observation that, when a constituent other than the subject is fronted, this produces verb-subject inversion whenever the subject is overtly realized (cf. 4c, 6c,d,f,g,k, 8a,c-d, 9a above), contrary to what happens in SVO languages.[30] Below follow some representative examples (subjects in bold):

28. Cf. the following example where the first conjunct of the focal object is fronted while the remaining conjuncts occur postverbally:
    (i) Nam ipse uicus **ecclesiam** habet **et martyria et monasteria plurima**
    for this.NOM village.NOM church.ACC has and martyrs.ACC and cells.ACC many.ACC
    sanctorum monachorum (7.7)
    holy.GEN.PL monks.GEN
    'This village has a church, as well as martyr-memorials, and many cells of holy monks'
29. Notable exceptions are Sicilian (Cruschina 2006, 2012; Bentley 2007), Sardinian (Jones 1993; Mensching & Remberger 2010) and Romanian (Zafiu 2013); cf. also Cruschina (2016: 606f.).
30. However, on par with medieval/modern Romance varieties (cf. Ledgeway 2007: n. 18), when the subject occurs in narrow focus (cf. i.a-b), as is frequently the case in unaccusative structures, or when the subject is 'heavy' (cf. i.c-e), the subject does not immediately follow the verb but, rather, occurs in clause-final position:
    (i) a. Et at ubi diaconus perdixerit omnia, quae dicere habet,
    and to where deacon.NOM will.have.said.out everything which.PL say.INF.ACT he.HAS
    dicet orationem primum **episcopus** (24.6)
    says prayer.ACC first bishop.NOM
    'And when the deacon has finished all that he has to say, first the bishop says a prayer'
    b. Ad quem puteum cum uenissemus, facta est ab episcopo
    to which.ACC well.ACC when we.had.come done.NOM.FSG ist by bishop.ABL
    oratio (21.1)
    prayer.NOM.FSG
    'When we had come to the well, prayer was made by the bishop'

(10) a. Illud etiam retulit **sanctus episcopus**: (19.14)
that.ACC also told holy.NOM bishop.NOM
'The holy bishop also told me: […]'

b. et sic dicet **episcopus** stans benedictionem super
and thus says bishop.NOM stand.PRS.PTCP.NOM.SG blessing.ACC over
cathecuminos (24.6)[31]
catechumens.ACC
'and the bishop stands and says the blessing over the catechumens'

c. Tunc interrogauimus **nos** etiam et illos sanctos monachos,
then asked.1PL we also and those.ACC holy.ACC.PL monks.ACC
qui (11.2)
who
'Then we asked also those holy monks who […]'

d. Lecto ergo, ipso loco, omnia de libro
read.ABL.SG thus the.very.ABL place.ABL whole.ABL of book.ABL
Moysi […] dederunt nobis **presbyteri loci ipsius**
Moses.GEN they.gave us.DAT priests.NOM place.GEN the.very.GEN
eulogias (3.6)[32]
eulogiae.ACC
'When the whole passage from the book of Moses had been read […] the priests of the place gave us *eulogiae*'

e. Retro in absida post altarium ponitur **cathedra** episcopo (46.5)
to.rear in apse.ABL after altar.ACC place.PASS3SG chair.NOM bishop.DAT
'and the chair is placed for the bishop in the apse behind the altar'

---

c. et peruenientes ad monasteria quedam susceperunt nos ibi
and arrive.PRS.PTCP.NOM.PL at monasteries.ACC certain.ACC.PL received us there
satis humane **monachi, qui ibi commorabantur** (3.1)
very humanly monks.NOM who.NOM.PL there dwelt
'and arriving at a certain monastery, the monks who dwelt there received us very kindly'

d. tunc retulit michi de ipsa aqua sic **sanctus episcopus**
then told me.DAT of the.very.ABL water.ABL so holy.NOM bishop.NOM
dicens: (19.8)
say.PRS.PTCP.NOM.SG
'Then the holy bishop told me about the water, saying: […]'

e. In sexto miliario est hinc **locus ipse iuxta uicum, qui**
in sixth.ABL mile.ABL is hence place.NOM the.very.NOM next.to village.ACC which.NOM
fuit tunc uilla Laban Siri (20.11)
was then farm.NOM Laban Syria.GEN
'The place is six miles hence, near the village which then was the farm of Laban the Syrian'

31. Note that forms like *dicet* (cf. also *uadent* in (14d) below) are morphologically futures in the Classical language, but in the *IE* frequently represent a late form of the present indicative.
32. For the position of the pronominal indirect object *nobis* in this example, see the discussion in §2.2.4 below.

f. sic dicitur **ymnus** (36.3)
thus say.PASS.3SG hymn.NOM
'and thus the hymn is said'

g. et cum illis ueniunt **multi clerici sui** (49.2)
and with them.ABL come many.NOM clergy.NOM their.NOM
'and with them come many of their clergy'

Under the proposed V2 analysis, subject inversion in such examples follows straightforwardly. If we assume an underlying SVXP order (at least for non-unaccusative structures), verb movement to C-Fin followed by fronting of some postverbal constituent (XP) to clause-initial position within the C-field will invariably result in the subject immediately following the verb, namely [$_{SpecCP}$ XP [$_{C'}$ V [S ~~V XP~~…]]] (see though §2.2.3 on the exact position of the postverbal subject). Unfortunately, the *IE* does not offer many examples of so-called 'Germanic' inversion (Roberts 1993: 56; Salvesen 2013: 136) where the in-situ subject occurs sandwiched between a finite auxiliary raised to the C-domain and its associated non-finite lexical verb in the sentential core since, as observed in footnote 25, in the most frequent auxiliary structure, *esse* 'be' + (passive/deponent) perfect participle, the participle systematically incorporates into *esse* to yield a single complex head [$_{T}$ [$_{v}$ PtP] *esse*], thereby excluding the possibility of Germanic-style inversion. However, there are some examples of 'Germanic' inversion with other functional predicates, e.g. *incipio* 'begin', *coepio* 'start', *soleo* 'be wont' (for arguments in support of the functional nature of such predicates, see Cinque 1999) where the subject occurs between the latter and the following lexical infinitive, although all such examples occur in relative (11a-b) and embedded (11c-d) clauses:

(11) a. intra spelunca, in qua spelunca solebat **Dominus** docere
in cave.ABL IN which.ABL cave.ABL was.wont lord.NOM teach.INF.ACT
discipulos (33.2)
disciples.ACC
'in the cave in which the Lord was wont to teach his disciples'

b. ea hora, qua incipit **sol** procedere (27.8)
that.ABL hour.ABL which.ABL begins sun.NOM proceed.INF.ACT
'at the hour when the sun begins to rise'

c. Cum autem coeperit **episcopus** uenire cum
when yet will.have.begun bishop.NOM come.INF.ACT with
ymnis (25.2)
hymns.ABL
'as the bishop approaches with hymns'

d. cum ceperit **hora** esse (32.2)
when will.have.begun hour.NOM be.INF.ACT
'when the hour approaches'

Examples like these, however, do not allow us to establish unambiguously whether the subject has raised to SpecTP or whether it occurs in Spec*v*P, the in-situ position of the subject in the case of transitives like (11a) or an intermediate position in the case of unaccusatives like (11b-d),[33] inasmuch as the surface order S+Inf(+Compl+X) is compatible with both underlying structures. The same holds for XPVSO examples such as (10b-d) where, in the absence of lower pre-*v*-VP adverbs (Cinque 1999), there is no independent way to discriminate between the SpecTP and Spec*v*P positions. Unfortunately, the *IE* does not provide any such examples which would allow us to distinguish between these two options (see, however, the discussion of low adverbs in V1 root contexts in (15a-c) in §2.2.3).

Putting to one side the exact position of the postverbal subject within the sentential core of the T-*v*P domain (for which see §2.2.3 below), it is important to note that the incidence of verb-subject inversion in the *IE* is hardly negligible, but stands out as a characteristic feature of the text and, by definition, of a V2 syntax. For instance, Väänänen (1987: 104) remarks that 'the frequency of sentences displaying VS order is striking in all chapters of the *IE*', an observation confirmed, in turn, by Spevak (2005: 251-55). Indeed, a count of all cases of immediately postverbal subjects in root contexts produced the figures reported in Table 5.

Limiting our attention principally to the three dominant words orders V1, V2 and V3, especially since the majority (viz. 58.3%) of V4* orders increasingly presuppose by their very nature a (typically topicalized) left-peripheral preverbal subject (hence the noticeable fall in postverbal subjects in the V4* sample), it is striking to note that 26.5% (253/955) of all V1-V3 clauses present an immedi-

Table 5. Distribution of immediately postverbal subjects in root clauses in *IE*

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals
V1	9/46 (19.6%)	92/120 (76.6%)	4/26 (15.4%)	105/192 (54.7%)
V2	28/106 (26.4%)	70/159 (44%)	14/224 (6.2%)	112/489 (22.9%)
V3	4/58 (6.9%)	24/112 (21.4%)	8/104 (7.7%)	36/274 (13.1%)
V4	1/40 (2.5%)	6/69 (8.7%)	3/52 (5.8%)	10/161 (6.2%)
V5	0/19 (%)	4/32 (12.5%)	0/16 (0%)	4/67 (6%)
V6	0/7 (0%)	2/10 (20%)	1/3 (33.3%)	3/20 (15%)
V7	0/1 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	—	0/4 (0%)
V8	—	0/2 (0%)	—	0/2 (0%)
Total	42/277 (15.2%)	198/507 (39%)	30/425 (7.1%)	270/1209 (22.3%)

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

ately postverbal subject,[34] a tendency which naturally increases in V1 contexts (54.7%) where a preverbal subject is never an option. This distribution is all the more revealing when we consider that, as a null subject language, in the majority of cases the subject is simply null and hence not phonologically detectable (cf. percentages of immediately pre- and postverbal subjects in V2* roots clauses: 29.2% vs 16.2%).[35] Overall, then, we witness a substantial number of immediately postverbal subjects, crucially not limited to unaccusative structures, which can only be interpreted as the surface output of a V2 syntax which requires the finite verb to raise to the C-domain. This is an important finding since subject-inversion is standardly considered to be one of the most salient and robust acquisitional cues in the instantiation of a V2 system.

2.2.3. V1 Structures & Subject Positions

Although it was previously noted in §2.1 that V2 structures represent the most frequent type of root clause, V1 orders were also observed to occur relatively frequently, accounting for 15.9% of all root clauses. This figure, however, excludes many superficial V1 clauses such as (12) involving (asyndetic) coordination with a preceding clause, in which the theme of the first clause is interpreted as the theme of the coordinated clause.

(12) [statim descendet episcopus$_i$] et [Ø$_i$ intrat intro speluncam] (24.9)
at.once descends bishop.NOM and enters into cave.ACC
'at once the bishops arrives and enters the cave'

For instance, in (12) the thematic subject *espicopus* of the first clause is also understood as the thematic subject of the second coordinated clause, but it is impossible to tell from the superficial order at what level coordination operates in such examples (e.g. CP, TP or even *v*P) and, consequently, whether the fronted adverb *statim* ranges over both coordinates or just the first. Given the difficulties in confidently assessing whether such coordinated clauses instantiate cases of V1 or V2(*), all such cases have been excluded from all counts in this study.

Rather, the root V1 tokens considered in our sample predominantly involve presentative contexts in which, in the absence of a theme,[36] the whole clause typically

34. The greater proportion of immediately postverbal subjects with unaccusatives than with transitive and athematic predicates (cf. Adams 1976b: 124f.; Väänänen 1987: 105) naturally follows from standard assumptions (Perlmutter 1978; Burzio 1986) that unaccusative subjects are generated underlyingly in the postverbal complement position. Objectors to a V2 analysis might therefore claim that all of these examples are ambiguous. Clearly, they would be ambiguous if they were the only structures acquirers were hearing but, combined with the other clearly V2 input, acquirers will surely be biased towards the V2 possibility.
35. We assume here, as argued below in §2.2.3, that there is no null subject position but, rather, that null subjects are an epiphenomenon licensed by V-to-T movement through the rich pronominal agreement on the finite verb (cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998).
36. Within the V2 literature, V1 root declaratives have been noted to perform a special stylistic function (cf. also discussion of Classical Latin examples in (1b-c)), occurring principally in so-called contexts of 'lively narrative' (Kiparsky 1995: 163 n.6) characterized by strong discourse cohesion (Sigurðsson 1990: 45; Lemieux & Dupuis 1995: 98; Ribeiro 1995: 121; Vikner 1995: 87, 90; Fontana 1993: §3.4.3,

receives a rhematic interpretation occurring in so-called wide focus (answering the question *What happened?*).[37] Indeed, the unmarked nature and high frequency of such V1 structures in late Latin, including in the *IE*,[38] has been noted in the literature (cf. Väänänen 1987: 104f.; Salvi 2004; Spevak 2005: 248f., 250, 253, 258f.), where V1 is explicitly described as a specific syntactic order for marking thetic sentences with a presentative or eventive structure and licensing narrative functions such as introducing description and marking progress of narrative action (for medieval Romance, cf. Ledgeway 2007: §2.2.6; Salvi 2016b: 1008). From a syntactic point of view, this pragmatico-syntactic mapping of thetic sentences onto V1 structures follows naturally from the proposed V2 nature of late Latin since, in the absence of any pragmatic saliency associated with the individual constituents of the clause, all constituents remain in the sentential core and the V2 requirement is satisfied solely through the core operation of V-to-C movement. Such clauses therefore prove particularly significant in that they provide us with a snap-shot of the underlying order of constituents, save the verb which, in accordance with the V2 requirement, moves to the vacant C position to yield VSO and VS orders in transitive/unergative (13) and unaccusative (14) thetic sentences, respectively.[39]

1997: 226). Consequently, many analyses assume the presence of a null operator (Diesing 1990: 56 n.14; Lemieux & Dupuis 1995: 98; Ribeiro 1995: 112; Fontana 1997: 226) or default discourse topic (Benincà 1996: 77f.; 2013) in the left periphery of V1 structures (cf. Ledgeway 2008: 446 n. 8).

37. As expected, V1 orders prove especially frequent in conjunction with unaccusative structures (cf. the distributions in Table 1, and the discussion in Väänänen 1987: 105) since they tend to introduce new arguments into the discourse. For discussion of similar Romance facts, see Bentley (2016: 830), Cruschina (2016: 598f.).

38. It will be recalled from Table 5 that 54.7% of all V1 structures involved an immediately postverbal subject.

39. Revealing in this respect is Väänänen's (1987:104f.) observation noted in §1 above that in the *IE* V1 structures are 'conditioned […] 2) by the nature of the verb: passive or intransitive; 3) by the content of the utterance, whenever it introduces new information', thereby explaining the use of V1 orders in thetic sentences and, by definition, the particularly high percentage of VS orders in unaccusative (including passive) structures (cf. also Väänänen 1987: 164).

    Naturally, some tokens of V1 in our sample include VO**S** and VXP**S** orders where the subject does not occur in the immediately postverbal position but, rather, in a clause-final extraposed/right-dislocated position or in the lower left periphery (Belletti 2004, 2005). In such cases, the subject is either 'heavy' (i.a-b) or falls under narrow focus (i.c); for a discussion of similar medieval Romance facts, see Salvi (2016b: 1008)

    (i) a. ostenditur etiam ibi **altarium lapideum, quem posuit ipse**
    shows.PASS.3SG also there altar.ACC of.stone.ACC which.ACC placed the.very.NOM
    sanctus Helias ad offerendum Deo (4.2)
    holy.NOM Elijah.NOM to offer.GER God.DAT
    'a stone altar also is shown which holy Elijah raised to make an offering to God'

    b. Dicuntur autem horis singulis **apti psalmi semper uel**
    say.PASS.3PL yet hours.ABL single.ABL.PL apt.NOM.PL psalms.NOM always or
    antiphonae tam loco quam diei (29.2)
    antiphons.NOM so place.DAT than day.DAT
    'For throughout the whole time psalms and antiphons are said appropriate both to the place and to the day'

    c. et leget resurrectionem Domini **episcopus ipse** (24.10)
    and reads resurrection.ACC lord.GEN bishop.NOM the.very.NOM
    'and the bishop himself reads the (narrative of the) Resurrection of the Lord'

(13) a. **Predicant** etiam omnes presbyteri et sic episcopus, semper de
preach.3PL also all.NOM priests.NOM and so bishop.NOM always of
eo loco (26)
that.ABL place
'All the priests, and after them the bishop, preach always about that passage […]'

b. (dicet psalmum quicumque de presbyteris) et **respondent** omnes (24.9)
says psalm.ACC each.one.NOM of priests.ABL and reply.3PL all.NOM
'(one of the priests says a psalm) and all respond to it'

c. (Facta ergo missa Martyrii uenitur post Crucem, dicitur ibi unus ymnus tantum, fit oratio) et **offeret** episcopus ibi oblationem et
and offers bishop.NOM there oblation.ACC and
communicant omnes (35.2)
communicate all.NOM.PL
'(Then, after the dismissal at the martyrium, they arrive behind the Cross, where only one hymn is said and prayer is made), and the bishop offers the oblation there and all communicate'

d. et **noluit** Deus ita permittere (12.10)
and not.wanted God.NOM thus permit.INF.ACT
'and God refused to permit it'

(14) a. **incenduntur** omnes candelae et cerei et **fit**
light.PASS.3PL all.NOM candels.NOM and tapers.NOM and becomes
lumen infinitum (24.4)
light.NOM great.NOM
'and all the candles and tapers are lit, making a very great light'

b. **Intrat** episcopus intro cancellos Anastasis, **dicitur** unus
enters bishop.NOM in rails.ACC Anastasis say.PASS.3SG ONE.NOM
ymnus (38.2)
hymn.NOM
'The bishop enters the rails of the Anastasis, and one hymn is said'

c. Postmodum fit oratio, **benedicuntur** cathecumini,
afterwards do.PASS.3SG prayer.NOM bless.PASS.3PL catechumens.NOM
postmodum fideles, et **fit** missa (34)
afterwards faithful.NOM.PL and do.PASS.3SG dismissal.NOM
'Afterwards prayer follows, then the blessing, first of the catechumens, and then of the faithful, and the dismissal is made'

d. **Recipit** se episcopus et **uadent** se unusquisque ad
receives self.ACC bishop.NOM and go.3PL self.ACC each.one.NOM to
ospitium suum (25.7)
lodging.ACC his.ACC
'then the bishop retires, and every one returns to his lodging to take rest'

Examples such as (13)-(14) do not, however, offer any unambiguous evidence about the position of the postverbal subject in VS(O)(XP) sequences and, in particular, whether the subject occurs in SpecTP or Spec*v*P (or even in V',DP in unaccusative structures). Similar uncertainty regarding the exact position of the subject was noted above in §2.2.2 in relation to verb-subject inversion structures (cf. examples (10)-(11)). Now consider the V1 (and V2) examples in (15).

(15) a. legitur denuo **et ille locus de euangelio** (40.2)
read.PASS.3SG again and that.NOM passage.NOM from gospel.ABL
'and again that passage from the Gospel is read'

b. fit denuo **oratio** ad Crucem (31.4) / et fit
do.PASS.3SG again prayer.NOM at cross.ACC and do.PASS.3SG
denuo **oratio** (36.1) / Hoc lecto fit
again prayer.NOM this.ABL read.PFV.PTCP.ABL.SG do.PASS.3SG
denuo **oratio** (39.5)
again prayer.NOM
'prayer is again given at the Cross / and again prayer is given / When this has been read, prayer is given again'

c. Post hoc cum coeperit se iam **hora**
after this.ABL when will.have.begun self.NOM already hour.NOM
nona facere, legitur iam **ille locus de**
ninth.NOM do.INF.ACT read.PASS.3SG already that.NOM place.NOM of
euangelio cata Iohannem (37.7)[40]
gospel.ABL by John.ACC
'Afterwards, at the beginning of the ninth hour, there is read that passage from the Gospel according to John'

The six examples in (15) all include VP-adverbs (*denuo* 'again', *iam* 'already') which, following Cinque (1999), we take to occupy a fixed position in a space immediately to the left of the *v*-VP, hence a convenient diagnostic for identifying the left edge of the verb phrase. Although there occur very few such examples together with an overt postverbal subject in the *IE* (and none involving transitives – presumably *semper* in (13a) above takes narrow scope over the prepositional complement), those that do occur invariably present the order (Verb +) Adverb + Subject, implying that there is no SpecTP position above the *v*-VP available to the subject.[41] Although

40. On the Wackernagel position of *se* in (15c), see the discussion in §2.2.4.
41. The only apparent exception to this generalization concerns the example in (i) where the subject precedes the adverb *denuo*. However, the subject is pronominal and pronominal subjects are well known to show second-position effects in Latin (cf. Adams 1994a, and discussion in §2.2.4 below), hence the placement of *nos* in (i) immediately to the right of the verb above the adverb.
(i) et iunximus **nos** denuo ad mare Rubrum (6.3)
and reached we.NOM again to sea.ACC red.ACC
'and we reached again the Red Sea'
Moreover, there is a strong cross-linguistic tendency for pronominal and full nominal subjects to occupy distinct positions (cf. discussion of English in Biberauer & van Kemenade 2011).

the examples in (15) all involve unaccusatives where the subject could *a priori* be argued to occur in situ in V',DP, we should note that the Adverb+Subject order is found with both rhematic (15b,c) and, crucially, thematic (15a,c') subjects which can confidently be argued to lexicalize the intermediate Spec*v*P position, if not SpecFocP or SpecTopP positions within Belletti's (2004;2005) lower left periphery. In this respect, the embedded temporal clause in (15c) proves particularly revealing since it exemplifies a case of 'Germanic' inversion involving an auxiliary structure with *coepio* 'begin' + infinitive. Given that the finite verb cannot move to C°,[42] which is already lexicalized by the subordinator *cum*, we can reasonably assume that the finite verb lexicalizes a position within the T-domain, while the lexical verb *facere* is forced to remain within the *v*-VP. It follows from this that the subject *hora nona*, which immediately follows not only the finite verb but, in turn, also the VP-adverb *denuo*, and immediately precedes the lexical infinitive raised to *v*, must occupy Spec*v*P, as sketched in (16):

(16) [$_{CP}$ [$_{Spec}$ Post hoc] [$_{C'}$ cum [$_{TP}$ [$_{T'}$ coeperit se <u>denuo</u> [vP [SPECvP **hora nona**] [v' ~~se~~ facere [VP ~~se facere hora nona~~]]]]]]]

The evidence of the examples in (15) therefore leads us to conclude that the late Latin of the *IE*, unlike modern Italian or English, is not an EPP-language in that it fails to project a dedicated SpecTP subject position. Rather, as we have seen, subjects, just like all other constituents, are restricted to occurring in their (intermediate) base position within the sentential core, unless they receive particular pragmatic salience, in which case they are fronted to SpecCP (or more accurately, SpecFocP) where they variously receive a thematic (old) or rhematic (new, narrow focus) reading, or to one of the various specifier positions within the topic space where they receive a topicalized reading.

The lack of a SpecTP position above the *v*-VP complex is further confirmed by the order of constituents in embedded V1 clauses. By way of illustration, consider the examples in (17a-d):

(17) a. uigilatur in Anastase, ut legat **episcopus** locum
watch.PASS.3SG in Anastasis so.that reads.SBJV bishop.NOM place.ACC
illum euangelii (43.1)
that.ACC gospel.GEN
'vigil is kept in the Anastasis, and the bishop reads the passage from the Gospel'

42. It is not essential for the discussion here that the finite verb *coeperit* has not moved to a lower C-related head in (15c) – indeed the enclitic position of reflexive pronoun *se* suggests otherwise (cf. §2.2.4) – inasmuch as the positions of the postverbal subject *hora nona*, the VP-adverb and the infinitive remain constant under either analysis.

b. sed cum leget **affectio** **uestra** libros sanctos
but when will.read affection.NOM your.NOM books.ACC holy.PL.ACC
Moysi (5.8)
Moses.GEN
'but when your affection shall read the holy books of Moses'

c. Et cum ceperit **hora** esse (40.1)
and when will.have.begun hour.NOM be.INF.ACT
'And when the hour approaches'

d. Cum autem coeperit **episcopus** uenire cum ymnis (25.2)
when yet will.have.begun bishop.NOM come.INF.ACT with hymns.ABL
'As the bishop approaches with hymns'

Assuming again that in these embedded examples the finite verb has not moved to the C position but lexicalizes a T-related position, it follows that the postverbal subject, which immediately follows the finite lexical verb and immediately precedes the direct object (17a-b) or the lexical infinitive (17c-d), must occupy Spec*v*P. This is an internally-consistent result in that it allows us to make a single generalization about subject positions valid for both root and embedded clauses, namely that late Latin T° lacked an EPP feature and hence failed to project SpecTP. This does not mean, however, that embedded examples of SV(X) order are not found in late Latin, but forces us to assume that instances of embedded SV(X), which, significantly, are not statistically dominant in embedded contexts (see §2.2.5.1), are actually cases of embedded V2.

It is also worth noting that the lack of a TP-related subject position in late Latin is entirely in keeping with the V2 nature of the language. Whereas in a non-V2 language like modern Italian (cf. Cardinaletti 1997, 2004) the dedicated SpecTP subject position licenses, although not exclusively, both thematic subjects (18a) and rhematic subjects in wide focus (cf. 18b), in a V2 language like late Latin these same pragmatic functions are typically licensed by fronting of the subject to a specifier position within the C-space. It follows that there would be very little motivation for a TP-related subject position in a V2 language like late Latin,[43] especially if the EPP feature (whatever that turns out to be) can be satisfied by V-to-T movement (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998).[44]

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

44. That finite verbs raise to T in the *IE* is shown, not only by examples such as (17a-d), but also in relation to the discussion of the proclisis/enclisis alternation (cf. §2.2.4, §2.2.5.3) and the position of the finite verb in embedded V1 contexts (cf. §2.2.5.1).

(18) a. (Cosa ha trovato Luca?) Luca ha trovato un portafogli. (It.)
what has find.PFV.PTCP Luca Luca has find.PFV.PTCP a wallet
'(What did Luca find?) Luca found a wallet.'

b. (Cosa è successo?) LUCA HA TROVATO UN PORTAFOGLI (It.)
what is happen.PFV.PTCP Luca has find.PFV.PTCP a wallet
'(What happened?) Luca has found a wallet.'

By way of a final observation, it is interesting to note that technically our analysis implies that the late Latin of the *IE* is a verb-initial language (on the syntax of verb-initial languages, see Carnie & Guilfoyle 2000; Carnie, Harley & Dooley 2005), in that the unmarked (underlying) order of root and embedded clauses is VSO with the finite verb variously surfacing in C° (root(/embedded contexts)) or T° (embedded contexts). In this connection, it is instructive to compare the situation in early Sardinian, where Lombardi (2007) and, in turn, Wolfe (2015a,c) argue that the earliest texts of the language present a symmetric verb-initial order in root and embedded contexts, which Wolfe interprets as a conservative instantiation of the V2 constraint restricted to the core operation of (V-to)T-to-C movement (cf. footnote 21 above). This view finds substantial support in our analysis of late Latin where the unmarked (underlying) V-initial root and embedded orders can be argued to have been preserved in early Sardinian, albeit with subsequent generalization of (V-to-)T-to-C movement in all embedded contexts. This interpretation of the late Latin, and in turn early Sardinian, facts finds an interesting parallel with VSO Brythonic Celtic varieties such as modern Welsh which has been argued by Roberts (2004) to display a V2 grammar on a par with modern Germanic. At the relevant level of abstraction, Roberts maintains that both language families can be analysed as V2 insofar as (root) finite Fin° must be given PF–realization, but differ as to the formal realization of this requirement in terms of verb raising (Germanic) and merger of a 'sentential' particle (Celtic). On this view, V2 should not be uniquely understood as a case of structurally-induced verb raising, but ultimately as a featural requirement of the relevant C–related head which can be satisfied by one of the two core syntactic operations external Merge or internal Merge (viz. Move). Within this typology, late Latin (together with early Sardinian) only differs from Welsh in the way the V2 constraint on C-Fin is satisfied, namely by internal Merge in the former case and external Merge in the latter.[45]

2.2.4. Second-Position pronouns

Classical Latin is known to present a series of so-called Wackernagel or second-position elements (cf. Adams 1994a,b; Janse 1994; Salvi 2004: 123ff.) which include clause connectors (e.g. *enim* 'for'), discourse particles (e.g. *ergo* 'therefore'), forms of *esse* 'be' (and most probably other auxiliary-like predicates), and so-called weak pronouns (e.g., *me* 'me.ACC', *illum* 'him.ACC', etc.), although the latter are generally not distinguished orthographically from their tonic counterparts. To varying

45. See Ledgeway (2008) for a Romance case of V2 satisfaction via the external Merge option.

degrees, these same elements are also attested in the *IE* (Väänänen 1987: 116f.; Salvi 2004: 167f.; Ledgeway 2016a; cf. also footnote 22 above), some of which throw light on the V2 nature of the text. Due to space limitations, here we focus on weak object pronouns, but refer the reader to Ledgeway (in prep.) for a discussion of clause connectors and discourse particles and their interaction with V2 in the *IE*.

As extensively argued by Salvi (2004), the position of weak pronouns in (late) Latin serves as an important diagnostic in understanding Latin word order since, as place-holders which demarcate the left edge of the T-domain, weak pronouns can be used to pinpoint the position of the finite verb. In particular, we follow Salvi (2004) in taking Latin non-tonic pronouns to be underlying XPs which (raise from within the *v*-VP complex to) surface at the left edge of the TP as weak pronouns from where they follow the verb raised to C°. However, we depart from Salvi in assuming that pronouns may also raise from this TP position as heads (X°) to left-adjoin into the verb in C°. On this view, enclisis is to be interpreted as the result of purely phonological cliticization of a phrasal (viz. weak) pronoun to the verb at PF (19a), whereas proclisis obtains as the result of syntactic cliticization of a pronominal head (viz. clitic) onto the finite verb under C° in the narrow syntax (19b).

(19) a. $[_{CP}\ [_{C'}$ V $[_{TP}\ [_{DP}$ **Pro**$]$ ~~V~~ $[_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ (O) $[_{DP}$ ~~Pro~~$]]]]]$ (enclisis)

b. $[_{CP}\ [_{C'}\ [_{C}\ [_{D^\circ}$ **Pro**$]$ V$]$ $[_{TP}\ [_{DP}$ ~~Pro~~$]$ ~~V~~ $[_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ (O) $[_{DP}$ ~~Pro~~$]]]]]$ (proclisis)

As we shall see, the distribution of proclisis and enclisis in finite root clauses in the *IE* is subject to a degree of variation determined by specific structural factors which largely anticipate those of the Tobler-Mussafia Law recognized for medieval Romance (cf. Tobler 1875; Mussafia 1886; Huber 1933: §3.3.8; Benincà 1995, 2006; 2013; Salvi 1990; 2004: ch.4, 2016b: 1006f.). Following in essence Benincà (1995) and Salvi (2004), the left periphery can be understood in terms of two distinct sub-spaces as illustrated schematically in (20):

(20) $[_{TopP}$ HTs, Circum.s, Disloc.s $[_{CP}$ Theme/Focus $V_{finite}\ [_{TP}$ ~~V~~$_{\text{~~finite~~}}\ [_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ (X)$]]]]$

Immediately above the sentential core (TP) we can identify the C-domain – we use CP here as a syncretic label for the lower projections typically labelled as FinP and FocP in the literature (cf. 5) –, an area which hosts the raised finite verb in the C° head and thematicized or focalized constituents in its associated specifier. In turn, CP is preceded by an extra-sentential topicalization space (namely, TopP), specialized in hosting hanging topics (HTs), scene-setting and circumstantial elements (Circum.s), and dislocated (Disloc.s) constituents ultimately to be identified with the specifier positions of corresponding functional projections such as FrameP, SceneP, and TopP.

Now, CP, which apparently only provides for one specifier position (Benincà 1995: 333; Ribeiro 1995: 126; Salvi 2004: 67f.; Ledgeway 2008: 449), is to be equated with the position targeted by fronted constituents as part of the V2 rule triggered by the prior movement of the finite verb to C°, whereas the hosting of

one or more constituents within the topicalization space (informally labelled TopP above) is strictly interpreted as independent of the V2 constraint. Indeed, this view is directly supported by the distribution of so-called weak pronoun placement. In particular, in the presence of a fronted constituent within SpecCP all pronouns (below highlighted in bold) invariably occur proclitic on the verb. This can be demonstrated by examples like those illustrated in (21) where the fronted constituents are foci (here represented in small caps), namely a contrastive focus in (21a) and a quantified adverb in (21b), which we have independently argued (§2.2.1.1) to involve fronting to SpecCP driven by V2:

(21) a. ita ET NOS **uobis** monstramus (12.2)
thus and we.NOM you.DAT show.1PL
'(for as it was shown to us by our ancestors who dwelt here where [he was laid],) so do we show it to you'

b. et ADHUC **nobis** superabant milia tria (4.5)
and still us.DAT remained miles.NOM three.NOM.N
'we still had three miles to cover'

By contrast, when SpecCP remains empty (22a), even when the topicalization space hosts fronted elements such as the (underlined) temporal clause in (22b), all pronouns obligatorily appear enclitic to their associated verb:

(22) a. Et ait **nobis** sanctus episcopus: (20.4)
and says us.DAT holy.NOM bishop.NOM
'And the holy bishop tells us: […]'

b. Et at ubi perdicti fuerint iuxta consuetudinem,
and to where recite.PRF.PTCP will.have.been according custom.ACC
lebat **se** episcopus (24.5)
raises self.ACC bishop.NOM
'And when all these have been recited according to custom, the bishop rises'

These facts find a straightforward explanation in terms of the traditional Tobler-Mussafia Law, one of the principal generalizations of which states that enclisis obtains whenever the verb occurs in clause-initial position. Thus, in the case of fronting to CP, proclisis invariably obtains since the verb (raised to C°) occurs in second position preceded by a fronted constituent in its specifier, allowing the pronoun to left-adjoin into the raised verb (23a). When, however, SpecCP is not lexicalized, only enclisis is possible, even if the topicalization space hosts a hanging topic and/or a left-dislocated constituent (23b): the verb now raised to C° technically occurs in clause-initial position, inasmuch as elements contained within the extra-sentential topicalization space – presumably a higher phase on top of CP – prove invisible to the Tobler-Mussafia generalization which only makes reference to the SpecCP position in computing second-position effects.

(23) a. XP Pro=V: [$_{TopP}$ (YP)… [$_{SpecCP}$ XP] [$_{C'}$ **Pro**-V [$_{TP}$ ~~Pro V~~ [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ O …]]]]

b. # V=Pro: [$_{TopP}$ (YP)… [$_{SpecCP}$ Ø] [$_{C'}$ V [$_{TP}$ =**Pro** ~~V~~ [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ O …]]]]

In short, we interpret the observed proclisis-enclisis alternation as a direct effect of V2 fed by V-to-C raising which creates either a V2 structure and proclisis in the presence of fronting to SpecCP (23a), or a V1 structure and enclisis in the absence of fronting to SpecCP (23b). This demonstrates that clitic placement in late Latin proves sensitive to the placement of the finite verb and any associated fronted constituents within the left periphery, whereas in varieties like modern Italian there is no generalized movement of the finite verb to the C-domain (namely, no V2) and there is generalized proclisis. At the same time, we must bear in mind that the proclisis/enclisis pattern is, of course, also a very useful acquisition cue to reinforce the V-in-C analysis.

2.2.5. Embedded Clauses

A comparison of the statistical results reported in Tables 1 and 2 above highlighted how the distribution of linear V2 and V1 orders observed in root clauses is reversed in embedded clauses. Previously we interpreted this observation as indirect evidence for the V2 nature of late Latin, insofar as V2 (namely, movement of the finite verb to C°) will normally be precluded, or at the very least, heavily restricted in embedded clauses on account of the C position already being lexicalized by a complementizer or subordinator. Although we assume this to be the case in most instances, this does not imply that V2 is invariably excluded in embedded contexts. Indeed, many examples of embedded V2, albeit often constrained by various syntactic and pragmatic factors, have been noted in the early Romance and Germanic literature on V2 (Vikner 1995: ch. 4; Salvi 2004: 68-74; Ledgeway 2007: 139-45, 2008: 458f.; Freitag & Scherf 2016). For instance, Benincà (1996: 72) notes in relation to medieval Romance that '[i]n dependent complement sentences governed by bridge verbs and even dependent relatives the accessibility of CP appears more restricted than in main clauses, but only in quantity, not in quality'.

This characterization equally holds of the *IE*, where embedded V2 is constrained by a number of factors. As we shall see, cases of embedded V2 in late Latin involve, with very few exceptions, those same environments recognized for other V2 languages displaying restricted embedded V2. More specifically, embedded V2 predominantly occurs in complement clauses to predicates of strong assertion (cf. Hooper & Thompson 1973), so-called bridge verbs,[46] as well as in specific types of adjunct clause, especially causal, temporal and purpose clauses (Vance 1997: ch. 4; Cardinaletti & Roberts 2002; Salvi 2016b: 1007).[47] Such parallelism in the

46. Cf. de Haan & Weerman (1986), Vanelli (1986: 269, 1999: 78), Hulk & van Kemenade (1995: 237), Kiparsky (1995: 164 n. 15), Ribeiro (1995: 118, 121), Santorini (1995: 56), Fontana (1997: 246), Benincà (2006: 72).

47. The 'classical' accusative with infinitive construction continues to represent the principal means of marking complementation in the *IE* (Väänänen 1987: 72), with just 66 examples of finite complement clauses. Consequently, the majority of embedded V2 examples in the *IE* come from our corpus of 430 subordinate adjunct clauses.

distribution of embedded V2 strongly suggests that we are correct in our analysis of late Latin as a V2 language, insofar as the *IE* patterns in all relevant respects with other asymmetric V2 languages that license V2 only in specific, lexically-restricted embedded contexts.

Before we consider the late Latin data, however, we must first briefly address the major technical issue associated with embedded V2, namely how both the finite verb and a lexical complementizer can apparently occupy simultaneously the same C position. In the literature, three principal solutions have emerged in relation to this problem. Under one proposal, V2 is to be interpreted as movement of the finite verb to T° with fronting of some other thematic or rhematic constituent to SpecTP (cf. Martins 1994; Kaiser 1999, 2002, 2002-3; Sornicola 2000; Rinke 2009; Sitaridou 2012). This analysis leaves the higher C position available to host lexical complementizers. This solution, while superficially attractive for languages like Icelandic and Yiddish that apparently display generalized embedded V2 (Santorini 1995; Vikner 1995: §4.2.1; though see Angantýsson 2011 for detailed reconsideration of modern Icelandic), fails to explain the severely restricted nature of embedded V2 in languages like late Latin. This observation has led some researchers (cf. Authier 1992; Vance 1997: ch. 4) to propose instead that restricted embedded V2 in languages like late Latin should be interpreted as a case of CP recursion. Under this view, the frequent observation that embedded V2 is restricted to complements of so-called bridge verbs can now be understood as an idiosyncratic lexical property of specific predicates which allow CP recursion. Nonetheless, given the articulated C-domain in (5), replete with at least two distinct complementizer positions *Force* and *Fin*, in addition to various Topic and Focus positions sandwiched between them, an empirically and theoretically more satisfying solution to this problem is now available. In particular, embedded V2 structures can quite simply be accommodated by assuming that the complementizer/subordinator lexicalizes the highest C-head *Force*,[48] while the finite verb raises to the lowest C-head *Fin*, a solution we shall also assume here for late Latin embedded V2.

48. Evidence that complementizers/subordinators may variously lexicalize both *Fin* and *Force* is provided by examples of so-called recomplementation (cf. Wanner 1998; Ledgeway 2005: 380-90, 2012a: 171-73, 2016b: 1019f.; Paoli 2005; Vincent 2006, 2016: 46; Demonte & Fernández-Soriano 2009; Gupton 2010: 227-34; Villa-García 2012a,b, 2015; Nicolae 2015: 28, 120, 149f.; Cruschina & Ledgeway 2016: 566; Gheorghe 2016: 463-73) such as (i.a), where the subjunctive complementizer *ut* '(so) that' simultaneously surfaces both in the lower and higher C-heads to introduce a purpose clause, within which is contained a complement clause (introduced by *quia*) and its associated fronted topic (underlined) and focus (in small caps) constituents.

(i) Nam talis consuetudo est hic ieiuniorum in quadragesimis, **ut** hi, quos
for such.NOM custom.NOM is here fasts.GEN in Lent.ABL so.that they.NOM those.ACC
appellant ebdomadarios, id est qui faciunt septimanas, dominica die,
they.call hebdomadarii.ACC that is who.NOM.PL do.3PL weeks.ACC of.lord.ABL day.ABL
quia hora quinta fit missa, **ut** manducent (27.9)
because hour.NOM fifth.NOM do.PASS.3SG dismissal.NOM so.that they.eat.SBJV
'For the custom of the fast in Quadragesima is that the dismissal on the Lord's Day is at the fifth hour in order that they whom they call hebdomadarii, that is, they who keep the weeks' fast, may take food'

Finally, we should note that in a non-EPP language with VO order (cf. Hinojo 1986) like late Latin the asymmetry between root and embedded clauses produced by the V2 constraint is superficially less pronounced in some respects, since Verb+Subject order is not to be interpreted as a superficial inversion effect of V2 and there is no OV/VO alternation as happens in an OV V2 language like German. Nonetheless, the effects of the V2 constraint are still visible in embedded contexts in several areas, including through significant root vs embedded asymmetries. Below we consider these and some further consequences of our V2 analysis of late Latin for our understanding of word order in embedded contexts in the *IE*.

2.2.5.1. V1 Orders

In contrast to root clauses, we observed above in Table 2 that V2 orders, although not uncommon (viz. 34.3%), are nonetheless less numerous in embedded clauses where V1 orders prove much more frequent (viz. 41.9%). In fact, given our formal interpretation of V1 structures in §2.2.4 in relation to pro- vs enclitic alternations where we saw, on the basis of obligatory enclisis, that V1 structures technically include also sequences in which all fronted constituents are contained in the extra-sentential space of the higher left periphery (cf. 22b, 23b), it is highly likely that some, if not many, of the V2* sequences recorded in Table 2 are also to be considered V1 sequences. If correct, then the observed asymmetry between root and embedded clauses in relation to the distribution of V1 and V2 is in all probability much greater than reported in Table 2.

On the one hand, this root vs embedded asymmetry finds an explanation in the widely observed fact that, in terms of discourse structure, embedded clauses are typically informationally less rich than root clauses and often show, for example, a severely reduced or restricted left periphery.[49] It follows that embedded clauses are more likely to show an unmarked word order which, as argued in §2.2.3, involves precisely VS(O)X order.

(24) a. uigilatur in Anastase, ut legat episcopus locum
watch.PASS.3SG in Anastasis.ABL so.that reads.SBJV bishop.NOM place.ACC
illum euangelii (43.1)
that.ACC gospel.GEN
'vigil is kept in the Anastasis, and the bishop reads the passage from the Gospel'

b. sed cum leget affectio uestra libros sanctos
but when will.read affection.NOM your.NOM books.ACC holy.ACC.PL
Moysi (5.8)
Moses.GEN
'but when your affection shall read the holy books of Moses'

49. Cf. the restrictions on the availability of focus-fronting in embedded contexts in many Italian dialects (Cruschina 2010: 255f.; Ledgeway 2010: 41f.; Paoli 2010: 282f.) and the impossibility of constituent-fronting in embedded contexts in early Sardinian (Lombardi 2007; Wolfe 2015a).

c. posteaquam scripserat Aggarus rex ad Dominum (19.8)
after.that had.written Abgar.NOM king.NOM to lord.ACC
'after that King Abgar had written to the Lord'

d. Et at ubi intrauerit populus (25.3)
and to when will.have.entered people.NOM
'And when the people have entered'

e. donec commonetur episcopus (24.3)
while summon.PASS.3SG bishop.NOM
'while the bishop is being summoned'

f. Et cum ceperit hora esse (40.1)
and when will.have.begun hour.NOM be.INF.ACT
'And when the time comes'

On the other hand, we also previously interpreted this asymmetry as indirect evidence of the V2 nature of late Latin, insofar as V2 (and associated XP fronting) will normally be precluded in embedded clauses on account of the C position already being lexicalized by a complementizer/subordinator (cf. Wolfe 2015c: 17-19, 2015d: §3.3). It therefore follows that in embedded V1 sequences, irrespective of whether V2 obtains (V-to-T-C) or not (V-to-T), the order is invariably VS(O)X since the underlying position of the subject, as already established in §2.2.3, lexicalizes Spec*v*P. Indeed, an examination of all embedded clauses (cf. Table 6) reveals a much higher incidence of immediately postverbal subjects in V1 clauses (viz. 22.1%) than in V2* clauses (viz. 8.1%). If, however, the *IE* were not a V2 language, but rather, for example, SVO or SOV, then we would not *a priori* expect such a higher incidence of immediately postverbal subjects with V1 over V2* (and especially not in non-unaccusatives clauses).

Finally, we should note that the evidence considered here and, in particular, our observation about the predominance of V1 in embedded contexts in the *IE* highlights a significant innovation in late Latin syntax regarding Latin word order. In contrast to the flexibility of root clauses, the word order of Latin embedded

Table 6. Immediately postverbal subjects in embedded contexts in *IE*

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	Totals
V1	8/67 (11.9%)	16/71 (22.5%)	22/70 (31.4%)	46/208 (22.1%)
V2	2/57 (3.5%)	5/46 (10.9%)	5/67 (7.5%)	12/170 (7.1%)
V3	1/22 (4.5%)	4/23 (17.4%)	2/33 (6.1%)	7/78 (8.9%)
V4	0/6 (0%)	1/9 (11.1%)	2/9 (22.2%)	3/24 (12.5%)
V5	0/2 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	0/5 (0%)	0/13 (0%)
V6	—	0/2 (0%)	—	0/2 (0%)
V7	—	0/1 (0%)	—	0/1 (0%)
Total	11/154 (7.1%)	26/158 (16.4%)	31/184 (16.8%)	68/496 (13.7%)

clauses has widely been reported to follow a very rigid SOV arrangement,[50] a tendency which, according to Adams (1976a: 93 n. 61) is not limited to Classical Latin, but is readily observable in the 'Latin of all periods, including that of very late antiquity' (cf. also Adams 1992: 21f.). Given the supposed predominance of SOV order in embedded contexts, we should therefore expect a high incidence of embedded V3(*) order(s) in the *IE*. Nonetheless, we have seen in Table 2 that V3(*) orders only account for 15.8% (23.8%) of all embedded clauses (and just 14.3% (19.5%) of all embedded V3(*) transitive clauses), demonstrating how SOV order characterizes neither root nor embedded clauses in late Latin.

2.2.5.2. Constituent Fronting

When dominant V1 order does not obtain, in many embedded clauses there intervenes between the complementizer/subordinator and the finite verb a constituent different from the subject. As was observed in relation to root clauses in §2.2.1, the frequent preposing of a constituent distinct from the subject represents a typical configuration in V2 languages, where such preposing signals the rhematic (cf. 25) or thematic (cf. 26) interpretation of the fronted constituent, and the type of constituent amenable to preposing is essentially unconstrained, but in any case not restricted to subjects. Thus, in (25)-(26) we find in the immediate preverbal position not only subjects (a), but also direct objects (b), various prepositional and oblique (e.g. locative, temporal, predicative) complements (c-d), and various types of adverb and adjunct (e-g):

(25) a. tu promiseras nobis, ne **aliquis** **hostium**
thou had.promised us.DAT that.not someone.NOM enemies.GEN
ingrederetur ciuitatem istam (19.9)
enter.PST.SBJV.PASS.3SG city.ACC this.ACC
'thou hadst promised us that none of our enemies should enter this city'

b. quoniam **et** **ingens** fuit per girum et **multas**
because and huge.NOM it.was through round.ACC and many.ACC
fabricas habuit (8.1)
workshops.ACC it.had
'since it was great in circumference and contained many buildings'

c. uolui, iubente Deo, ut **et** **ad** **Mesopotamiam**
I.wanted love.PRS.PTCP.ABL god.ABL that and to Meopotamia.ACC
Syriae accedere ad uisendos sanctos
Syria.GEN go.PST.SBJV.1SG to visit.GER.ACC.PL holy.ACC.PL
monachos (17.1)
monks.ACC
'I wished, however, at God's bidding, to go to Mesopotamia in Syria, to visit the holy monks'

50. Linde (1923: 154, 156f.), Marouzeau (1938: 49, 104-7), Ramsden (1963: 43f., 114), Amacker (1989: 493), Bolkestein (1989: 23), Charpin (1977: 404, 1989: 518), Pinkster (1991: 69), Bauer (1995: 91; 2009: 270), Oniga (2004: 99), Baños Baños & Cabrillana (2009: 696), Ledgeway (2012a: 185-87).

d. Ac sic est, ut **prope usque ad quintam aut sextam horam**
and thus is that nearly until to fifth.ACC or sixth.ACC hour.ACC
protraitur missa (25.4)
delay.PASS.3SG dismissal.NOM
'Thus the dismissal is delayed until nearly the fifth or sixth hour'

e. Propter ipsos ergo, ut **citius** absoluant (27.9)
because.of these.ACC thus so.that sooner they.finish
'It is for their sake, then, that they may finish their fast the sooner'

f. iter sic fuit, ut **per medium** transuersaremus caput
route.NOM thus was that through middle.ACC we.crossed.SBJV head.ACC
ipsius uallis (2.4)
the.same.gen valley.gen
'our route was to cross the middle of the head of that valley'

g. Cum ergo **iubente Deo** persubissemus in
when thus love.PRS.PTCP.ABL.SG god.ABL we.had.ascended in
ipsa summitate (3.4)
the.very.ABL summit.ABL
'When, therefore, at God's bidding, we had arrived at the summit'

(26) a. Et hoc per scripturas sanctas inuenitur, quod **ea**
and this through scriptures.ACC holy.ACC.PL find.PASS.3SG that this.NOM
dies sit enceniarum qua […] (48.2)
day.NOM be.SBJV.3SG consecrations.GEN which.ABL
'Moreover, it appears from the Holy Scriptures that this is also the day of dedication when […]'

b. et dicentibus ei aliis apostolis, quia
and say.PRS.PTCP.ABL.PL him.DAT other.ABL.PL apostles.ABL that
Dominum uidissent (39.5)
lord.ACC they.had.seen.SBJV
'and the other Apostles told him that they had seen the Lord'

c. Nam vere scriptura hoc testatur, quoniam ad accipiendam
for truly scripture.NOM thither testify.PASS.3SG that to take.GER.ACC
sanctam Rebeccam **huc** uenerit puer sancti Abrahae (20.10)
holy.ACC Rebecca.ACC hither came boy.NOM holy.GEN Abraham.GEN
'The Scripture does indeed relate how holy Abraham's servant came here to take holy Rebecca'

d. priusquam **post illos** occuparet (8.5)
before.that after those.ACC he.seized.SBJV
'before he set out after them'

e. rogauimus presbyteros, ut **et ibi** fieret oblatio (4.8)
we.asked priests.ACC that and there do.PST.PASS.SBJV.3SG oblation.NOM
'we asked the priests that the oblation should be made there'

f. ut porro **foras ecclesia** audiantur uoces eorum (47.2)
that afar out.of church.ABL hear.PASS.3PL voices.NOM them.GEN
'(the voices of those who applaud are so loud) that they can be heard outside the church'

g. gratius mihi uisum est, ut et ibi eas **de**
more.pleasant me.DAT see.PST.PTCP is that and there them.F.ACC from
ipso acciperem (19.19)
him.ABL I.received.SBJV
'it seemed to me more pleasant to receive them from him there'

Indeed, a consideration of the number of immediately preverbal subjects in embedded V2* contexts is statistically revealing, as illustrated in Table 7.

If the *IE* were an SV(O) (or even an S(O)V) language, then we would expect, even in a null subject language like late Latin, for a considerable proportion of embedded clauses to present SV(X) order. Nonetheless, we see from Table 7 that (X)SV(X) order only accounts for a meagre 25.3% of all V2* embedded clauses; crucially, the distribution of immediately preverbal subjects remains largely constant across all predicate types and is neither significantly greater in conjunction with transitives (24.1.5%) nor significantly more restricted in conjunction with unaccusatives (21.8%), whose surface subjects are underlying objects and crosslinguistically more apt to occur in postverbal position. Even allowing for a greater number of (left-dislocated) topicalized (non-immediately preverbal) subjects in V3* sequences, namely 52/118 (44.1%),[51] the proportion of preverbal subjects in linearly V2 embedded sequences still remains remarkably low at just 33.5%. Quite clearly, the distributions observed in Table 7 are not readily compatible with an SVO (or SOV) grammar, but do find a natural explanation in terms of a V2 syntax in which, as argued in §2.2.3, TP lacks an EPP-feature and hence fails to project a dedicated SpecTP subject position. As a consequence, the unmarked position of the subject, even when thematic (cf. 27a-b), is underlying postverbal (Spec*v*P), such

Table 7. Distribution of immediately preverbal subjects in embedded contexts in *IE*

	Transitives	Unaccusatives	Athematics	TOTALS
V2	18/57 (31.5%)	13/46 (28.3%)	26/67 (38.8%)	57/170 (33.5%)
V3	2/22 (9.1)	4/23 (17.4%)	6/33 (18.7%)	12/78 (15.4%)
V4	1/6 (16.6%)	2/9 (22.2%)	0/9 (0%)	3/24 (12.5%)
V5	0/2 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	1/5 (20%)	1/13 (7.7%)
V6	—	0/2 (20%)	—	0/2 (0%)
V7	—	0/1 (0%)	—	0/1 (0%)
Total	21/87 (24.1%)	19/87 (21.8%)	33/114 (28.9%)	73/288 (25.3%)

51. Cf. discussion of preverbal topicalized subjects in root V4* contexts in §2.2.2.

that (immediately) preverbal subjects only arise in embedded clauses, as in root clauses, when they receive particular pragmatic salience and are fronted within the left periphery to a marked position.

(27) a. id est ut die dominica de pullo primo legat
that is so.that day.ABL of.lord.ABL from cock.ABL first.ABL reads.SBJV
episcopus intra Anastase locum resurrectionis Domini
bishop.NOM within Anastasis.ABL place.ACC resurrection.GEN lord.GEN
de euangelio (27.2)
of gospel.ABL
'On the Lord's Day after the first cockcrow the bishop reads in the Anastasis the account of the Lord's Resurrection from the Gospel'

b. […] ut semper erudiatur **populus** in Scripturis (25.1)
so.that always instruct.PASS.3SG people.NOM in scriptures.ABL
[…] in order that the people may always be instructed in the Scriptures'

Irrespective therefore of whether V2 (viz. *v*-to-T-to-C) obtains or not (viz. *v*-to-T) in embedded contexts,[52] we conclude that all preverbal elements, including subjects, are necessarily left-peripheral in late Latin. This naturally explains why in embedded contexts the immediately preverbal position (together with all left-peripheral positions above it) does not function as a grammaticalized subject position. By way of further illustration, in Table 8 we provide a breakdown by grammatical category of all immediately preverbal constituents in embedded contexts: once again these findings highlight the unrestricted nature of the preverbal position which, in order of decreasing frequency, is statistically most often targeted by complements (45.5%), adjuncts (29.2%) and then only finally by subjects (25.3%).

We conclude therefore that in examples like (25), and potentially in many examples like (26)-(27) whenever the left-peripheral constituent is not merged in the extra-sentential topic space, the embedded finite verb lexicalizes the lowest C-position *Fin*, whereas the complementizer/subordinator is generated in the highest position *Force*, as illustrated schematically in (28):

(28) …[$_{\text{ForceP}}$ *quoniam/quia/ut/si/cum*… [$_{\text{TopP/FocP}}$ XP [$_{\text{FinP}}$ V$_{\text{Finite}}$ [$_{\text{TP}}$ ~~V$_{\text{Finite}}$~~…]]]]

In summary, we have seen that the major asymmetry between root and embedded clauses produced by the V2 grammar of late Latin surfaces in the increased distribution of V1 in embedded contexts, where (V-to-)T-to-C movement is significantly much more restricted than in root clauses. Abstracting away, however, from the quantitative differences in the distribution of V2* across both clause types, namely 84.1% vs 58.1%, qualitatively V2* clauses in root and embedded contexts are largely similar inasmuch as the preverbal position proves grammatically

52. On the question of how the V-in-T vs V-in-C cases can be distinguished by the child, see the discussion in §2.2.5.3 below on the proclisis-enclisis alternation.

Table 8. Distribution of immediately preverbal elements in embedded clauses in *IE*

	Subject	Direct Object	Indirect Object	Oblique Object	Adjunct	Total
V2	57 (33.5%)	26 (15.3%)	1 (0.6%)	50 (29.4%)	36 (21.2%)	170
% of all V2*	19.8%	9%	0.3%	17.4%	12.5%	
V3	12 (15.4%)	10 (12.8%)	1 (1.3%)	26 (33.3%)	29 (37.2%)	78
% of all V2	4.2%	3.5%	0.3%	9%	10.1%	
V4	3 (12.5%)	6 (25%)	—	5 (20.8%)	10 (41.7%)	24
% of all V2	1.1%	2.1%		1.7%	3.5%	
V5	1 (7.7%)	2 (15.4%)	—	3 (23.1%)	7 (53.8%)	13
% of all V2	0.3%	0.7%		1.1%	2.4%	
V6	—	—	—	—	2 (100%)	2
% of all V2					0.7%	
V7	—	—	—	1 (100%)	—	1
% of all V2				0.3%		
TOTAL (%)	73 (25.3%)	44 (15.3%)	2 (0.7%)	85 (29.5%)	84 (29.2%)	288
		131 (45.5%)				

unrestricted in both cases. For instance, the frequency of immediately preverbal subjects in root and embedded V2(*) clauses stands at 38.9% (29.2%) and 33.5% (25.3%), respectively. As we shall see directly, the root vs embedded asymmetry surfaces however more conspicuously in other areas such as the alternation between pronominal proclisis and enclisis.

2.2.5.3. Proclisis-Enclisis alternations

One of the clearest reflexes of, and diagnostics for, the distribution of embedded V2 surfaces in the alternation between proclisis and enclisis of non-tonic pronouns. In §2.2.4 we saw that in root clauses non-tonic pronouns surface as weak phrasal pronouns at the left edge of the TP from where they can encliticize at PF to the finite verb raised to C° (cf. 29a). Alternatively, they can procliticize by left-adjunction into the raised verb in the narrow syntax in accordance with the Tobler-Mussafia generalization whenever SpecCP is lexicalized (cf. 29b).

(29) a. $[_{CP}$ $[_{C'}$ V $[_{TP}$ $[_{DP}$ **Pro**] ~~V~~ $[_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ (O) $[_{DP}$ ~~Pro~~]]]]]
(enclisis)

b. $[_{CP}$ $[_{Spec}$ XP] $[_{C'}$ $[_{C}$ $[_{D°}$ **Pro**] V] $[_{TP}$ $[_{DP}$ ~~Pro~~] ~~V~~ $[_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ (O) $[_{DP}$ ~~Pro~~]]]]]
(proclisis)

In embedded contexts, by contrast, we have seen that the finite verb generally remains in T° (30a), but may in specific pragmatico-syntactic contexts – complements to bridge verbs and certain adverbial clauses – raise to the C-domain (30b).

(30) a. [$_{CP}$ ([$_{Spec}$ XP]) [$_{C'}$ [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ **Pro**] V [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ (O) [$_{DP}$ ~~Pro~~]]]]]

b. [$_{CP}$ ([$_{Spec}$ XP]) [$_{C'}$ [$_{C}$ ([$_{D°}$ **Pro**]) V] [$_{TP}$ [$_{DP}$ **Pro**] ~~V~~ [$_{v\text{-}VP}$ (S) ~~V~~ (O) [$_{DP}$ ~~Pro~~]]]]]

A priori we therefore expect in accordance with the predictions of the Tobler-Mussafia generalization that in embedded contexts non-tonic pronouns may surface in the four distinct configurations informally sketched in (31a-d), all of which are attested in the *IE*.[53]

(31) a. Comp Pro=V

b. Comp XP Pro=V

c. Comp V=Pro

d. Comp XP V=Pro

The embedded linearization in (31a) is attested six times in our corpus and is illustrated by examples like those in (32a-c) where, given the unambiguous Pro+V order, we take this sequence to instantiate the underlying non-V2 structure in (30a) where the weak phrasal pronoun procliticizes to the finite verb to its right at PF. If V-raising to C° had taken place in such sequences, then the opposite V+Pro order would obtain; note, furthermore, that such a V2 structure would not be saved by the pronoun subsequently left-adjoining to the finite verb under C°, since such a placement is ruled out by the Tobler-Mussafia generalization (the complementizer/subordinator lexicalizes *Force* within the higher extra-sentential space and is therefore invisible to the computation of the Tobler-Mussafia generalization).

(32) a. ubi stetit sanctus Moyses, quando **ei** dixit Deus: (4.8)
where stood holy.NOM Moses.NOM when him.DAT said God.NOM
'Where Moses stood, when God said to him: […]'

b. uadent se unusquisque ad ospitium suum, ut **se**
they.go self.ACC each.one.NOM to lodging.ACC their.ACC so.that self.ACC
resumant (25.7)
they.restore.SBJV
'every one returns to his lodging to take rest'

c. Ipse ergo cum **se** dignatus fuisset
he.self.NOM thus when self.ACC deign.PRF.PTCP had.been.SBJV
uexare et ibi nobis occurrere (8.5)
trouble.ACT.INF and there us.DAT meet.ACT.INF
'He, after deigning to give himself the trouble of meeting us'

53. As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, whereas the configuration in (31d) is occasionally attested in medieval Romance (cf. Skårup 1975: ch.VII:12-3, ch.IX; Salvi 1990: §2.2.2; 2004: ch.3; Vance 1995: 192, n.2; Ledgeway 2007: §2.2.73), the linearization in (31c), the most frequent in the *IE*, is not attested in medieval Romance.

Turning now to the configuration in (31b), this is illustrated by examples such as (33a-c) of which there are a total of just five occurrences in the *IE*. In principle, the linearization in (31b) is compatible once again with a non-V2 structure (cf. 30a) in which the fronted constituent may variously lexicalize SpecCP or a topic-related specifier in the higher extra-sentential space, as well as with a V2 structure (cf. 30b) in which the fronted constituent specifically lexicalizes SpecCP. In the former case, the pronoun would procliticize to the verb at PF, whereas in the latter case procliticization would be the result of left head-adjunction of the pronoun into the finite verb under C° in the narrow syntax. An examination of all five examples, however, reveals that the fronted constituent (represented in small caps below) in all five cases never involves a topicalized element, but systematically involves an operator (quantified subject/object: *sexta hora/maximus labor* 'sixth hour/great toil', informationally-focused predicative complement: *necesse* 'necessary', negator (x 2): *non* 'not'). We are therefore inevitably led to conclude that the linearization in (31b) invariably instantiates the V2 structure in (30b) with syntactic procliticization of the pronoun to the verb raised to C°, a conclusion further substantiated by the observation that all five clauses involve environments widely reported in the literature as licensing embedded V2, namely 3 causal clauses (introduced by *quia/quoniam*), 1 purpose clause (introduced by *ut*) and 1 temporal clause (introduced by *at ubi* 'when').

(33) a. quoniam MAXIMUS LABOR **nobis** instat hodie nocte ista (35.1)
because great.NOM toil.NOM us.DAT impends today night.ABL this.ABL
'for great toil awaits us today, in this very night'

b. quia NECESSE **nos** erat et loca omnia sancta ambulare
because necessary us.ACC it.was and places all holy walk.INF.ACT
et monasteria, quecumque erant ibi, uidere (4.5)
and cells each.which were there see.INF.ACT
'because it was necessary that we should walk past and see all the holy places and the cells that were there'

c. quoniam NON **eos** subis lente et lente per
because not them.ACC you.ascend slowly and slowly through
girum (3.1)
round.ACC
'These mountains are ascended with infinite toil, for you cannot go up gently by a spiral'

The linearization in (31c) is the most frequent in the *IE* with 15 occurrences and is illustrated by the representative examples in (34). Given the underlying structure in (30a), the surface order V+Pro in (31c) can only be interpreted as the output of a V2 rule which raises the finite verb to C° to the immediate left of the pronoun situated in the left margin of the TP. However, procliticization of the pronoun onto the raised verb by left head-adjunction is ruled out by the Tobler-Mussafia generalization (cf. 30b), forcing the pronoun to encliticize onto the verb at PF. Once again

it is revealing to note that all 15 occurrences of the configuration in (31c) involve typical embedded V2 environments, namely complements to bridge verbs (cf. 34a) and causal (cf. 34b) and temporal (cf. 34c) clauses.

(34) a. Rogo te, domine, ut dicas **michi**, quod desidero audire (20.9)
I.ask you lord.VOC that you.say.SBJV me.DAT what I.desire hear.INF.ACT
'I beg of you, my lord, to tell me that which I desire to hear'

b. quoniam uideo **te**, filia, gratia religionis tam
because I.see you.ACC daughter.VOC favour.ABL duty.GEN so
magnum laborem imposuisse (19.5)
great.ACC toil.acc impose.prf.inf.act
'as I realize, daughter, that for the sake of devotion you have undertaken so great a labour'

c. cum uiderent **se** nullo modo posse
when they.saw.SBJV self.ACC no.ABL way.ABL be.able.INF.ACT
ingredi in ciuitatem (19.11)
enter.INF.PASS in city.ACC
'when they saw that they could by no means enter the city'

Finally, the linearization in (31d), of which there are just three occurrences in the *IE* (35a-c), unambiguously involves once again a V2 structure (cf. 30a), since the finite verb surfaces to the immediate left of the pronoun which encliticizes to the verb only at PF. However, this configuration only arises when the verb is preceded by a topic constituent (underlined in the examples below) merged in the extra-sentential topicalization space since, whenever the verb is preceded by an operator in SpecCP (cf. 31b), syntactic procliticization of the pronoun occurs in accordance with the Tobler-Mussafia generalization. Once again the V2 status of these examples is confirmed by their occurrence in typical embedded V2 contexts, namely complements to bridge verbs (35a), and purpose (35b) and causal (35c) clauses.[54]

54. The eight counterexamples to the structural generalizations in (31a-d), illustrated below in (i.a-h), are only apparent, inasmuch as they all involve a topicalized, and hence tonic, pronoun (given in bold below). The topicalized status of the relevant pronouns is demonstrated in (i.a-b) by the fact that the pronoun is sandwiched between two topicalized constituents (*ibi…de ipso*; *ibi…iter*), and similarly in (i.c-e) by the fact that the pronoun immediately precedes one or more topicalized constituents (*ita; iter sic; sanctus Iesus, filius Nave, Iordanem*), and in (i.f) is sandwiched between a topicalized and a focalized constituent (*hic medianus…nimium*). Finally, in (i.g) the topicalized nature of the pronoun is revealed by its position to the left of the subordinator/complementizer *cum*, and in (i.h) by the fact that the pronoun is modified by a coordinated adjectival phrase (*indignae et non merenti*).

(i) a. gratius mihi uisum est, ut et <u>ibi</u> **eas** <u>de ipso</u>
more.pleasant me.DAT see.PRF.PTCP is that and there them.F.ACC from him.ABL
acciperem (19.19)
I.received.SBJV
'it seemed to me more pleasant to receive them from him there'

(35) a. uidit, quod filii Israhel dimiserant **eum** (8.5)
he.saw that sons.NOM Israel deserted him.ACC
'when he realized that the children of Israel had escaped him'

b. Illud etiam satis mihi grato fuit, ut epistolas
that also very me.DAT pleasing.DAT it.was so.that letters.ACC
ipsas siue Aggari ad Dominum siue Domini ad
the.very.ACC.PL or Abgar.GEN to lord.ACC or lord.GEN to
Aggarum, quas nobis ibi legerat sanctus episcopus,
Abgar.ACC which.ACC.FPL us.DAT there had.read holy.NOM bishop.NOM
acciperem **mihi** ab ipso sancto (19.19)
I.accepted.SBJV ME.DAT FROM SELF.ABL holy.ABL.SG
'I was very thankful in order to receive from the holy man himself the letters of Abgar to the Lord and of the Lord to Abgar, which the holy bishop had read to us there'

---

b. Ac sic ergo euntes aliquandiu per vallem Iordanis super
and so thus go.PRS.PTCP.NOM.PL some.time through valley.ACC Jordan.GEN on
ripam fluminis ipsius, quia ibi **nobis** iter erat aliquandiu (16.1)
bank.ACC river.GEN the.very.GEN because there us.DAT route.NOM was some.time
'Then going for a time through the valley of the Jordan on the bank of the river, because our route lay that way for a while'

c. Et quoniam **nobis** ita erat iter, ut prius montem Dei ascenderemus (2.3)
and because us.DAT thus was route.NOM that first mount.ACC god.GEN we.ascended.SBJV
'And as our route was first to ascend the mount of God'

d. Et quoniam **nobis** iter sic erat, ut per ualle illa media,
and because us.DAT route.NOM so was that through valley.ABL that.ABL middle.ABL
qua tenditur per longum, iremus (5.1)
which.NOM extend.PASS.3SG through length.ACC we.went.SBJV
'And as our route lay through the middle and along the length of the valley'

e. ad eum locum Iordanis, ubi filii Israhel transierant, quando **eos**
to that.ACC place.ACC Jordan.GEN where sons.NOM Israel had.crossed when them.ACC
sanctus Iesus, filius Naue, Iordanem traiecerat (10.3)
holy.NOM Joshua.NOM son.NOM Nun.GEN Jordan.ACC had.led.across
'to that spot on the Jordan where the children of Israel had crossed when holy Joshua, the son of Nun, had led them over Jordan'

f. nisi quod hic medianus **eos** NIMIUM precedebat (3.8)
unless that this.NOM middle.NOM them.ACC exceedingly preceded
'except that this central one excelled them by far'

g. Quae **me** cum uidisset (23.3)
which.NOM.FSG me.ACC when she.had.seen.SBJV
'And when she had seen me'

h. agens Christo Deo nostro gratias, quod **mihi**
do.PRS.PTCP.NOM.SG christ.DAT god.DAT our.DAT thanks.ACC that me.DAT
indignae et non merenti prestare dignatus est
unworthy.DAT.SG and not deserve.PRS.PTCP.DAT offer.INF.ACT deign.PRF.PTCP is
tantam gratiam (23.8)
so.much.ACC grace.ACC
'giving thanks to Christ our God who deigned to give me such grace, unworthy and undeserving as I am'

c. Et quoniam sanctus episcopus ipsius ciuitatis, uir
and because holy.NOM bishop.NOM the.very.GEN city.GEN man.NOM
uere religiosus et monachus et confessor,
truly devout.NOM and monk.NOM and confessor.NOM
suscipiens me libenter ait **michi** (19.5)
receive.PRS.PTCP.NOM.SG me.ACC gladly said me
'Moreover, the holy bishop of the city, a truly devout man, both monk and confessor, received me willingly and said […]'

In summary, we conclude that enclisis is always phonological in both root and embedded clauses, its presence in embedded clauses also serving as a surface diagnostic for V2 produced by V-to-T-to-C movement over the (weak) phrasal pronoun situated in the left edge of the TP (cf. 31c-d). By contrast, proclisis is always syntactic in root clauses, where it represents the output of left head-adjunction into the finite verb raised to C° under V2 in accordance with the Tobler-Mussafia generalization. In embedded clauses, on the other hand, proclisis may be the result of either phonological or syntactic processes. The former option arises whenever V2 fails to obtain and the pronoun simply procliticizes to the finite verb to its immediate right within the TP at PF (cf. 31a), whereas syntactic procliticization occurs as a concomitant of V2 and the Tobler-Mussafia generalization which force the pronoun to left-adjoin into the raised verb whenever SpecCP is lexicalized (cf. 31b). Clearly, these pronominal alternations are intimately tied to the surface position of the finite verb and, in particular, to the availability or otherwise of V-to-T-to-C raising under V2, and must therefore have played a key role in providing the necessary acquisitional cues.

3. Conclusion

The evidence reviewed in the preceding sections has highlighted how the word order patterns characterizing late Latin root and embedded clauses differ quite considerably from those of Classical Latin and modern standard Romance languages. Despite enjoying an apparently greater degree of freedom than the latter, though less than that of the Classical language, the late Latin word order of the *IE* has been shown nonetheless to be constrained by a number of clearly definable structural principles which ultimately characterize it as a V2 language. Within this perspective, the late Latin data provide further evidence for the growing consensus among linguists that, typologically, late Latin and medieval Romance, in its many diatopic varieties, displayed a high degree of structural cohesion in presenting a uniform V2 rule.

References

Adams, James. 1976a. A typological approach to Latin word order. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 81: 70-99. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110243239.70>

Adams, James. 1976b. *The Text and Language of a Vulgar Latin Chronicle (Anonymus Valesianus II), Bulletin Supplement No 36. University of London: Institute of Classical Studies.*

Adams, James. 1992. British Latin: Notes on the language, text and interpretation of the Bath Curse Tablets. *Britannia* 23: 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/526102>

Adams, James. 1994a. Wackernagel's Law and the position of unstressed pronouns in Classical Latin. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92: 103-78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.1994.tb00430.x>

Adams, James. 1994b. *Wackernagel's Law and the Placement of the Copula Esse in Classical Latin*. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society.

Adams, James. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, Marianne. 1987. *Old French, Null Subjects, and Verb Second Phenomena*. University of California Los Angeles: unpublished thesis.

Alexiadou, Artemis & Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word order, verb-movement and EPP checking. *Natural Languages and Linguistic Theory* 16: 491-539. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006090432389>

Amacker, René. 1989. Sur l'ordre des termes dans la proposition latine. In Calboli, Gualtiero (ed.). *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin. Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985*, 485-501. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.17.31ama>

Anderson, Stephen. 2016. Romansh (Rumantsch). In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 169-184. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.001.0001>

Angantýsson, Ásgrímur. 2011. *The Syntax of Embedded Clauses in Icelandic and Related Languages*. Reykjavik: Hugvísindastofnun.

Arce, Augustín. 1980. *Itinerario de la virgin Egeria*. Madrid: Editorial Católica.

Authier, Jean-Marc. 1992. Iterated CPs and embedded topicalization. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 329-336. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4178771>

Baños Baños, José & Cabrillana, Concepción. 2009. Orden de palabras. In Baños Baños, José (ed.). *Sintaxis del latín clásico*, 679-708. Madrid: Liceus.

Bauer, Brigitte. 1995. *The Emergence and Development of SVO Patterning in Latin and French. Oxford: Oxford University Press.*

Bauer, Brigitte. 2009. Word order. In Baldi, Philip & Cuzzolin, Pierluigi (eds.). *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 1. Syntax of the Sentence*, 241-316. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110205626.241>

Bech, Kristin & Salvesen, Christine. 2014. Preverbal word order in old English and old French. In Bech, Kristin & Gunn Eide, Kristine (eds.). *Information Structure and*

Syntactic Change in Germanic and Romance Languages, 233-269. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/la.213.09bec>

Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In Rizzi, Luigi (ed.). *The Structure of CP and IP*, 16-51. Oxford: Oxford University of Press.

Belletti, Adriana. 2005. Extended doubling and the VP periphery. *Probus* 17: 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2005.17.1.1>

Benincà, Paola. 1995. Complement clitics in medieval Romance: The Tobler-Mussafia Law. In Battye, Adrian & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 325-344. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benincà, Paola. 1996. *Piccola storia ragionata della dialettologia italiana*. Padua: Unipress.

Benincà, Paola. 2006. A detailed map of the left periphery of medieval Romance. In Zanuttini, Raffaella, Campos, Hector, Herberger, Elena &Portner, Paul. (eds.). *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics. Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*, 53-86. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Benincà, Paola. 2013. Caratteristiche del V2 romanzo. Lingue romanze antiche, ladino dolomitico e portoghese. In Cognola, Federcia & Bidese, Ermengildo (eds.). *Introduzione alla linguistica del mòcheno*, 65-84. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier.

Benincà, Paola & Poletto, Cecilia. 2004. Topic, focus, and V2. Defining the CP sublayers. In Rizzi, Luigi (ed.). *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 2*, 52-75. Oxford: Oxford University of Press.

Bentley, Delia. 2007. Relazioni grammaticali e ruoli pragmatici: siciliano e italiano a confronto'. In Bentley, Delia & Ledgeway, Adam (eds.). *Sui dialetti italoromanzi. Saggi in onore di Nigel B. Vincent*, 48-62. Norfolk: Biddles.

Bentley, Delia. 2016. Split intransitivity. In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 821-832. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0050>

Biberauer, Theresa. 2003. *Verb Second (V2) in Afrikaans: A Minimalist Investigation of Word Order Variation*. Phd dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Biberauer, Theresa. 2004. Reconsidering the EPP and Spec-TP in Germanic. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 1: 15-40.

Biberauer, Theresa & Kemenade, Ans van. 2011. Subject positions and information-structural diversification in the history of English. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 10: 17-69.

Biberauer, Theresa & Roberts, Ian. 2005. Changing EPP-parameters in the history of English: Accounting for variation and change. *English Language and Linguistics* 9: 5-46.

Boeckx, Cedric & Grohmann, Kleanthes. 2005. Left dislocation in Germanic. In Werner, Abraham (ed.), *Focus on Germanic typology*, 131-44. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Bolkestein, Machtelt. 1989. Parameters in the expression of embedded predications in Latin. In Calboli, Gualtiero (ed.). *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin. Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985*, 3-35. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.17.04bol>

Bolkestein, Machtelt. 2001. Random scrambling? Constraints on discontinuity in Latin noun phrases. In Moussy, Claude, Dangel, Jacqueline, Fruyt, Michèle, Nadjo, Léon & Sznajder, Lyliane (eds.). *De lingua latina nouae questiones. Actes du X^e^ colloque international de linguistique latine Paris-Sèvres, 19–23 avril 1999*, 245-58. Louvain/Paris/Sterling: Editions Peeters.

Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian Syntax: A Government-binding Approach*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Cabrillana, Concepción. 1999. Type of text, pragmatic function, and constituent order. A comparative study of the *Mulomedicina Chironis* and the *Peregrinatio Egeriae*. In Petersmann, Hubert & Ketteman, Rudolf (eds.). *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif V. Actes du V^e^ colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif Heidelberg, 5–8 septembre 1997*, 319-30. Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Cardinaletti, Anna. 1997. Subjects and clause structure. In Haegeman, Lilianne (ed.). *The New Comparative Syntax*, 33-63. London: Longman.

Cardinaletti, Anna. 2004. Toward a cartography of subject positions. In Rizzi, Luigi (ed.). *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures. Volume 2*, 115-165. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cardinaletti, Anna & Roberts, Ian. 2002. Clause structure and X-Second. In Cinque, Guglielmo (ed.). *Functional Structure in DP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, 123-166. Oxford / New York: Oxford University Press.

Carnie, Andrew & Guilfoyle, Eithne. 2000. *The Syntax of Verb Initial Languages*. Oxford: Oxford Univeristy Press.

Carnie, Andrew, Harley, Heidi & Dooley, Sheila Ann. 2005. *Verb First. On the Syntax of Verb-initial Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.73>

Casalicchio, Jan & Cognola, Federica. In press. V2 and (micro-)variation in two Rhaeto-Romance varieties of northern Italy. In D'Alessandro, Roberta & Pescarini, Diego (eds.), *Advances in Italian dialectology. Sketches of Italo-Romance Grammars*. Leiden: Brill

Charpin, François. 1977. *L'idée de phrase grammaticale et son expression en latin*. Lille: Atelier de reproduction des thèses; Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion.

Charpin, François. 1989. Etude de syntaxe énonciative: L'ordre des mots et la phrase. In Calboli, Gualtiero (ed.). *Subordination and Other Topics in Latin. Proceedings of the Third Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Bologna, 1–5 April 1985*, 503-520. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.17.32cha>

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Clackson, James & Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2007. *The Blackwell History of the Latin Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cognola, Federica. 2013a. The mixed OV/VO syntax of Mòcheno main clauses: On the interaction between high and low left periphery. In Biberauer, Theresa & Sheehan, Michelle (eds.), *Theoretical Approches to Disharmonic Word Orders*, 106-135. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199684359.001.0001>

Cognola, Federica, 2013b. Scrambling as verum focus: German scrambling meets Romance anaphoric anteposition. Unpublished manuscript, University of Trento.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2006. Informational focus in Sicilian and the left periphery. In Frascarelli, Mara (ed.). *Phases of Interpretations*, 363-386. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197723.5.363>

Cruschina, Silvio. 2010. Fronting as focalization in Sicilian. In D'Alessandro, Roberta, Ledgeway, Adam & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, 247-260. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2012. *Discourse-related Features and Functional Projections*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cruschina, Silvio. 2016. Information and discourse structure. In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 596-608. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0034>

Cruschina, Silvio & Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. Structure of the clause. In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 556-574. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0031>

Cuzzolin, Pierluigi & Haverling, Gerd. 2009. Syntax, sociolinguistics, and literary genres. In Baldi, Philip & Cuzzolin, Pierluigi (eds.). *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax. Volume 1. Syntax of the Sentence*, 19-63. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110205626.19>

Danckaert, Lieven. 2012. *Latin Embedded Clauses. The Left Periphery*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/la.184>

de Haan, Willem & Weerman, Frank. 1986. Finiteness and verb fronting in Frisian. In Haider, Hubert & Prinzhorn, Martin (eds.). *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*, 77-110. Dordrecht: Foris.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110846072.77>

de Jong, Jan. 1994. Word order in Cato's *De Agricultura. In* Herman, József (ed.). *Linguistic Studies on Latin. Selected papers from the 6th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics (Budapest, 23-27 March 1991)*, 91-101. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.28.10jon>

Demonte, Violeta, and Fernández Soriano, Olga. 2009. Force and Finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system. *Probus* 21: 23-50.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2009.002>

Devine, Andrew & Stephens, Laurence. 2006. *Latin Word Order. Structured Meaning and Information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195181685.001.0001>

Diesing, Moly. 1990. Verb movement and the subject position in Yiddish. In Blevins, Jim & Carter, Juli (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 18*, 124-40. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA.

Dragomirescu, Adina & Nicolae, Alexandru. 2015. Old Romanian inversion as a residual V2 grammar. Paper presented at *Romance Syntax. Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives, Al 15-lea Colocviu Internațional* al Departamentului de Lingvistică: Perspective Comparative și Diacronice asupra Limbii Române, Facultatea de Litere, University of Bucharest, 26-28/11/15.

Ernout, Alfred & Thomas, François. [1953] 1993. *Syntaxe latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Fontana, Josep. 1993. *Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Fontana, Josep. 1997. On the integration of second position phenomena. In van Kemenade, Ans & Vincent, Nigel (eds.). *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, 207-249. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Francheschini, Ezio & Weber, Robert. [1958] 1965. 'Itinerarium Egeriae', in Geyer, Paul et al. (eds.). *Itineraria et alia geographica* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 175), 29-106. Turnhout: Brepols.

Freitag, Constantin & Scherf, Nathalie. 2016. Embedded V2 revisted: dependent vs. subordinate clauses. Paper presented at *Rethinking Verb Second: Assessing the Theory and the Data*, Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, University of Cambridge, 22-24 March 2016.

Frey, Werner. 2006. Contrast and movement to the German prefield. In Molnár, Valéria & Winkler, Susanne (eds.). *The Architecture of Focus. Studies in Generative Grammar 82*, 235-64. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110922011.235>

Gheorghe, Mihaela. 2016. Complementizers and complement clauses. In Pană *Dindelegan*, Gabriela (ed.). *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, 463-73. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198712350.001.0001>

González, Sergio. 2009. Análisis del *Itinerarium Egeriae* I-II. *Byzantion Nea Hellás* 28: 105-125.

Gupton, Timothy. 2010. *The Syntax-Information Structure Interface: Subjects and Clausal Word Order in Galician*. University of Iowa: unpublished thesis.

Haida, Roman. 1928. *Die Wortstellung in der Peregrinatio ad loca sancta*. Breslau: thesis.

Haider, Hubert. 1993. *Deutsche Syntax Generativ*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Haider, Hubert. 2010. *The Syntax of German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845314>

Haider, Hubert. 2013. *Symmetry Breaking in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139084635>

Haiman, John, & Benincà, Paola. 1992. *The Rhaeto-Romance Languages*. London: Routledge.

Harris, Martin. 1978. *The Evolution of French Syntax: A Comparative Approach*. London: Longman.

Herman, József. 1990. *Du Latin aux langues romanes: études de linguistique historique*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Herman, József. 2000. *Vulgar Latin*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Herrero, Víctor José. 1963. *Peregrinación de Egeria*. Madrid: Aguilar.

Hertzenberg, Marie Johanne Bordal. 2015. *Third Person Reference in Late Latin. Demonstratives, Definite Articles, and Personal Pronouns in the Itinerarium Egeriae*. Tübingen: De Gruyter Mouton.

Hinojo, Gregorio. 1986. El orden de palabras en la Peregrinatio Aetheriae. *Studia Zamorensia* 7: 81-7.

Hinojo, Gregorio. 1988. Del orden de palabras en castellano medieval. In Ariza, Manuel, Salvador, Antonio & Viudas, Antonio (eds.). *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española, Cáceres 1987*, 435-448. Madrid: Arco Libros.

Hinojo, Gregorio. 2012. El orden de palabras en autores renacentistas. *Studia Philologica Valentina* 14: 323-337.

Holmberg, Anders. 2015. Verb second. In Kiss, Tibor & Alexiadou, Artemis (eds.). *Syntax – Theory and Analysis. An International Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Research*, 342-383. Berlin: de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110377408.342>

Hooper, Joan & Thompson, Sandra. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4: 465-97. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4177789>

Huber, Joseph. 1933. *Altportugiesisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Hulk, Aafke & van Kemenade, Ans. 1995. Verb second, prodrop, functional projections and language change. In Battye, Adrian & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 227-256. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Janeras, Sebastià. 2003. Bibliografia egeriana recent. *Butlletí bibliographic* 38: 231-240.

Janse, Mark. 1994. La loi de Wackernagel et ses extensions en latin: à propos de la collocation pronominale chez Pétrone. *Tema* 1: 107-46.

Jones, Michael. 1993. *Sardinian Syntax*. London: Routledge.

Kaiser, Georg. 1999. A ordem das palavras e a posição do verbo finito no português antigo. In Pál, Ferenc (ed.). *Actas do congresso internacional por motivo dos vinte anos do português no ensino superior*, 248-61. Budapest: Departamento de língua e literatura portuguesas da Faculdade de Letras da Universidade Eötvös Loránd de Budapeste1.

Kaiser, Georg. 2002. *Verbstellung und Verbstellungswandel in den romanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kaiser, Georg. 2002-03. Die Verb-Zeit-Stellung im Rätoromanischen. Ein typologischer Vergleich. *Ladinia* 26-7: 313-34.

Kiparsky, Paul. 1995. Indo-European origins of Germanic syntax. In Battye, Adrian & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 140-69. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kroll, Wilhelm. 1918. Anfangsstellung des Verbums im Lateinischen. *Glotta 9: 112-23.*

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form. Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620607>

Ledgeway, Adam. 2005. Moving through the left periphery: The dual complementiser system in the dialects of southern Italy. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103: 336-396. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.2005.00157.x>

Ledgeway, Adam. 2007. Old Neapolitan word order: Some initial observations. In Lepschy, Anna Laura & Tosi, Arturo (eds.). *Histories and Dictionaries of the Languages of Italy*, 121-49. Ravenna: Longo.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2008. Satisfying V2 in early Romance: Merge vs. Move. *Journal of Linguistics* 44(2): 437-470. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226708005173>

Ledgeway, Adam. 2010. The clausal domain: CP structure and the left periphery. In D'Alessandro, Roberta, Ledgeway, Adam & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, 38-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2012a. *From Latin to Romance. Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199584376.001.0001>

Ledgeway, Adam. 2012b. From Latin to Romance: Configurationality, functional categories and head-marking. In Barðdal, Johanna, Cennamo, Michela & van Gelderen, Elly (eds.). *Variation and Change in Argument Realisation*. Oxford: Blackwell. Special Issue of the *Transactions of the Philological Society* 110: 422-442. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.2012.01310.x>

Ledgeway, Adam. 2014. Parametrului poziţiei centrului şi efectele sale pragmatice în trecerea de la latină la limbile romance. In Zafiu, Rodica, Dragomirescu, Adina & Nicolae, Alexandru (eds.). *Diacronie şi sincronie în studiul limbii române*, 11-26. Bucharest: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2016a. Sentential word order in the late Latin of the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*. Paper presented at *Rethinking Verb Second: Assessing the Theory and the Data*, Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, University of Cambridge, 22-24 March 2016.

Ledgeway, Adam. 2016b. Complementation. In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 1013-1028. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0063>

Ledgeway, Adam. In press a. From Latin to Romance: The decline of edge-fronting. In Cardosa, Adriana & Martins, Ana Maria (eds.). *Word Order Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. In press b. From Latin to Romance syntax: The great leap. In Crisma, Paola & Longobardi, Giuseppe (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Diachronic and Historical Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ledgeway, Adam. In prep. Second position elements and late Latin verb-second syntax. In Biberauer, Theresa, Wolfe, Sam & Wood, Rebecca (eds.). *Verb Second. The State of the Art*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lemieux, Monique & Dupuis, Ferdinande. 1995. The locus of verb movement in non-asymmetric verbsecond languages: The case of middle French. In Battye, Adrian & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 80-109. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Linde, Paul. 1923. Die Stellung des Verbs in der lateinischen Prosa. *Glotta* 12: 153-178.

Löfstedt, Einar. 1911. *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Lombardi, Alessandra. 2007. Posizione dei clitici e ordine dei costituenti nella lingua sarda medievale'. In Bentley, Delia & Ledgeway, Adam (eds.). *Sui dialetti italo-romanzi. Saggi in onore di Nigel B. Vincent* (*The Italianist* 27, Special supplement 1), 133-147. Norfolk: Biddles.

Lombardi, Alessandra & Middleton, Roberta. 2004. Alcune osservazioni sull'ordine delle parole negli antichi volgari italiani. Dardano, Maurizio & Frenguelli, Gianluca (eds.). *SintAnt. La sintassi dell'italiano antico. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi*, 553-82. Rome: Aracne.

Maraval, Pierre. 1982. *Journal de voyage (Itinéraire). Valerius du Bierzo. Lettre sur la B^se Égérie*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.

Marouzeau, Jules. 1938. *L'ordre des mots dans la phrase latine. II. Le verbe*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Martins, Ana Maria. 1994. *Clíticos na história do português*. Unpublished PhD, Universidade.

McClure, M.L. Herbert & Feltoe, Charles. 1919. *The Pilgrimage of Etheria*. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Mensching, Guido & Remberger, Eva-Maria. 2010. Focus fronting and the left periphery in Sardinian. In D'Alessandro, Roberta, Ledgeway, Adam & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, 261-276. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Möbitz, Otto. 1924. Die Stellung des Verbums in den Schriften des Apuleius. *Glotta* 13: 116-126.

Mussafia, Adolfo. 1886. Una particolarità sintattica della lingua italiana dei primi secoli. In *Miscellanea di filologia e linguistica, dedicata alla memoria di Napoleone Caix e Ugo Angelo Canello*, 255-61, 474-475.

Nicolae, Alexandru. 2015. *Ordinea constituenților în limba română: O perspectivă diacronică. Structura propoziției și deplasarea verbului*. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.

Nicolae, Alexandru & Niculescu, Dana. 2015. Pronominal clitics in old Romanian: The Tobler-Mussafia Law. *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 60: 223-242.

Nilsen, Øystein. 2003. *Eliminating Positions: Syntax and Semantics of Sentential Modification*. Unpublished PhD, Utrecht University.

Nocentini, Alberto. 1990. L'uso dei dimostrativi nella *Peregrinatio Egeriae* e la genesi dell'articolo romanzo. In *Atti del convegno internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae*, 137-158. Arezzo: Accademia Petrarca di lettere e arti e scienze.

Oniga, Renato. 2004. *Il latino. Breve introduzione linguistica*. Milan: Franco Angeli.

Oniga, Renato. 2014. *Latin. A Linguistic Introduction* (edited and translated by Norma Schifano). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Orinsky, Kurt. 1923. Die Wortstellung bei Gaius. *Glotta* 12: 83-100.

Paoli, Sandra. 2005. COMP: A Multi-talented category. Evidence from Romance. In Brugè, Laura, Giusti, Giuliana, Munaro, Nicola, Schweikert, Walter & Turan, Giuseppina (eds.), *Contributions to the XXX Incontro di Grammatica Generativa*, 185-202. Venice: Cafoscarina.

Paoli, Sandra. 2010. In focus: An investigation of information and constrastive constructions. In D'Alessandro, Roberta, Ledgeway, Adam & Roberts, Ian (eds). *Syntactic Variation. The Dialects of Italy*, 277-291. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perlmutter, David. 1978. Impersonal passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 157-189. Berkeley: University of California.

Pinkster, Harm. 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London: Routledge.

Pinkster, Harm. 1991. Evidence for SVO in Latin? In Wright, Roger (ed.). *Latin and the Early Romance Languages in the Middle Ages*, 69-82. London: Routledge.

Pinkster, Harm. 1993a. Tipo di testo e variazione linguistica in latino. In Hilty, Gerold (ed.). *Actes du XX^e Congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes.*

Université de Zurich (6-11 avril 1992). Tome II, section II, Analyse de conversation, 645-650. Tübingen: Narr.

Pinkster, Harm. 1993b. Chronologie et cohérence de quelques évolutions latines et romanes. In Hilty, Gerold (ed.). *Actes du XX^e congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes. Tome III, section IV, Typologie des langues romanes*, 239-250. Tübingen: Narr.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The Higher Functional Field.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2002. The left-periphery of V2-Rhaetoromance dialects: A new view on V2 and V3. In Barbiers, Sjef, Cornips, Leonie & van der Kleij, Susanne (eds.). *Syntactic Microvariation*, 214-242. Amsterdam: Meertens Institute.

Poletto, Cecilia. 2014. *Word Order in Old Italian*. Oxford, Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199660247.001.0001>

Polo, Chiara. 2004. *Word Order in Latin, Italian and Slovene between Morphology and Syntax. Padua: Unipress.*

Price, Glanville. 1971. *The French Language Present and Past*. London: Arnold.

Radwan, Sonja. 2011. *L'ordre des mots en ancien français. La syntaxe et la structure informationelle de la zone préverbale*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Oslo.

Ramsden, Herbert. 1963. *Weak Pronoun Position in the Early Romance Texts*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Renzi, Lorenzo. 1985. *Nuova introduzione alla filologia romanza*. Bologna: il Mulino.

Ribeiro, Ilza. 1995. Evidence for a verb-second phase in Old Portuguese. In Battye, Adrian & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 110-139. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rinke, Esther. 2009. Verb placement in old Portuguese. In Dufter, Andreas & Jacob, Daniel (eds.). *Focus and background in the Romance languages*, 309-332. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.112.11rin>

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Haegeman, Lilianne (ed.). *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8>

Roberts, Ian. 1993. *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax. A Comparative History of English and French*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-2910-7>

Roberts, Ian. 2004. The C-system in Brythonic Celtic languages, V2, and the EPP. In Rizzi, Luigi (ed.). *The Structure of CP and IP*, 297-328. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Ian & Roussou, Anna. 2002. The extended projection principle as a condition on the Tense dependency. In Svenonius, Peter (ed.). *Subjects, Expletives, and the EPP*, 125-155. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosén, Hannah. 1998. Latin presentational sentences. In García-Hernández, Benjamín (ed.). *Estudios de lingüística latina*, 723-742. Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.

Salvesen, Christine. 2013. Topics and the left periphery: A comparison of old French and modern Germanic. In Lohndal, Terje (ed.). *In search of Universal Grammar: From Old Norse to Zoque*, 131-72. Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.202.10sal>

Salvi, Giampaolo. 1990. La sopravvivenza della legge di Wackernagel nei dialetti occidentali della Penisola iberica. *Medioevo Romanzo* 15: 177-210.

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2000. La formazione del sistema V2 delle lingue romanze antiche. *Lingua e stile* 35: 665-692.

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2004. *La formazione della struttura di frase romanza. Ordine delle parole e clitici dal latino alle lingue romanze antiche*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2005. Some firm points on Latin word order: The left periphery. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.). *Universal Grammar in the Reconstruction of Ancient Languages*, 429-456. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110902228.429>

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2011. Morphosyntactic persistence. In Maiden, Martin, Smith, John Charles & Ledgeway, Adam (eds.). *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*, 318-381. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521800723.009>

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2012. On the nature of the V2 System of medieval Romance. In Brugè, Laura, Cardinaletti, Anna, Giusti, Giuliana, Munaro, Nicola & Poletto, Cecilia (eds.). *Functional Heads*, 103-111. New York: Oxford University Press.

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2016a. Ladin. In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 154-168. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0011>

Salvi, Giampaolo. 2016b. Word order. In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 997-1012. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0062>

Santorini, Beatrice. 1995. Two types of verb second in the history of Yiddish. In Battye, Adrian & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 53-79. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schneider, Nicolaus. 1912. *De verbi in lingua latina collocatione*. Münster: Monasterii Guestfalorum.

Sigurðsson, Halldor. 1990. V1 declaratives and verb raising in Icelandic. In Maling, Joan & Zaenen, Annie (eds.). *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, 41-69. San Diego, Academic Press.

Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2012. A comparative study of word order in Old Romance. *Folia Linguistica* 46: 553-604. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2012.019>

Skårup, Povl. 1975. *Les Premières zones de la proposition en ancien français*. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.

Sornicola, Rosanna. 2000. Stability, variation and change in word order: Some evidence from the Romance languages. In Sornicola, Rosanna, Poppe, Erich & Shisha-Halevy, Ariel (eds.). *Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns Over Time*, 101-118. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.213.10sor>

Spevak, Olga. 2005. *Itinerarium Egeriae*: L'ordre des constituants obligatoires. *Mnemosyne* 58(2): 235-261. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4433635>

Spevak, Olga. 2007. La place du focus en latin: Quelques observations. In Purnelle, Gérald & Denooz, Jospeh (eds.). *Ordre et cohérence en latin. Communications présentées au 13e colloque international de linguistique latine (Bruxelles-Liège, 4-9 avril 2005)*, 191-201. Geneva: Droz.

Spevak, Olga. 2008. Le placement de *is, hic* et *ille* chez Grégoire de Tours. In Wright, Roger (ed.). *Latin vulgaire – latin tardif. Actes du VIII*ème *colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif (Oxford, 6-9 septembre 2006)*, 361-70. Olms-Weidmann: Hildesheim.

Tobler, Adolphe. 1875. *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik*, Erste Reihe, Leipzig.

Väänänen, Veikko. 1987. *Le Journal*épître d'Egérie. *Etude linguistique*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Vance, Barbara. 1995. On the decline of verb movement to Comp in old and middle French. In Battye, Adrian & Roberts, Ian (eds.). *Clause Structure and Language Change*, 170-199. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vance, Barbara. 1997. *Syntactic Change in Medieval French. Verb-second and Null Subjects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-015-8843-0>

Vanelli, Laura. 1986. Strutture tematiche in italiano antico. In Stammerjohann, Harro (ed.). *Tema-Rema in Italiano*, 248-273. Tübingen: Narr.

Vanelli, Laura. 1999. Ordine delle parole e articolazione pragmatica nell'italiano antico: La 'prominenza' pragmatica della prima posizione nella frase. *Medioevo Romanzo* 23: 229-246.

Vanelli, Laura, Renzi, Lorenzo & Benincà, Paola. 1985. Typologie des pronoms sujets dans les langues romanes. In *Actes du XVIIe Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes*, III, 163-176. Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence.

Vikner, Sten. 1995. *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Villa-Garcia, Julio. 2012a. *The Spanish Complementizer System: Consequences for the Syntax of Dislocations and Subjects, Locality of Movement, and Clausal Structure*. University of Connecticut: Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Villa-Garcia, Julio. 2012b. Recomplementation and locality of movement in Spanish. *Probus* 24: 257-314.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/probus-2012-0011>

Villa-Garcia, Julio. 2015. *The Syntax of Multiple-que Sentences in Spanish: Along the left Periphery*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/ihll.2>

Vincent, Nigel. 1988. Latin. In Harris, Martin & Vincent, Nigel (eds.). *The Romance Languages*, 26-78. London: Croom Helm.

Vincent, Nigel. 1997. The emergence of the D-system in Romance. In van Kemenade, Ans & Vincent, Nigel (eds.). *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, 149-169. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vincent, Nigel. 1998. Tra grammatica e grammaticalizzazione: Articoli e clitici nelle lingue (italo)-romanze. In Ramat, Paolo & Roma, Elisa (eds.). *Sintassi storica. Atti del XXX congresso internazionale della Società di linguistica italiana, Pavia, 26-28 settembre 1996*, 411-440. Rome: Bulzoni.

Vincent, Nigel. 2006. Il problema del doppio complementatore nei primi volgari d'Italia. In Andreose, Alivse & Penello, Nicoletta (eds.). *Laboratorio sulle varietà romanze antiche: Giornata di lavoro sulle varietà romanze antiche*, 27-42. Padua: University of Padua.

Vincent, Nigel. 2016. A structural comparison of Latin and Romance. In Ledgeway, Adam & Maiden, Martin (eds.). *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, 37-49. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199677108.003.0004>

Walkden, George. 2014. *Syntactic reconstruction and Proto-Germanic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198712299.001.0001>

Walkden, George. 2015. Verb-third in early west Germanic: A comparative perspective. In Biberauer, Theresa & Walkden, George (eds.). *Syntax over time*, 236-248. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199687923.001.0001>

Wanner, Dieter. 1998. Les subordonnées à double complémentateur en roman médiéval. In Giovanni Ruffino (ed.). *Atti del XXI congresso internazionale di linguistica e filologia romanza. Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, Università di Palermo 18-24 settembre 1995. Volume I, sezione 1, Grammatica storica delle lingue romanze*, 421-433. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Wolfe, Sam. 2015a. The old Sardinian condaghes: A syntactic study. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 113: 177-205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.12046>

Wolfe, Sam. 2015b. *Microvariation in Medieval Romance Syntax: A Comparative Study*. University of Cambridge: unpublished doctoral thesis.

Wolfe, Sam. 2015c. Microvariation in old Italo-Romance syntax: The view form old Sardinian and old Sicilian. *Archivio glottologico italiano* 100: 3-36.

Wolfe, Sam. 2015d. The nature of old Spanish verb second reconsidered. *Lingua* 164: 132-55.

Wolfe, Sam. 2016. Towards a new typology of verb second systems. Paper presented at *Rethinking Verb Second: Assessing the Theory and the Data*, Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, University of Cambridge, 22-24 March 2016.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2013. Information structure. In Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (ed.). *The Grammar of Romanian*, 568-575. Oxford: Oxford University Press.